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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

In November 2011, the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology received an order of reference from the Senate “to examine and report on social inclusion and cohesion in Canada.” Continuing from its earlier study on social conditions in Canadian cities, the committee built upon the testimony from more than 170 witnesses, who contributed to the earlier report, *In from the Margins: A Call to Action on Poverty, Housing and Homelessness*, tabled in December 2009. With testimony from more than 65 witnesses over two Parliaments, the committee has now completed its second report, entitled *In from the Margins, Part II: Reducing Barriers to Social Inclusion and Social Cohesion*.

As in its earlier study, and the committee’s report on access to post-secondary education, statistical evidence, testimony during hearings and written submissions identified particular groups that are vulnerable to economic and social marginalization. These groups include recent immigrants, visible minorities, religious minorities, sexual minorities, urban Aboriginal peoples, and individuals with disabilities. In addition, the committee heard that youth and seniors also face barriers to social inclusion in their communities. For each of these groups, the committee learned about particular barriers, current initiatives intended to reduce and eliminate these barriers, and persistent challenges that remain. The committee has made recommendations to support these groups in overcoming remaining hurdles to their inclusion, with a particular focus on income mobility as a route to greater equality and inclusion.

The committee also recognizes that urban safety and upward income mobility are prerequisites to social inclusion, and has included these themes in this study.

In this Executive Summary, recommendations are abbreviated, but are understood to be directed to the Government of Canada and to be cognizant of existing programs and operational constraints.

RECENT IMMIGRANTS

Canada welcomes approximately 250,000 newcomers to Canada as permanent residents, many of whom become citizens over time. While historically Canada’s immigration came primarily from western European countries, increasingly these newcomers also join racial minorities within Canada, and may be less skilled in either of Canada’s official languages. The committee heard that highly educated recent immigrants face barriers to working in their fields of expertise, and, in contrast to historical trends, immigrants in general are not achieving the same levels of economic returns as Canadian-born citizens.

The committee heard that selection processes are being modified to place greater emphasis on official language proficiency, that efforts are continuing to expedite the recognition of the foreign-earned credentials of skilled immigrants and that pre-departure services are being expanded and have shown greater promise in facilitating the social and economic integration of
recent immigrants. The committee recommends enhancement of these initiatives to support greater social inclusion.

For recent immigrants who need support to develop official language proficiency, the committee recommends that access to these services, especially for parents with young children, be expanded.

The committee learned that some recent immigrants are settling in communities that are at greater risk of exclusion because of poverty and the absence of links to employment and social engagement. To overcome these challenges, the committee recommends partnerships with municipal and provincial governments to expand the existing Local Immigration Partnership model, in order to support newcomers and their neighbourhoods that are at heightened risk of exclusion. The committee also recommends that such partnerships be used to promote both civic awareness and civic participation among recent immigrants.

VISIBLE MINORITIES

As noted above, an increasing proportion of newcomers to Canada are visible minorities; however, the presence of visible minorities pre-dates Confederation. Yet, the committee learned that visible minorities continue to face challenges to full participation in Canadian society, particularly with respect to employment opportunities. As the visible minority population increased by more than a million people from 2001 to 2005, the projections are that by 2031, almost one-quarter of the Canadian population will be non-Caucasian.

Labour force participation rates for visible minorities are lower than for non-visible minorities. Similarly, among visible minorities seeking work, the unemployment rate is higher than for their Caucasian counterparts. Low incomes, precarious employment and higher rates of unemployment among visible minorities, most of whom live in Canada’s cities, result in higher levels of poverty relative to non-visible minorities.

Witnesses told the committee that higher levels of participation by visible minorities in organizations that contribute to the development of public policy at all levels was an important step in increasing social inclusion for this population. The committee agrees and calls for federal government support initiatives to achieve this goal. Witnesses also told the committee that persistent racism plays a role in the social exclusion of this population; the committee recommends a continuation of federal efforts to combat racism and encourage provincial and territorial governments to develop a national comprehensive education policy to challenge and address racism, other forms of intolerance, and the bullying that can result.

Although the Public Service Employment Act requires the representation of visible minorities in the federal public service hiring and retention practices to achieve participation that reflect their labour force availability, the committee learned that this group continues to be under-represented in the public service. The committee recommends an acceleration of hiring and staffing process for visible minorities and other groups identified in the Act, and that
federally regulated industries be invited to hire and retain members of these groups in proportion to their workforce availability.

**Religious Minorities**

In recent years, the percentage of Canadians who identify themselves as Protestant or Catholic has remained high, but the composition of those identifying themselves as adhering to a minority denomination increased substantially from 1991 to 2001. Most notably, there was an increase of approximately 90% or more among Hindus, Buddhists and Sikhs. Despite Canada’s history of religious tolerance, the committee learned that almost 400 hate crimes reported to police in 2010 were motivated by religious intolerance.

The committee noted the protections offered by the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, and the establishment of a permanent federal program to provide financial support to groups at risk of hate-motivated crime.

**Urban Aboriginal Canadians**

The committee heard of the persistent barriers faced by Canada’s Aboriginal peoples living in cities, including poorer health, education, social and economic outcomes relative to their non-Aboriginal counterparts. The committee also learned that the demographic profile of Aboriginal peoples continues to show a younger population than among Canadians in general, and an increase in the proportion of older Aboriginal peoples as well.

The diversity among Aboriginal peoples – comprising First Nations, Inuit and Métis – was highlighted in testimony before the committee. The committee also heard of a growing proportion of Aboriginal peoples moving to cities, and the widely varying proportion of Aboriginal peoples among Canadian cities. Although the legal interpretations of the definition of “Aboriginal” under the Constitution have been the subject of litigation that continues, witnesses told the committee that determining jurisdiction could not delay action to address the needs of Aboriginal peoples in our cities.

The committee and its witnesses also focused on the participation of young Aboriginal people in youth gangs in Canadian cities. Witnesses linked this participation to poverty and exclusion, and told the committee that Aboriginal organizations and services were under-resourced to respond fully. Although federal funding is available in the Youth Gang Prevention Fund, the committee recommends that national Aboriginal organizations be consulted and informed about how these funds could be accessible to and effective for activities among Aboriginal youth.

A recurring theme in testimony was that existing federal programs would be more effective if they were developed and implemented in closer co-operation with existing Aboriginal organizations. The committee recommends that Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development work with the National Association of Friendship centres in delivering the Cultural Connections for Aboriginal Youth Program and in supporting transition services for Aboriginal peoples.
moving to cities. The committee calls for increased collaboration within the Urban Aboriginal Strategy, both with respect to improving distributional fairness and coordination on the community steering committees developed under the Strategy and with a view to working with other governments to expand the Urban Aboriginal Strategy beyond its current reach in 13 communities. The committee also recommends a review of core funding under the Aboriginal Friendship Centre Program and, where warranted, adjustments in funding to appropriate levels.

The urgency of improving educational outcomes for Aboriginal peoples was an echo of testimony heard during earlier committee studies. Access to post-secondary education and training was identified by witnesses and endorsed by committee members as one of the best opportunities for social and economic inclusion of Aboriginal peoples.

Witnesses also identified the need to increase both employment opportunities and entrepreneurial pursuits among young Aboriginal peoples. The Committee recommends continued emphasis by the federal government on ensuring that Aboriginal youth access skills training and employment opportunities, and co-operation with private sector partners to enhance such opportunities in all sectors of the Canadian economy.

With respect to the encouragement of entrepreneurial opportunities for Aboriginal peoples, the committee calls for co-operation with provincial and territorial governments to work with national Aboriginal organizations to support new and existing Aboriginal businesses. The committee also recommends that federal partnership with these organizations focus on skills development appropriate to the needs of Aboriginal entrepreneurs and their businesses.

The committee recommends that the federal government explore its participation in the Aboriginal Affairs Working Group currently bringing together ministers and officials from provincial and territorial governments to discuss and address the broad range of needs and interests of Aboriginal Canadians.

**Canadians with Disabilities**

Approximately one in seven Canadians reported a disability in 2006, a significant increase over five years earlier. While the aging of the population was reported to have accounted for part of the increase, Statistics Canada indicated that the changing perception of disability may have contributed to more individuals being willing to report a disability.

The committee heard that one in five working-age persons with disabilities had a low income in 2006, about twice the rate for persons without disabilities. Human Resources Development Canada (HRSDC) reported in 2010 that the average income of working-age persons with disabilities was 20% lower than their non-disabled counterparts. This differential, combined with the impairments associated with disabilities, make inclusion of persons with disabilities a challenge in Canada’s cities.
Federal initiatives have included the introduction of the Registered Disability Savings Plan, bilateral Labour Market Agreements for Persons with Disabilities, the non-refundable Disability Tax Credit, the Opportunities Fund for Persons with Disabilities and ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

To improve the reach and effectiveness of these initiatives, the committee recommends reporting on allocations to and achievements of the Opportunities Fund for Persons with Disabilities in the HRSDC Departmental Performance Report, monitoring of the implementation of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities with provincial and territorial partners and continued collaboration with provincial and territorial governments to identify and implement measures to encourage and support persons with disabilities to enter the labour market.

YOUTH AND SENIORS

The committee heard that Canadians at both ends of the age spectrum experience challenges to inclusion.

Younger Canadians are a declining portion of the population and an increasingly diverse group. The committee heard about an innovative program to engage youth in problem-solving by including them in local decision-making bodies. Recognizing a wide range of federal programs that are intended to support youth who may be unemployed, Aboriginal, disabled or newcomers, the committee recommends that information about these programs be communicated in youth-friendly language and through social media.

Based on this and past studies, the committee is aware of the challenges facing youth in their transition to employment particularly following the recession, and recommends federal collaboration with provincial and territorial governments to support this transition with programs that increase opportunities with respect to training, apprenticeship and other programs that increase labour mobility. The committee also recommends that the government consider tax incentives for companies that hire and invest in young Canadians.

The proportion of Canadians over the age of 65 is increasing, and this population is increasingly diverse. The population is also increasingly urban, making the World Health Organization’s Age-Friendly Cities initiative particularly relevant.

Their social inclusion is affected by their income and health status. Statistics Canada reported in 2006 that the financial situation of older Canadians had been improving for 25 years. The committee also heard that the proportion of seniors in low income had risen from the 1990s to the mid-2000s.

Federal initiatives with respect to seniors have included support for that initiative, along with the New Horizons for Seniors Program and an awareness campaign with respect to elder abuse. The committee recommends that the government’s efforts to raise public awareness about
elder abuse devote particular attention to reaching seniors who are living independently or in isolation.

**Sexual Minorities**

While lesbian, gay bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people are also a diverse group with respect to age, ethno-racial background, gender and socio-economic status, the committee learned that specific demographic data with respect to sexual minorities is limited. However, police data indicate an increase in hate crimes motivated by sexual orientation, which accounted for approximately one in six hate crimes in 2008. Other studies report that more than half of LGBT youth have been verbally harassed about their sexual orientation and that these youth are more likely to have experienced physical and sexual abuse, harassment in school, and discrimination in their communities than their heterosexual counterparts.

The committee heard that the “invisibility” of sexual minorities has contributed to a dearth of federal and other programs intended to overcome these challenges to inclusion. The committee recommends that the federal government recognize sexual minorities as a distinct minority, like other cultural, linguistic and ethnic communities, to support their inclusion in all federal programs policies designed to support minorities. The committee also recommends that identity and gender expression be included in the hate crime provisions of the *Criminal Code of Canada* as aggravating circumstances to be taken into consideration in sentencing.

**Community Safety**

The committee recognizes that safe cities and community spaces within them are necessary elements to social inclusion and that many of those vulnerable to exclusion are also vulnerable to crime, e.g., seniors and persons with disabilities. Aggregated crime data indicate that the level of crimes reported to police is dropping in Canada, yet self-reported victimization surveys show that most incidents of victimization are not reported to police and not included in the declining rates of police-reported crimes.

While most Canadians report feeling safe in their communities, with more than 90% of all Canadians over the age of 15 satisfied with their personal safety from crime, just over half felt safe using public transit. The committee heard that women are over-represented among victims of certain types of crime, notably criminal harassment, and recommends support for awareness and education programs to combat sexual assault and harassment, including cyber-bullying. Aboriginal peoples, people with a disability and sexual minorities are also over-represented among victims of crime.

Some of these groups, along with visible minorities, have also reported less satisfaction than the rest of the population with police services and the criminal justice system. Recognizing the increasing diversity of some police forces, the committee recommends federal government support for the diversification efforts being made by these forces.
Testimony from police and academic witnesses highlighted the importance of crime prevention to reduce victimization and costs, and to increase both the safety and the perception of safety in Canadian communities. The committee recommends that an increased proportion of the federal criminal justice budget be devoted to crime prevention.

The committee also heard testimony about the need to ensure public safety when offenders have completed their sentences and are seeking integration into communities. With a view to rehabilitation of offenders, the committee recommends offering small incentives to offenders to receive further education and training while incarcerated to increase employment options on release; making addiction treatment mandatory for inmates with addictions in federal institutions. The committee recommends and facilitating and increasing access to mental health services for offenders to increase integration into the community.

Safe and efficient urban transit systems promote and enhance community safety. This is particularly important to those individuals who cannot afford private transportation options, many of whom are in groups at high risk of social exclusion. Recognizing existing federal support for municipal transit systems, the committee recommends federal encouragement of provincial and territorial governments to identify and develop urban transit strategies; the introduction of a tax-exempt status for employer-provided transit benefits; and consideration of additional allocations from the Gas Tax Fund specifically to transit capital investment.

**THE INCOME GAP AND MOVING UP THE INCOME LADDER**

Relatively high rates of low income are common among groups at risk of social exclusion and may reflect limited resources needed for full participation in community life. Although there is some debate as to the mechanics of measurement of income inequality, witnesses described increased income inequality and its correlation to a lower share of income for less-skilled workers and a larger share for higher skilled workers. Tax systems and income support for lower income people has reduced the gap, but not as much in recent years.

With this polarization, mobility up the income ladder becomes more important. The evidence before the committee suggested that while upward income mobility was somewhat limited within one lifetime, it is still relatively high from one generation to the next. To support income mobility, the committee recommends consideration of an increase in the value of and specific expansion of eligibility for the Working Income Tax Benefit.

Recognizing that public policy has been credited with supporting intergenerational income mobility, the committee also recommends a review of the *Income Tax Act* and its application to ensure progressivity and fairness and that this review pay particular attention to the role of the tax system in reducing income inequality, improving the circumstances of low-income Canadians and stimulating job creation.
CONCLUSION

Over the life of this study, the committee fulfilled the requirements of the Order of Reference from the Senate: to examine social inclusion in Canada. With national, provincial, regional and local witnesses and data, the committee has focused on solutions and collaboration among governments, has taken into account the body of work of the committee prior to this study and submits this report of the committee’s findings and recommendations.
FROM MARGINS TO MAINSTREAM:
TOWARDS A MORE INCLUSIVE AND COHESIVE CANADA

INTRODUCTION

In November 2011, the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology (the committee) received an Order of Reference from the Senate requesting that it examine and report on social inclusion and cohesion in Canada. The Order of Reference represented a continuance of a previous Reference under which the committee conducted a comprehensive and detailed examination of poverty, housing and homelessness in major urban centres; that study began in May 2007.

During its poverty, housing and homelessness study, the committee heard from over 170 witnesses and conducted several site visits in communities across Canada. In 2008, the committee tabled an interim report\(^1\) in which it set forth the challenges facing low-income Canadians along with possible ways of meeting those challenges. In December 2009, the committee concluded its study with the tabling of a report entitled *In from the Margins: A Call to Action on Poverty, Housing and Homelessness*.\(^2\)

In the report that follows, the committee presents its findings and recommendations derived from its study in which it examined social inclusion and social cohesion in Canada.

*An Urban Lens*

The majority of Canadians live in cities. What began as an overwhelmingly rural society in the 18\(^{th}\) century is now an overwhelmingly urban one in the 21\(^{st}\). As a 2011 report indicated, 15.3 million Canadians 18 years of age and older currently live in this country’s major urban areas. Ninety per cent of immigrants reside in these cities as do 96% of Canada’s visible minorities. Furthermore, $17.5 billion in personal income, $910 billion in GDP, and over 74% of 2009 employment growth were generated in Canada’s cities.\(^3\) Results of the 2011 Census show that the trend towards increasing population concentration in Canadian cities is continuing, with more than 23.1 million people – nearly seven Canadians in 10 (69.1%) – living in one of Canada’s 33 census metropolitan areas (CMAs), an increase from the previous 2006 Census when 68.1% of the population lived in urban centres.\(^4\) Therefore, to the extent that Canada is now an urban

---

country, the social and economic challenges this country faces are – and will continue to be – shaped by events occurring in its urban centres. Accordingly, the committee decided to view social inclusion and social cohesion in Canada through an urban lens.

At the same time, the committee recognizes that rural Canada is intimately affected by the conditions that exist within cities. Urban economies have an enormous impact on surrounding rural communities. Cities are markets for rural goods and each working day, thousands of Canadians commute from rural homes to earn their living in urban centres. While there, they rely on municipal services such as police and fire services to keep them safe, and city infrastructure for transportation and recreation. They also interact with city dwellers socially as well as professionally. Others have taken up residence in cities which offer easier access to services. In summary, what happens in Canadian cities is of direct importance to all Canadians.

Previous Studies and Reports

In a subsequent section of this report, the committee will explain what it means by “social inclusion” and “social cohesion.” Prior to that, however, it wishes to point out that its intention is to highlight successful efforts by all sectors of Canadian society to engage more fully those Canadians who, for a variety of reasons, find themselves on the margins and lacking in influence over the major decisions affecting their lives. Furthermore, through evidence garnered from research and testimony by witnesses, and by building on examples of success, the committee will offer recommendations designed to try to make Canada more inclusive and cohesive.

The current study fits within a pattern of previous studies and reports related to social inclusion and cohesion. In May 2006, the committee tabled its landmark report Out of the Shadows at Last: Transforming Mental Health, Mental Illness and Addiction Services in Canada (Kirby Report) in which it drew attention to the needs of Canadians particularly vulnerable to social exclusion; those who suffer from mental illness and addictions.\(^5\) In 2006 and 2007, the committee examined the challenges confronting autistic children and their parents. In March 2007, the committee tabled its report containing its findings and recommendations designed to provide better support and bring the needs of these Canadians to public attention.\(^6\) In 2008-09, in recognition that Canada’s future depends upon its children, the committee studied the state of early childhood education and called for changes to ensure that young Canadians get the best

---

\(^5\) Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology, Out of the Shadows at Last: Transforming Mental Health, Mental Illness and Addiction Services in Canada, 2\(^{nd}\) Report, 39\(^{th}\) Parliament, 1\(^{st}\) Session, May 2006, [http://www.parl.gc.ca/Content/SEN/Committee/391/soci/rep/pdf/rep02may06part1-e.pdf](http://www.parl.gc.ca/Content/SEN/Committee/391/soci/rep/pdf/rep02may06part1-e.pdf);

possible start on the pathway to lifelong learning. In 2010-2011 the committee explored and reported on access to post-secondary education in Canada, acknowledging its importance to Canada and recognizing that educational attainment is critical to facilitating entry into the labour market and thus greater inclusion, particularly for those on the margins. More recently, the committee examined the 2004 10-Year Plan to Strengthen Health Care and the Communiqué on Improving Aboriginal Health. Cognizant of the important role of health care in supporting social inclusion and cohesion, the committee proposed measures to improve access to, and the efficiency of, Canada’s health care system. Collectively, these studies and reports, along with the recommendations they contain, point towards a Canada that is more inclusive and cohesive. The committee will thus highlight select recommendations from its previous studies in the report that follows.

**METHODODOLOGY: THE COMMITTEE’S APPROACH**

The committee conducted its study of social inclusion and social cohesion in two phases. During the first phase, which took place prior to the general election of May 2011, the committee held six meetings during which it heard from 27 witnesses, including academics and representatives from policy institutes, professional organizations, municipal governments, federal departments and agencies, and organizations representing those most vulnerable to exclusion. When Parliament reconvened following the 2011 general election, the committee held an additional six meetings at which it heard from 28 witnesses. A list of these witnesses, the organizations they represent, and the date they appeared before the committee is included in Appendix C of this report. In addition to oral testimony, the committee received a total of approximately 29 written submissions.

It should be noted that in the report that follows, the committee makes a number of recommendations that address areas in which the constitutional authority to act is either shared between the federal and provincial/territorial governments, or is under the exclusive authority of the latter. The committee wishes to stress that in those instances, its recommendations are not intended to infringe upon provincial/territorial constitutional authority.

---


10 Note that many of these submissions consisted of the texts of opening statements made by witnesses before the committee.
Historical Perspective: Towards a More Inclusive, Cohesive Canada

[A] lot of Canadians do not know much about the past. Because of that, they do not know where we are today.11

In presenting this report, the committee recognizes that regardless of regrettable instances and practices in the past and continuing challenges today, Canada and Canadians have made and continue to make significant progress toward a more inclusive and cohesive society.

The right, for example, to cast a ballot in free and fair elections is a defining characteristic of citizenship in a modern democracy. What began as a restrictive franchise that denied the vote to women, Aboriginal Canadians, certain religious and ethnic groups, and others, has been expanded. Canadian citizens 18 years of age and older now can cast a ballot for representatives at the federal, provincial/territorial, and municipal levels.12

Legal guarantees of basic rights have also been adopted. On 10 August 1962, Canada’s first Bill of Rights was enacted by the Government of Canada. The Canadian Bill of Rights gave Canadians, for the first time, certain rights in relation to federal statutes. Twenty years later, the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms guaranteeing political and civil rights was entrenched in the Canadian Constitution and signed into law by Queen Elizabeth II.

Canada has also accepted accountability for previous acts of marginalization. On 22 September 1982, the Prime Minister apologized to Canadians of Japanese ancestry for their treatment during the Second World War and provided compensation for some of their losses.13 In June 2006, the Prime Minister issued an apology to Canadians of Chinese ancestry for the imposition of a head tax on Chinese immigrants between 1923 and 1947.14 More recently, in 2009, Aboriginal Canadians received a formal apology from the Prime Minister on behalf of the federal government and all Canadians for the abuses that occurred in the residential school system.15 As these, and other examples mentioned in the report that follows show, Canada and Canadians are moving toward a society in which economic and social inclusion are increasingly open to all.

Yet while Canada has become more inclusive over time, it would not be accurate to state that marginalization and exclusion have been eradicated. Individual chapters in this report will

11 Evidence, 7 March 2012, Avvy Go.
point to areas in which more work needs to be done; contemporary examples show that social exclusion remains a challenge to overcome. As this report will show, Canadians among those groups most vulnerable to exclusion still encounter significant obstacles to becoming fully included in the communities and country in which they live.
CHAPTER ONE: DEFINING SOCIAL INCLUSION AND SOCIAL COHESION

It is about inclusion, opportunity, participation, shared values and shared prosperity, building on the successes and innovation in local communities. These are the things that tie us together. It can be as simple as having a library to walk to in your community or as complex as ensuring that all buildings in it are accessible to people living with disabilities, having programs that support new Canadians, creating good quality jobs and meaningful opportunities that lift people out of poverty. It is about ensuring the best start for kids and creating meaningful opportunities for the full participation of every Canadian, regardless of postal code, privilege or circumstance.

Peggy Taillon, President and CEO,
Canadian Council on Social Development,
Evidence, 15 February 2012

INTRODUCTION

In North America, social inclusion is a relatively new concept while in the European Union and other jurisdictions such as Australia, it has been in common use for some time. In Canada, the term is still in evolution.

The concept of social inclusion is closely linked to that of social exclusion. The concept of social exclusion emerged in Europe in the 1970s to describe the growing economic gap between certain groups in society. At first, social exclusion had primarily an economic dimension and was associated with poverty. Over time, however, the concept was expanded to encompass other dimensions (social, cultural and political), and has come to include the various barriers that prevent individuals from participating fully in society. Social inclusion, on the other hand, could be defined as “the situation in which individuals or communities (both physical and demographic) are fully involved in the society in which they reside, including the economic, social, cultural and political dimensions of that society.”

Professor Fran Klodawsky of the Department of Geography and Environmental Studies at Carleton University emphasized that social inclusion is not solely about having sufficient financial resources, but about having ties and engagement with one’s community, about contributing to the life of the community and having that contribution acknowledged. As she

16 Evidence, 15 February 2012, Alain Mercier.
stated, “inclusion is about feeling part of things, and feeling part of things means that you are connected to others; you are not isolated.”19 Other witnesses added that social inclusion also involves choice and access to opportunity.

Importantly, social inclusion involves more than entitlement or the rights of citizens to belong and be recognized. Social inclusion also encompasses social obligation. As Natasha Blanchet-Cohen, Assistant Professor, International Institute for Child Rights and Development indicated with reference to youth:

....being inclusive is not just about creating opportunities for young people to participate in the local community as it currently exists; it is about belonging and contribution, about being fully a citizen with rights and obligations. 20

Lastly, Ratna Omidvar, President of the Maytree Foundation,21 emphasized that the promotion of social inclusion is about more than some in society delivering while others receive. Inclusion, she stated, is “a two-way street” that involves all members of the community.

All actors are inclusion actors, such as the postman, the businessman, the librarian, the school teacher and the neighbor. I am always concerned when this conversation about inclusion seems to put the inclusion types into one corner and everyone else throughout the rest of the room. No; this is about all of us.

Ratna Omidvar, President, Maytree Foundation, Evidence, 2 February 2011

In summary, social inclusion relates to the ability, of an individual or group of individuals, to participate in the social and economic lives of their communities and to have their contributions acknowledged. It also involves access to tools – such as education – that enable participation and a set of shared rights, values and responsibilities that bind people together in a cohesive society.

Social Inclusion and Social Cohesion

Social cohesion has been defined as “the ongoing process of developing a community of shared values, shared challenges and equal opportunity within Canada, based on a sense of trust, hope and reciprocity among all Canadians.”22 In his testimony, Zheng Wu, of the University of Victoria, explained that social cohesion refers to:

19 Evidence, 2 February 2011, Fran Klodawsky.
21 The Maytree Foundation helps communities cope with poverty and reduce inequalities. It provides programs and conducts research on issues related to immigration, integration, and diversity. The Foundation is centred in Toronto. http://maytree.com/
the material and social conditions that connect people and encourage solidarity between them. In plural societies, social cohesion is a barometer of intergroup or race relations that implies a level of acceptance of ethnic diversity. In other words, it represents the capacity of communities to integrate their members and avoid social isolation and marginalization of minorities.\textsuperscript{23}

In brief, social cohesion is characteristic of communities that promote the principles of inclusion, belonging, participation, recognition and legitimacy. Poverty reduction, investment in social infrastructure, crime prevention and suppression, and promotion of equality are all factors that contribute to greater social cohesion.

\textit{Intersectionality}

Another term employed by the committee’s witnesses and found in the literature on social inclusion and cohesion is “intersectionality.” The challenge confronting excluded individuals is compounded when they possess the attributes of more than one group that exists on society’s margins; this is referred to as “intersectionality.” This perspective takes into account the possibility that an individual may experience multiple dimensions of difference that could reinforce his or her social exclusion and as a result intensify the challenge of facilitating her or his inclusion. As one witness explained “…one person may embody a number of different sources of vulnerabilities or identities.”\textsuperscript{24} According to another witness, Caroline Andrew, Director of the Centre on Governance at the University of Ottawa, “[t]he importance of intersectionality is that we are not just talking about gender; we are talking about people who are handicapped […], [w]e are talking about age, gender, race, class.”\textsuperscript{25}

Kristopher Wells of the Institute for Sexual Minority Studies and Services at the University of Alberta alluded to intersectionality, testifying that “sexual minorities exist within all faith-based, ethnic, linguistic, cultural and racialized communities in the world.”\textsuperscript{26} On occasion, these individuals may be excluded from one identity group as a consequence of their membership in another. As Mr. Wells stated, “some ethnic, cultural or faith-based communities may be openly hostile to sexual minorities. As a result, individuals within that community may remain hidden, and often isolated or disconnected.”\textsuperscript{27} Mr. Wells offered a concrete example:

If they are Aboriginal and gay, which is often referred to as “two-spirited,” they may not be accepted by the dominant society

\textsuperscript{23} Evidence, 9 February 2011, Zheng Wu.
\textsuperscript{24} Evidence, 7 March 2012, Avvy Go.
\textsuperscript{25} Evidence, 15 February 2012, Caroline Andrew.
\textsuperscript{26} Evidence, 17 February 2012, Kristopher Wells.
\textsuperscript{27} Ibid.
because of systemic racism and homophobia, and they also may not be accepted by their Aboriginal community due to experiences of colonization and prejudices against sexual minorities.28

**Measuring and Assessing Social Inclusion and Cohesion**

How do public policy makers and governments determine the extent of social exclusion within a society, whether a policy response is required and if so, what are the best policy instruments to deploy? Unless careful analysis, thought, and precision are brought to bear, a poorly conceived response brings with it the risk of expending scarce resources without any tangible outcome or, far worse, exacerbating a given situation.

Efforts to address social exclusion are hindered by the absence of consensus about what the goal of such efforts – social inclusion – constitutes. Furthermore, once defined, how are we to determine when society has achieved a desirable degree of social inclusion? As one of the committee’s witnesses indicated, to his knowledge “there are currently no widely accepted standards to determine adequate levels of social inclusion.”29

Avvy Go, Director of the Metro Toronto Chinese and Southeast Asian Legal Clinic, told the committee that an appropriate conceptual framework for understanding social exclusion/inclusion is needed. “Such a conceptual framework,” she testified,

must be guided by a vision for equality which acknowledges the existence of the multi-faceted and intersecting inequities in the Canadian society as experienced by various marginalized communities, including racialized communities. It also must be equipped with appropriate indicators and outcome measures that will not only evaluate the process for building social inclusion but the impact of any policy measures towards this goal.30

To measure and assess the extent to which social inclusion and cohesion are present in Canada, the federal government could develop a comprehensive set of indicators. Such indicators, in turn, could be applied to the design and evaluation of government programs and policies, and used to report progress. Examples exist with regard to other aspects of federal government activity, principal among them the application of a gender lens in the development and assessment of government programs.31 It is notable that other countries are measuring social inclusion through the use of specific indicators. In Australia, for example, the Commonwealth [federal] Government has developed a Social Inclusion Measurement and Reporting Strategy,

---

29 *Evidence*, 15 February 2012, Alain Mercier.
30 *Evidence*, 7 March 2012, Avvy Go.
that it uses to strengthen reporting and accountability arrangements that monitor progress in addressing social exclusion.\textsuperscript{32}

Just as it has done with gender-based analysis, the federal government should create an analytic tool to assess levels of social inclusion in Canadian society and report to Canadians on the progress that is being made. Therefore, the committee recommends:

**RECOMMENDATION 1**

That the Government of Canada initiate research that will lead to the development of a set of indicators to measure levels of social inclusion and social cohesion in Canada:

a) That the Government of Canada, using these indicators, establish goals for social inclusion and social cohesion in those areas which fall within its responsibilities as set forth under the Canadian Constitution;

b) That the Government of Canada use these indicators, when appropriate, in the design and evaluation of its policies, programs and activities; and

c) That the Government of Canada measure, at regular intervals, the extent to which its policies, programs, and activities are achieving the social inclusion and social cohesion goals it has established, and report the results to the Parliament of Canada.

Social inclusion is not a task just for government. It is a task for all Canadians, in all sectors and walks of life. A witness raised the concern that most Canadians are not aware of the importance of social inclusion. Heidi Illingworth, Executive Director of the Canadian Resource Centre for the Victims of Crime, asserted that this lack of awareness should be addressed at an early age by including an emphasis on social inclusion in the materials that young Canadians are exposed to in school. She elaborated that such an approach would include elements such as:


The Measurement and Reporting Strategy and selection of indicators is the responsibility of a Social Inclusion Board created in 2008 to advise the government (and its Minister for Social Inclusion). The Strategy uses indicators that fall under 3 main categories: Resources (individual skills, assets, social and economic capital); participation in work, training, and connecting with others, and multiple disadvantages. The indicators are subdivided into ‘headline’ and ‘supplementary’ indicators, and include:

- Material/economic;
- Health and disability;
- Education and skills;
- Social resources;
- Community and institutional resources; and
- Housing and personal safety.

Much of the data is drawn from the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) General Social Survey and is supplemented by other data depending on availability. Where possible, international comparisons are provided to show were Australia sits internationally.
national anti-bullying, antiviolence, anti-substance abuse messages and campaigns; encouragement of unisex sporting activities, so limiting male and female stereotypes and biases; and educating young children and new immigrant adults about how to recognize the current gender barriers that exist within Canadian society and how they can be deconstructed.33

One of the most effective ways in which the federal government can advance social inclusion and social cohesion is through the support of efforts at the local level. For example, in relation to efforts to make cities safer for women, the committee heard that the federal government can best help by “supporting community initiatives and strengthening them.”34 This could well apply to all similar initiatives that are taking place at the local level.

When it comes to coordination and delivery, the focus needs to be on facilitating how different levels and agencies work together to achieve certain goals. Here I encourage committee members to consider the positive features of such tripartite initiatives as the Homeless Partnering Strategies and their predecessors. The combination of dedicated funding, flexibility in local application and the requirement for broad stakeholder engagement in preparing a community plan might well be applicable with regard to social issues other than homelessness.

*Fran Klodawsky, Associate Professor, Carleton University, Evidence, 2 February 2011*

Thus, where appropriate and feasible, the Government of Canada should seek ways to support and encourage these local efforts. Given that municipal governments and education are under the jurisdiction of provincial and territorial governments, working in partnership with the latter is essential. The committee therefore recommends:

**RECOMMENDATION 2**

That the Government of Canada work in partnership with other levels of government to provide support over the long term for initiatives that have, as their objective, enhanced social inclusion and social cohesion; and

That the Government of Canada support efforts by provincial and territorial ministers of education to implement and integrate the importance of social inclusion and acceptance into their educational systems.

33 Evidence, 7 March 2012, Heidi Illingworth.
34 Evidence, 15 February 2012, Caroline Andrew.
CHAPTER TWO: GROUPS AT RISK OF SOCIAL EXCLUSION

INTRODUCTION

Social exclusion affects some more than others and it is towards those groups and individuals that governments and others must turn their attention. Consequently, in this study the committee concentrated on those Canadians who are most at risk of exclusion.

In its study of social issues pertaining to Canada’s largest cities, the committee identified groups that are most at risk of low income, inadequate housing, and homelessness. These same groups – recent immigrants, visible minorities, Aboriginal peoples, Canadians with disabilities, single parents (the majority of whom are women) and seniors – are also most at risk of social exclusion.

Acting on the basis of its previous study on poverty, housing and homelessness, and on the advice of witnesses, the committee decided to take a closer look at the circumstances of those who are most challenged by social exclusion: recent immigrants; visible minorities; urban Aboriginal peoples; Canadians with disabilities; religious minorities; sexual minorities; and youth and seniors. Because gender brings particular challenges of its own, the committee considered the special circumstances of women within each of these categories. The committee also recognizes that no Canadian, regardless of identity, can possibly engage in her or his community unless it is a safe one. It also recognizes that access to financial resources, although not the sole factor in enabling full social inclusion, is an important one. Accordingly, the committee determined that it would also look at the safety of Canada’s urban centres and the extent to which income is distributed in order to facilitate the full participation of all Canadians in their communities and control over decisions affecting their lives.

BUILDING AN INCLUSIVE CANADA: A GENERAL APPROACH

Throughout its hearings, the committees asked its witnesses to indicate which measures they would recommend in order to build an inclusive society. In many instances, suggestions dealt specifically with addressing the set of unique challenges encountered by one vulnerable group or another. However, witnesses also advanced general suggestions aimed at bringing excluded groups in from the margins of society and ways in which polices designed for that purpose should be structured These overall suggestions are important ones that can and should be taken into consideration whenever governments and other sectors of society set out to create a more inclusive Canada.

Address Basic Needs First

The first step in ensuring inclusion is to facilitate access to basic necessities (such as affordable housing and adequate nutrition). As Professor Klodawsky explained, “... until people
have decent housing and enough money for food they will not be able to begin to think about other things that are also involved in feeling included and feeling part of the life of cities and part of being a citizen.”\textsuperscript{35} Other witnesses also stressed that basic needs, particularly in the area of adequate housing, have to be addressed in order to provide a sufficient foundation upon which Canadians can engage in the labour market and contribute to their communities.

In addition, the committee wishes to draw attention to the assistance currently being provided by Canadian governments, volunteer agencies, and the private sector, all of which are intended to provide all Canadians with the basic necessities of life. Without doubt, many of these forms of assistance could be enhanced and expanded and, in its previous report on poverty, housing and homelessness, the committee highlighted ways in which such enhancements could occur. The recommendations contained in \textit{In From the Margins} can be found in Appendix B.I of this report.

\textit{Ensure Consultation and Participation in Decision-making Bodies}

\begin{tabular}{|p{1\textwidth}|}
\hline
I would stress the importance of consultation or community-driven engagement processes. Canada has been a leader in this regard.  
\textit{Fran Klodawsky, Associate Professor, Carleton University, Evidence, 2 February 2011}  
\hline
\end{tabular}

Being included means being able to shape the decisions that have an influence over one’s day-to-day life. Marginalized individuals need to play a more central role in making the decisions that affect their lives. Members of groups subject to exclusion need to take an active role in decision-making forums. Ratna Omidvar told the committee that:

\begin{quote}
[p]ossibly the most interesting work [the Maytree Foundation has] done is around the boardrooms of our cities and institutions. [...] our system of democracy involves citizens making decisions on the public good, our hospitals, museums, NGOs [non-government organizations], the Royal Ontario Museum, the university health network, et cetera. These are all places where significant power and privilege are exercised on behalf of the public.\textsuperscript{36}
\end{quote}

As the committee hearings into social inclusion proceeded, a view shared by organizations representing Canadians at risk of social exclusion was the express desire to be represented in the decision making process. Indeed, in many instances, in which socially excluded groups have managed to move away from the margins, it has been in large measure as a result of their

\textsuperscript{35} \textit{Evidence}, 2 February 2011, Fran Klodawsky.  
\textsuperscript{36} \textit{Evidence}, 2 February 2011, Ratna Omidvar. Since Ms. Omidvar gave her testimony, the Maytree Foundation has released its third annual report on measuring diversity among leaders in the Greater Toronto Area (GTA). The report can be found at: \url{http://docs.maytree.com/diversecity/counts3/CountsReport3-full.pdf}
insistence that they not be the passive recipients of programs and services handed down to them from others.

Avvy Go, speaking of Toronto’s citizens of Chinese and Southeast Asian descent, noted the progress that has been made so far by members of those communities, and reminded the committee that inclusion and a seat at the table have been the result of “people fighting for them. It is not something that was handed to us.”37 This refrain was echoed by Tony Dolan, Chairperson of the Council of Canadians with Disabilities:

Unfortunately, as we know, change never happens that easily; it is always the people who are affected, are most disenfranchised speaking out and saying, “We want to speak for ourselves and our own organizations represent ourselves.”38

A similar plea was made by the women and men who appeared before the committee to speak on behalf of Aboriginal Canadians. It is clear that they do not wish to have others from outside their communities making vital decisions on their behalf, a view that the committee supports fully.

The advice that excluded groups be consulted and that they seek actively to participate in decision making has been followed, not only by advocacy organizations, but by governments at every level, including the federal government. In Appendix D of this report, the committee lists examples of promising practices presented by its witnesses. A characteristic of many promising practices is the extent to which governments have sought out the views of those who are on the margins, not only through consultation, but more importantly, through collaborative engagement and delivery. In the view of the committee, this approach is key to bringing about measures that are truly effective in offsetting the harm that is done, not only by way of exclusion, but as a result of poorly designed policies and programs that do not take into account the views of those who are directly affected.

37 Evidence, 7 March 2012, Avvy Go.
38 Evidence, 7 March 2012, Tony Dolan.
Encourage Political Engagement

It is an educational process. The work we do is educating our colleagues in how to have a better rapport with the Aboriginal community, but also educating our Aboriginal community in how to have a better rapport with the city administration and politicians. [...] We now have had one Aboriginal person run for council in the last municipal election.

Leona Carter, Director, Aboriginal Relations Office, Community Services, City of Edmonton, Evidence, 8 February 2012

Canada is a democratic society in which citizens are encouraged not only to exercise their right to elect their governments, but also to engage in more demanding forms of political participation including taking up membership in political parties and running for office. While the committee did not focus on this particular aspect of inclusion and engagement, it recognizes that active participation in the political life of one’s city, province, or country constitutes an effective way of bringing one’s voice (and that of one’s community) into inclusion and contributing towards a more cohesive society. The committee notes a healthy and growing receptiveness on the part of Canadians and their political institutions towards this kind of inclusion. Examples of initiatives underway at the local level are demonstrative of that fact.

The committee takes note of the work of Toronto’s Maytree Foundation in opening up the possibility of active political involvement for new Canadians.

On the inclusion side, we are interested in ensuring that the political landscape in the city is more reflective [of the people living in it]. We are not talking about quotas [...]. We are talking about what is more reflective of the people who live in urban centres.

Ratna Omidvar, President, Maytree Foundation, Evidence, 2 February 2011

The Foundation has established a school for would-be politicians who need to “understand the lay of the land, how to get nominated, and how to hire their campaign managers. We train both campaign managers and candidates.”

Governments Have a Role Providing Infrastructure that Facilitates Inclusion

While governments cannot act alone to bring about greater social inclusion and stronger social cohesion, they do have a central role in helping establish the conditions in which such outcomes can be achieved.

39 Evidence, 2 February 2011, Ratna Omidvar. Ms. Omidvar was referring to Toronto’s School4civics:
In particular, governments have an important role to play in ensuring the safety of the communities in which Canadians live and work, as well in providing the physical infrastructure – schools, parks and playgrounds, libraries, and public transit – which operate as forums within and through which social inclusion takes place.

**Federal Government Can Provide Leadership**

Under the terms of the *Constitution Act, 1867*, the powers of the federal government are limited with respect to many of the elements relating to social inclusion. In particular, Section 92 of the Constitution assigns exclusive authority over health, primary education, and municipal governments to the provinces. These limitations, however, do not exclude the federal government from working with the other levels of government in ways that can facilitate social inclusion and social cohesion. In particular, the federal government has important roles to play in convening partners, supporting local initiatives, and disseminating information and best practices.

In the next sections of this report, the committee will point to instances in which the federal government is fulfilling a coordinating and convening role and working in close partnership, not only with other levels of government, but with the private and voluntary sectors, to create conditions favorable to social inclusion.

**Avoid One-Size-Fits-All Solutions**

Canada is diverse and becoming more so. While each marginalized group shares certain characteristics with other excluded groups, each confronts a set of unique challenges. Each of these challenges calls for a different set of approaches in order to be successful. Government should thus move from standardized to personalized services that are built around the needs of people who are using them.

Diversity has profound implications for thinking about what the federal government might do to reduce social exclusion. I agree with Meyer Burstein's conclusion that “Different at-risk groups require different policies. These policies engage different levels of government, different public agencies and different civil groups. As a result, consultation, co-ordination, and delivery strategies will also differ.”

*Fran Klodawsky, Associate Professor, Carleton University, Evidence, 2 February 2011*

Kristopher Wells told the committee that change will not “come from one program, one policy or one intervention. Changing culture is like a thousand or more different kinds of practice.” Efforts to involve excluded groups (whether on the part of governments or by those

---

40 *Evidence*, 17 February 2011, Kristopher Wells.
groups themselves, and preferably both) along with multi-partner involvement and a focus on actions at the local, or city, level are the best guarantors of effective action toward social inclusion and social cohesion.

Facilitating Inclusion for Everyone

As previously noted, social inclusion is about everyone and to the extent that social inclusion is facilitated for those at most risk of exclusion, it is facilitated for all Canadians. In response to questioning, witnesses offered general suggestions about how Canada can be made more inclusive for all of its citizens. Sandeep Kumar Agrawal, Graduate Program Director of School of Urban and Regional Planning at Ryerson University, indicated that:

Strengthening public education, increasing employment equity, fostering an open society and promoting political participation are the processes that promote social cohesion. Institutions where such activities are enacted – such as schools, places of work, governments, media, sports and arts – are the sites where social cohesion can be fostered and where investments of political will must be made.41

41 Evidence, 15 February 2012, Sandeep Kumar Agrawal.
INTRODUCTION

Canada is a nation built by successive waves of immigration. In 1867, the year of Canada’s birth, immigrant arrivals numbered approximately 10,666. One hundred and thirty three years later, in 2010, Canada admitted 280,681 permanent residents, an increase of 11.3% over the previous calendar year and the highest level in 50 years. In 2011, 248,748 permanent residents were admitted to Canada. These levels are projected to remain in the neighbourhood of a quarter of a million individuals annually. In 2013, for example, Canada plans to welcome between 240,000 to 265,000 immigrants.

Prior to the 1990s, Canada’s population growth came as the result of natural increase (the difference between births and deaths), but in the mid-1990s, this trend was reversed and immigrants became the main source of Canadian population growth, in large part due to lower Canadian fertility rates and an aging population. Immigration is thus looked upon as a partial solution to Canada’s future demographic and economic challenges.

Initially, Europe provided the largest source of immigration to Canada. Immigrants from the United Kingdom made up a significant proportion of these immigrants, with a smaller proportion coming from France and other European countries. In the 1960s, this trend began to change and by 1979-1980, immigrants coming from Asia outnumbered those of European origin.

Long-range forecasts developed by Statistics Canada predict that by 2031 in Canada as a whole...
“[d]epending on the projections chosen, the proportion of persons who are foreign-born would reach between 25% and 28% ...In 2006, the corresponding proportion was 20%.”

Under sections 91 and 95 of the Constitution, the federal government and provincial governments have shared responsibilities for immigration. The federal government fulfills its constitutional authority through Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC). Citizenship and Immigration Canada works in close partnership with provincial and territorial governments to provide integration services to new Canadians. The Department has agreements with British Columbia, Manitoba and Québec under which those provinces are responsible for the design, provision and administration of settlement services in their jurisdictions. In Ontario and Alberta, the Department has shared management of settlement services while in the remaining provinces and in the territories, CIC has sole responsibility.

**Immigrant Settlement Patterns**

In 2005, the author of a synthesis of trends and conditions in Canada’s urban centres, published by Statistics Canada, wrote that “[i]f there is one major socio-economic development in Canada that can be called ‘distinctly urban, it is immigration.”

According to data cited by this author, 1.8 million immigrants arrived in Canada between 1991 and 2001 and, of these, 94% settled in one of Canada’s Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs). Of those who chose to live in urban centres, 73% settled in Canada’s three largest cities, Toronto, Montréal and Vancouver. This is in contrast with 1981, when 58% of immigrants chose to live in one of those three cities.

Data released by CIC show that for 2011, the bulk of new Canadians continued to settle in these three cities.

---


Table 1: Immigrant and Refugee Settlement, Selected Major Urban Centres, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>77,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montréal</td>
<td>44,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>28,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>15,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>10,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnipeg</td>
<td>13,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Major Cities</td>
<td>190,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Canada</td>
<td>248,748</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Citizenship and Immigration Canada, Quarterly Administrative Data Release, CD-ROM, accessed 20 August 2012. Note: These data reflect first place of settlement. Recent immigrants will sometimes relocate to different cities (known as “secondary migration”) a phenomenon not reflected in these data.


Note: 'Recent immigrants' refers to landed immigrants who arrived in Canada within five years prior to a given census.

Social inclusion involves basic notions of belonging, acceptance and recognition. For immigrants and refugees, social inclusion would be represented by the realization of full and equal participation in the economic, social, cultural and political dimensions of life in their new country.


Becoming engaged with Canadian society, becoming full members of the communities in which they have settled, and finding an appropriate place in the labour market pose real and often daunting challenges for recent immigrants. Sociologists Philippe Couton and Stéphanie Gaudet report that ‘social engagement’ (which they define as activities such as volunteering, community involvement, and support between individuals) “is one of the critical issues facing immigrants in Canada,” as well as in other receiving countries.51

Witnesses observed that recent waves of immigrants have not fared as well economically as previous waves, and that the changing composition of immigrant groups is producing new challenges to their inclusion. In particular, and in contrast to earlier waves of immigration, many recent immigrants are not fluent in either of Canada’s official languages, and the cultural norms of their countries of origin are often quite different than those present in Canada. Attachment to the labour market is made more difficult by the lack of familiarity on the part of Canadian employers with the universities or colleges where non-European immigrants have received their post-secondary education. Collectively, these factors raise the risks of social and economic exclusion for recently arrived new Canadians.

Immigrants are particularly vulnerable, for a number of reasons. They are overrepresented in the poverty statistics of this country. They are twice as likely to be unemployed as the average Canadian, and they are twice as likely to earn half as much. Immigrants have restricted access to Employment Insurance […]. They are also likely to have more years of education and training. The votes of visible minorities count for less because of historical electoral arrangements in our country. In many cases, racial minorities in large urban centres experience multiple examples of exclusion, not just […] economic exclusion.

*Ratna Omidvar, President, Maytree Foundation, Evidence. 2 February 2011*

---

Yet in spite of these vulnerabilities, Canada has been quite successful in integrating immigrants:

We are known the world over for our success in immigration and for our models of multiculturalism. I would suggest to you that our successes are in the medium and long term. If you look at the rising numbers of immigrants who own homes, who take out citizenship and who intermarry, these are important indicators of inclusion.\(^52\)

*Social Integration of Immigrants: The Views of Immigrants*\(^53\)


Findings included the following:

- 55% of those who planned to settle in Canada permanently cited the “quality of life” as their reason; 39% decided to stay because of the positive future for their family in Canada;
- 23% cited Canada’s public institutions as a reason to stay, while 18% referenced access to education and the social system (such as health care and other programs);
- Asked what they liked most about Canada, 14% cited cultural aspects of life (including social programs, and cultural diversity). Twenty-two per cent cited safety and security, and 24% cited opportunity (educational opportunities and ability to achieve desired quality of living respectively, employment opportunities and economic conditions).

These findings show that immigrants are appreciative of the benefits that living in Canada has to offer and are anxious to become integrated into Canada’s social and economic mainstream. However, when asked to identify what they least liked about Canada, 17% indicated that it was lack of employment. Of the 3% who planned to leave Canada, 32% indicated that employment-related reasons were behind their decision. Reasons for leaving included better job opportunities, pay, working conditions or the business climate elsewhere. A 2012 survey produced similar findings.\(^54\)

---

\(^52\) *Evidence*, 2 February 2011, Ratna Omidvar.

\(^53\) Data taken from Grant Schellenberg and Hélène Maheux, “Immigrants’ perspectives on their first four years in Canada: Highlights from three waves of the Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Canada,” *Canadian Social Trends*, Statistics Canada 2007, [http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/11-008-x/2007000/9627-eng.htm](http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/11-008-x/2007000/9627-eng.htm)

\(^54\) HSBC, “HSBC Study Reveals Canada’s Warm Welcome: Immigrants to Canada share their arrival experiences,” *News Release*, 1 November 2012,
The capacity of immigrants to integrate varies depending on their individual attributes and economic conditions upon arrival. Such factors as proficiency in either or both of Canada’s official languages, gender, the existence of established social networks within immigrant communities, generational status, place of residence, and racial status, visible minority status, and possession of education and skills needed and recognized by the Canadian labour market, all affect the social integration of immigrants settling in Canada.

**IMMIGRANT SELECTION**

Successful social inclusion of immigrants relies, in part, on ensuring that newcomers possess the appropriate combination of attributes that facilitate their becoming full members of the communities in which they settle. As a consequence, immigrant selection is a crucial step in the successful social and economic inclusion of newcomers.

There are three basic classes of permanent resident as defined under the *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act* (IRPA): economic, family and protected persons. The economic class includes people whose skills and attributes are assessed against a points system for their ability to establish economically in Canada, people nominated by provincial governments to fulfill regional economic goals, and investors and entrepreneurs. The family class is based on sponsorship by Canadians and permanent residents, and the protected persons class (refugees) fulfils Canada’s humanitarian tradition and international obligations.

Witnesses commented on the processes used to select immigrants. James Bissett of the Centre for Immigration Policy Reform, stated that “only a few immigrants coming here are seen and are subject to any selection criteria,” in particular, those who are coming as relatives, sponsored by provinces and refugee groups. Garnett Picot of Statistics Canada indicated that about 17 to 18% of immigrants are evaluated based on skills, education and ability in one of the two official languages. Those who are evaluated are applicants under the economic class, which

---

55 Couton and Gaudet, (2008), pp. 21-44.
59 Permanent residents are people who have not become Canadian citizens, but who have been authorized to live and work in Canada for an indefinite period, provided they meet residency requirements. Protected persons are defined as refugees.
60 *Evidence*, 10 February, 2011, James Bissett.
includes entrepreneurs and investors. Those not evaluated include newcomers immigrating under family reunification and the family members of those immigrating under the economic class.\textsuperscript{61}

Citizenship and Immigration Canada is revising the selection points system for immigrants coming to Canada as part of the Federal Skilled Worker Program (FSWP), the central program under the economic class. The Government of Canada intends to give greater emphasis to language proficiency, age at time of immigration, and offers of employment in Canada, as well as to introduce a skilled trades program. The committee welcomes these efforts and notes that the federal government has made changes to the \textit{Immigration and Refugee Protection Act} to facilitate easier entry into the labour market for new immigrants.

\textbf{SETTLEMENT}

\textit{Pre-arrival Services Provided in Countries of Origin}

Deborah Tunis, Director General, Integration, with Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC), told the committee that CIC is “hearing loudly and clearly that when [immigrants] come to Canada, they would like to have been told more realistically about some of the challenges surrounding credential recognition and others.”\textsuperscript{62} To some extent, opportunities to acquire this information already exist. The federal government provides a range of programs and services to immigrants prior to their departure for Canada. Two such programs are the Canadian Orientation Abroad and the Welcome to Canada initiatives. The Foreign Credentials Referral Office (FCRO) in the Department of Citizenship and Immigration works with the Association of Canadian Community Colleges to provide some services abroad as well.

The FCRO funds overseas services under the Canadian Immigration Integration Program (CIIP). The CIIP provides federal skilled workers and provincial nominees, their spouses and adult dependents in certain regions with voluntary and free orientation sessions prior to arrival in Canada. Applicants may also, on a voluntary basis, attend individual planning sessions that provide customized advice and assistance with credential assessment, skills and language upgrading, and job searches. Once an individual applies to immigrate to Canada, he or she is given an initial approval in the form of a letter from one of Canada’s overseas missions. The letter asks for a final medical check and provides information on the CIIP. They are also offered an opportunity to attend the free, two-day information sessions.

The FCRO provides these overseas services through offices in China, India, the Philippines and the United Kingdom. These offices serve applicants from neighbouring countries, with the potential to provide services in 25 countries. According to Corrine Prince-St-Amant, Director General of Citizenship and Immigration Canada’s Foreign Credential Referral Office, this program has the “opportunity to reach 44 per cent of all provincial nominees coming to Canada

\textsuperscript{61} \textit{Evidence}, 3 February 2011, Garnett Picot
\textsuperscript{62} \textit{Evidence}, 3 February 2011, Deborah Tunis.
and 70 per cent of federal skilled workers worldwide."\textsuperscript{63} In 2011-12, the Department reports that the number of potential immigrants receiving pre-departure services increased by 68%.\textsuperscript{64}

Ms. Prince-St-Amant testified that the pre-arrival services offered by the FCRO have been quite successful. She indicated that “93 per cent of those individuals who went through the two-day session found employment in Canada within six months of arrival,” and that “73 per cent of that 93 per cent found work within the first three months.”\textsuperscript{65} However, not all of those who are invited to participate do so.

The committee notes the success of pre-arrival services offered to immigrants prior to departure. Such services are crucial in preparing immigrants for their settlement experience and successful integration into Canadian society and labour market. However, such services are not available to all immigrants. Because all immigrants should receive the benefits of these services, the committee recommends:

**RECOMMENDATION 3**

That the Government of Canada enhance the availability of the full suite of pre-arrival services provided to immigrants prior to their departure for Canada.

**Arrival and Settlement**

Settlement refers to the short-term transitional issues faced by newcomers, while integration is an ongoing process of mutual accommodation between an individual and society.  

*Citizenship and Immigration Canada, Annual Report to Parliament on Immigration, 2010, p. 21*

For newcomers to Canada, first impressions are crucial in terms of the ease with which they integrate into Canadian society. Lori Wilkinson testified that the initial settlement experience provides:

A foundation for healthy, long-term attachments, not only to the economy but to other facets of Canadian community life, politics, society, and health. Those who have positive settlement experiences at arrival have higher satisfaction with their new lives.\textsuperscript{66}

\textsuperscript{63} *Evidence*, 10 February 2011, Corrine Prince-St-Amand.  
\textsuperscript{65} *Evidence*, 10 February 2011, Corrine Prince-St-Amand.  
\textsuperscript{66} *Evidence*, 10 February 2011, Lori Wilkinson.
In addition to its crucial role in identifying applicants for admission to Canada, Citizenship and Immigration Canada offers programs and services to assist new Canadians to become part of the Canadian community. As noted above, immigration is an area of shared jurisdiction between the federal and provincial/territorial governments, and CIC works with the latter to provide immigrant settlement services. The provinces of British Columbia, Manitoba and Québec have been responsible for the design, delivery and management of these services within their jurisdictions, with federal funding.\(^{67}\)

CIC fulfils its settlement responsibilities through its Integration Program which has, as its objective, the development of policies and programs that support the settlement, resettlement, adaptation, and integration of newcomers into Canadian society by delivering orientation, adaptation and settlement services as well as language programs for newcomers.\(^{68}\) Services under the Settlement Program are designed to give immigrants:

- information needed to understand life in Canada and make informed decisions;
- language training that will allow them to function in Canada;
- assistance in finding employment that matches their education and skills; and
- help to establish networks and contacts “so they are engaged and feel welcomed in their communities.”\(^{69}\)

Citizenship and Immigration Canada has identified immigrant integration as one of its strategic priorities. In 2006, the Government of Canada invested an additional $1.4 billion over five years in settlement funding. In its *Departmental Performance Report* for fiscal year 2011-2012, the Department reported that it had spent a total of $966 million on its settlement and integration programs.\(^{70}\)

In 2008-2009, Citizenship and Immigration Canada adopted a “modernized” approach to settlement programs. Under this approach, settlement programming moved from separate programs to one single Settlement Program. The overall objective of this consolidation was to improve settlement outcomes. As noted above, the Department has also established a Foreign Credentials Referral Office (FCRO); Human Resources and Skills Development Canada (HRSDC) has created a Foreign Credential Recognition (FCR) Program that is working with provincial and territorial governments to develop a pan-Canadian framework on foreign credential recognition. A number of these services will be discussed in further detail below.

\(^{67}\) After Budget 2012, the federal government indicated that it would be resuming management of the settlement services it funds in Manitoba and British Columbia within the next two years.


\(^{69}\) Ibid.

Deborah Tunis told the committee that CIC sees settlement as the “first phase on the pathway to integration,” and thus the federal government concentrates its programs for immigrants on the years following arrival. Several groups are involved in supporting immigrants during the initial settlement phase, including municipalities, faith and cultural groups, business and community groups, and others. The federal government forms partnerships with some immigrant-supporting entities, in particular with provinces and their municipalities, and non-profit settlement service agencies. The federal government works with up to 400 settlement service agencies across Canada under 900 contribution agreements. The settlement service agencies provide the bulk of language training for immigrants, information and orientation sessions and the Community Connections program. Other services offered by the agencies include training in résumé writing, career mentorship, and how to enter the Canadian labour force. Ms. Tunis explained that federal government investment in these agencies has gone from approximately $25 million annually in the 1990s to about $850 million currently.\(^\text{71}\)

To coordinate approaches to immigration, the federal government, provinces and territories have formed the Federal-Provincial-Territorial Ministers Responsible for Immigration. In recent meetings, the Ministers agreed to work together to improve measuring and reporting outcomes, and committed to developing a pan-Canadian framework that would establish a common set of successful settlement indicators across jurisdictions, as well as an assessment of service delivery models. Québec, which is responsible for its own settlement services under the terms of the Canada-Québec Accord, indicated that it would share best practices with the other governments.\(^\text{72}\)

Recently, Federal-Provincial-Territorial Ministers Responsible for Immigration agreed to develop a pan-Canadian framework for settlement outcomes and integration policies. The committee expects that this framework, once finalized, will be used to evaluate settlement outcomes and report the findings to Parliament.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada has consulted with the settlement sector and developed a set of indicators that it will use to evaluate its own settlement programs that it planned to implement in 2011-2012.\(^\text{73}\)

**Language Challenges and Programs**

Patterns of immigration have shifted from traditional European to other sources, with a resulting decline in an ability to speak either of Canada’s official languages. As Don Drummond and Francis Fong noted in 2010, “…the share of immigrants whose mother tongue is neither

\(^\text{71}\) Evidence, 3 February 2011, Deborah Tunis.
French nor English has increased from 53 per cent in 1981 to 80 per cent in 2006.” By 2009, the percentage of immigrants without English or French as a mother tongue had reached 86%.

The absence of appropriate linguistic skills has become a more significant barrier to full social inclusion. Lack of language skills is also a significant barrier to appropriate participation in the labour market.

---

The evidence is overwhelming that functioning knowledge of English or French is critical for an immigrant getting ahead and more so now than a generation ago. [...] Manufacturing was [...] the traditional classic route for an immigrant who, perhaps did not know much English or French, to start off, get a job and once having learned the job [...] could do it quite well and get a very good paying dependable job, and not be that fluent in English or French.

However, there has been an ongoing shift in Canada and elsewhere away from the proportion of the workforce in manufacturing jobs into services. When you move to services, there is much greater emphasis on or importance of the role of not just getting by in English or French but actually being quite good at it.

*Charles Beach, Professor of Economics, Queen’s University, Evidence, 2 May 2012*

---

In recognition that the barriers that result from the lack of adequate language skills are significant, the federal government, through the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, provides funding for language instruction delivered under settlement programs and services. The federal language program is known as the Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada, or LINC, and is available for all classes of permanent residents until they become Canadian citizens. LINC is provided in all provinces, with the exception of Manitoba, Québec and British Columbia. In those provinces, the federal government provides funding for language programming.

In addition to regular language instruction, the Department also funds a number of different types of language programs including the Enhanced Language Training Program which offers occupation-specific language training paired with a workplace component. Language training also occurs within the context of the Pan-Canadian Framework for the Assessment and Recognition of Foreign Qualifications through action plans (See below under Credentials and Credentialism).

Deborah Tunis acknowledged that language is “a key to economic outcomes” and “to making connections” to the wider community. Garnett Picot told the committee that language

---


issues (along with the perceived value of foreign work experience) “accounted for probably one third of the drop in [immigrant] earnings between 1980 and 2000.”

Mr. Picot agreed with the observation made by the Centre for Immigration Policy Reform that only a small percentage of permanent residents – between 17 and 18% – have their language skills (along with their skills and level of education) evaluated under the immigrant selection system. The federal government has made some significant adjustments in response to these circumstances. Recent changes to the selection process, for example, have resulted in a greater emphasis on pre-arrival language proficiency for economic class immigrants. In April 2012, the Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism announced that as of 1 July 2012, applicants under the Provincial Nominee Program seeking semi- and low-skilled employment will undergo mandatory testing of their listening, speaking, writing and reading linguistic skills and will have to meet standards in all four categories before they can be admitted to Canada. These changes, however, do not apply to spouses and dependents of the principal applicants who, as a recent study by Tracey M. Derwing and Erin Waugh indicates, “may have greater needs for language training on arrival.”

Existing language programs are seen as insufficient by some, including John Reilly, of the City of Edmonton, who has heard from “colleagues and counterparts in the community that are delivering language programs ... that they are inadequate,” a complaint that he hears from immigrant groups as well. At a subsequent meeting, Ms. Prince-St-Amand cited a study that found that “only approximately 25% of newcomers who were eligible for language training and assistance were actually taking advantage of [---] language programs.”

Basic proficiency in one of Canada’s official languages is essential for successful social and economic inclusion. Such skills are likely to become even more essential as the economy shifts toward more service-sector jobs. As a consequence, most immigrants should be given language assessments shortly after arrival to ensure that they can function in the economy and places of settlement, and to determine what level of language instruction they and their families should be assigned to. Furthermore, enrolment in the Language Instruction for Newcomers (LINC) Program should be encouraged for those whose language levels fall below a predetermined level. The committee recommends therefore:

---

76 Evidence, 3 February 2011, Deborah Tunis.
77 Evidence, 3 February 2011, Garnett Picot.
81 Evidence, 10 February 2011, Corrine Prince-St-Amand.
RECOMMENDATION 4

That permanent residents and their dependents between the ages of eighteen and fifty-four, and members of the family class of permanent residents within the same age range be assessed for their skills in one of the two official languages following arrival in Canada;

a) That based on this assessment, those tested be directed to an appropriate level of language training under the Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada (LINC) Program;

b) That enrolment in the Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada (LINC) Program be strongly encouraged for all those falling below a predetermined level of linguistic ability; and

c) That the Government of Canada continue to make improvements to the Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada (LINC) Program. In particular, such improvements should take into consideration those language skills that are work-specific and that enhance the ability of newcomers to interact with Canadians in ways that facilitate community involvement.

Immigrant Women

[I]t comes back to shared spaces. If new Canadian women are bringing their kids to school, are there opportunities for them to engage at school? It is using different access points – libraries, school community centres, health centres – as a place to find other opportunities and connect to other communities.

Katherine Scott, Vice-President, Research, Canadian Council on Social Development, Evidence, 15 February 2012

Female immigrants face a set of unique challenges. Immigration disrupts family ties and social networks these women had in their country of origins. Following arrival in Canada, cultural norms in some cases result in their isolation from the wider community. Compounding this isolation, many are obliged by circumstances to stay at home to raise children. Based on her research into rates of social participation and volunteerism, Stéphanie Gaudet told the committee that “in general, immigrant women with children are excluded from social participation,”82 defined as any exchange of time, formal or informal. She told the committee that this is in contrast to immigrants in general, who show comparable levels of social participation to their

82 Evidence, 9 February 2011, Stéphanie Gaudet.
Canadian-born counterparts, she attributed these low levels to female immigrants’ involvement in domestic tasks, raising children, and employment.\textsuperscript{83}

Dependent children [...] are a major barrier. The resources offered to these women are not necessarily adapted to their daily lives. For example, in the Ottawa neighbourhood of Vanier, a lot of immigrants live in low-cost housing or crowd into small apartments. These women have to take care of children in several age groups. It is one thing to have two or three pre-school-aged children and another to have children between the ages of 2 and 18. The task is enormous. Canadian society is designed on the basis of two children two and a half years apart. So it all has to be organized. However, the community is not organized to meet these needs. Consider travel. It is not easy to travel by public transit with a baby of two or three, with four children. Consequently, they stay at home in their neighbourhood.

\textit{Stéphanie Gaudet, Associate Professor, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Ottawa}

Low levels of volunteerism among immigrant women are in marked contrast to those of Canadian-born parents given that parenthood tends to increase volunteer activity that occurs as a result of having children enrolled in school and involved in sporting and other activities. Professor Gaudet noted that it is essential to involve immigrant women with children in social inclusion because these women “are the most important socialization agents for their children, and if we exclude them, we exclude very important citizens.”\textsuperscript{84}

A recent study by Statistics Canada has found that both male and female immigrants are less likely than the Canadian-born to volunteer with charitable or non-profit organizations.\textsuperscript{85} Volunteering offers important opportunities to develop skills, build social capital, and establish networks – all crucial in terms of inclusion for both women and men. Accordingly, volunteering should be encouraged among recent immigrants as a means of engaging them in their communities and helping them to build social networks and capital. The committee therefore recommends:

**RECOMMENDATION 5**

That the Government of Canada employ campaigns explaining the importance of community engagement and to promote volunteerism among immigrant communities.

\textsuperscript{83} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{84} Ibid.
Deborah Tunis testified that Citizenship and Immigration Canada has adjusted its program delivery in settlement agencies to reflect the needs of women immigrants with children. She indicated that over the last five years in Ontario, special programs with child minding services had been introduced for women, including the Language Instruction for Newcomers (LINC) Program. An evaluation of the LINC Program has found that approximately 80% of the organizations providing language training services offered child care, but that many providers offered such services in some locations only. The absence of child care services was cited by focus group participants as the principal barrier to enrolling in LINC.

Participation in LINC provides an avenue through which immigrant women can break their isolation, build new social networks, engage in volunteer activities both within and outside their own immediate communities and acquire the skills they need to overcome some of the challenges they encounter in their adoptive country. However, there is a caveat: access to LINC ends once citizenship is acquired, a process that can occur in Canada within three years after arrival.

Immigrant women with young children should not be denied an opportunity to attend language instruction after they have been granted Canadian citizenship. Nor should immigrants be dissuaded from becoming citizens because it would entail forfeiting access to needed language instruction. The committee therefore recommends:

**RECOMMENDATION 6**

*Where warranted, such as for immigrant women who stay at home to care for young children, that immigrants be granted admission to the Language Instruction*

---

86 Citizenship and Immigration Canada, *Evaluation of the Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada (LINC) Program*, March 2010, p. 17, [http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/resources/evaluation/linc/2010/linc-eval.pdf](http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/resources/evaluation/linc/2010/linc-eval.pdf) It should be noted that Québec, Manitoba and British Columbia provide their own language and settlement programs and thus were not included in the evaluation.

for Newcomers to Canada program up to five years following arrival regardless of acquisition of Canadian citizenship.

Child care services have been added to a growing number of language training facilities, enabling immigrant women with young families to participate in language instruction. These services could be expanded further. The committee recommends therefore:

**RECOMMENDATION 7**

That Citizenship and Immigration Canada expand the number of Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada (LINC) Program sites equipped with child care facilities for pre-school children.

**THE ROLE OF CITIES**

As principal final destinations in the immigration process, cities provide much of the infrastructure – schools, parks, libraries, recreational facilities, and community centres – through which inclusion and integration take place. As such, cities play a central role in facilitating immigrant social and economic inclusion.

Canadian cities are acutely aware of the necessity to attract and retain immigrants. As a former President of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, Jean Perrault, has written, immigration “[n]ot only created diversity that strengthens neighbourhoods and local economies, but has also brought us highly skilled and knowledgeable workers to make our cities and communities more competitive.”

John Reilly testified that the growing municipal interest in how immigration is managed in Canada is being driven by several factors. Cities are concerned about their social and economic sustainability and recognize that immigrants make an important contribution to both. In particular, immigrants possess needed skills and as a consequence municipalities are stepping up efforts to attract and retain them. Cities also recognize that Canada’s current immigration policies do not always address the differing regional labour and social needs and thus wish to take a more active role in making those needs known.

Nevertheless, the arrival of immigrants has presented Canada’s major immigrant-receiving centres with significant challenges. In the words of M. Perrault:

Recent immigrants are suffering from high rates of underemployment and poverty. This has significant implications

---

for municipal governments, as they struggle to provide adequate affordable housing, emergency shelters, social assistance and public health services to newcomers.\footnote{Ibid.}

In its report, \textit{In from the Margins}, the committee recommended that the federal government support the work of local and provincial non-profit housing developers by making housing programs longer term to accommodate five-year development cycles and ten-year planning cycles, and to permit more effective planning at the local and provincial levels. See Appendix B.I, recommendation 40.

Faced with these challenges, many cities have initiated programs designed to integrate recent arrivals. Frequently, these efforts have been developed in concert with stakeholders such as other levels of government, private sector employers, non-profit organizations, immigrant settlement organizations, and individual immigrants. Cities such as Vancouver, Edmonton, Halifax, and Saskatoon have in place programs, strategies and projects to ensure that recent immigrants remain and prosper in their communities.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 14 – 16.}

\textit{Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement and Local Immigration Partnerships (LIPS)}

As a step toward greater success for new immigrants, municipalities are calling for improved collaboration among all three orders of government when it comes to developing immigrant settlement strategy. They are calling for alignment with federal housing and transit initiatives with federal immigration policy to ensure better outcomes for communities and newcomers...

\textit{Ben Henderson, Chair, Standing Committee on Social-Economic Development, Federation of Canadian Municipalities, Evidence, 3 February 2011}

The governments of Canada and Ontario signed the first Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement (the Agreement) in 2005. Under the Agreement, the federal government and the province of Ontario committed to work together in several important areas regarding immigration, including settlement and training services and partnerships with municipalities.\footnote{Citizenship and Immigration Canada, “Immigration and Settlement in Ontario,” \url{http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/department/laws-policy/agreements/ontario/can-ont-index.asp}} The Agreement contains a provision giving municipalities an opportunity to become involved in planning and discussions on immigration and settlement – the first time that all three levels of government in Canada have worked together to address the needs of immigrants.

Local Immigration Partnerships, or LIPs, are partnerships formed between the federal, provincial, and municipal governments in Ontario. Local Immigration Partnerships are
“agreements between municipalities and local stakeholders to develop a comprehensive, coordinated and collaborative strategy for the settlement and integration of newcomers to their communities.”

There are currently over 30 LIPs in Ontario funded by CIC in collaboration with the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration and the Association of Municipalities of Ontario.

An example of a Local Immigration Partnership can be found in the Canada-Ontario-Toronto Memorandum of Understanding on Immigration and Settlement. Mr. Henderson stated that “it is the one model that seems to be working well and is a good step in the right direction and certainly can be looked at elsewhere.”

In September 2006, the governments of Canada, Ontario, and the City of Toronto signed the Canada-Ontario-Toronto Memorandum of Understanding on Immigration and Settlement under the terms of the Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement. The MOU established a framework for the federal, provincial and municipal governments to discuss matters related to immigration and settlement in the City of Toronto. It focuses on improving outcomes for immigrants through several areas of interest to all three governments, including citizenship and civic engagement, and facilitating access to employment, services, and educational and training opportunities.

As several witnesses indicated, Local Immigration Partnerships represent a workable and productive model to bring municipalities into partnerships with the other levels of government, allowing them to contribute to immigration planning that is tailored to match unique local needs. Recently Citizenship and Immigration Canada has been working with representatives of provincial governments and community stakeholders to stimulate interest in the LIP model and that the model has been adapted beyond Ontario as a result. These partnerships are an important component of successful immigrant integration. The committee therefore recommends:

**RECOMMENDATION 8**

That the Government of Canada initiate efforts to expand the Local Immigration Partnership model beyond the province of Ontario.

**Enclaves**

Witnesses noted a trend towards the formation of enclaves, in which immigrants from similar ethnic, religious, and cultural backgrounds settle within close proximity to one another.

---


93 Evidence, 3 February 2011, Ben Henderson.


The committee heard mixed views regarding the social impacts of such enclaves. Combined with the spread of the Internet and other newer forms of electronic communication which make it easier for recent immigrants to maintain ties with their countries of origin, the formation of enclaves creates a concern that recent immigrants might be even more isolated from mainstream Canadian life.

This concern was expressed by Professor Wu who testified that “first generation immigrants, especially visible minorities, living in ethnic enclaves report a lower sense of belonging to Canada than immigrants living in different types of neighbourhoods.”  

Martin Collacott, of the Centre for Immigration Policy Reform, also raised concerns about the formation of ethnic enclaves, telling the committee that “[t]here is no question that a newcomer from a very different culture and language group will be more comfortable living among people who speak the same language, but this does slow down integration.”

David Harris, the Director of IN SIGNIS Strategic Research Inc., also raised concerns about enclaves, testifying that their growth “hints at increasing separation of communities, some of its self-imposed, and the undermining of integrationist hopes, notably including hopes of integration of Charter values.”

Other witnesses had a more positive view of enclaves and the role that they play in the integration process. These witnesses distinguished between enclaves and ghettos; residents of the former settle there by choice while residents of the latter live there due to factors over which they have little or no control. David Hulchanski stated that “[t]here is nothing wrong with ethnic enclaves, enclaves of choice.” Katherine Scott expressed a similar view, stating that:

It is a question of choice and the degree to which people have choice. There is a large difference between new Canadians who choose to live in particular areas for a set of complex reasons, and those that have no choice.

Professor Agrawal also drew a distinction between enclaves and ghettos, testifying that “[e]thnic enclaves must not be confused with ghettos, which are the product of poverty, exclusion and physical blight. Most Canadian ethnic enclaves are not burdened with such conditions.”

97 Evidence, 3 February 2011, Martin Collacott.
98 Evidence, 3 February 2011, David Harris.
99 Evidence, 15 March 2012, David Hulchanski.
100 Evidence, 15 February 2012, Katherine Scott.
101 Evidence, 15 February 2012, Sandeep Kumar Agrawal.
Professor Hulchanski spoke in terms of “positive” and “negative” enclaves, using the Portuguese community of Toronto as an example of the former. Members of that community “want to be near the Portuguese church and Portuguese school, so they cluster in that area. [...] It is a positive kind of enclave. We have those all over our cities across the country.” 102 A “negative” enclave, in contrast “is where people end up living someplace they would rather not live and end up clustering with people like themselves in various ways.” 103

Professor Agrawal stated that contrary to the view that ethnic enclaves are dysfunctional communities, they perform a valuable role in the integration process. A positive settlement experience followed by gradual integration into Canadian society can be facilitated, for some groups of immigrants, by living in an enclave where they can gain social capital. According to Professor Zheng Wu “enclaves play a protective role in helping new immigrants to settle in.” 104

Professor Agrawal asserted that ethnic enclaves fit within the normal development patterns of Canadian cities, and added that due to significant changes in infrastructure, communications technologies, and social geography of cities, neighborhoods no longer play the role they once did in fostering social cohesion.

Ethnic enclaves do not pose a threat to social cohesion. Contemporary neighborhoods play a limited role in fostering social cohesion. Neighborhoods have long lost the character of territorial communities of primary relations and strong neighborhood bonds. Modern social life is based on communities of interest, occupational associations, voluntary organizations and social networks that are spread all across a city.

Dr. Sandeep Kumar Agrawal, Graduate Program Director, School of Urban and Regional Planning, Ryerson University, Evidence, 15 February 2012

In effect, technologies that enable new Canadians to maintain ties with their countries of origin also enable them to transcend the boundaries of the neighborhoods – or enclaves – where they reside and allow them to develop bridges to the wider community.

Although there may be no one single policy approach to addressing the phenomenon of “negative enclaves,” or ghettos, witnesses did offer a number of suggestions that municipal governments and local planners could employ. Professor Agrawal recommended:

- a mix of low and middle income households and deconcentration of disadvantaged families;
- … [r]ent subsidies and home ownership tax credits ..., and

102 Evidence, 15 March 2012, David Hulchanski.
103 Ibid.
• promoting infill development of market housing and businesses [to broaden] the economic base of deprived neighbourhoods.\textsuperscript{105}

He also suggested that “building [an] intercultural bridge – geographic and social – is the strategy of integration.”\textsuperscript{106}

Alain Mercier, a Board Member of the Canadian Urban Transit Association, indicated that public mass transit has a role to play in this regard, stating that: “One of the factors from an urban design and planning perspective and mobility is being able to connect some of these neighbourhoods [enclaves] that tend to isolate themselves both physically and socially...”\textsuperscript{107}

Lastly, within the “negative enclaves” themselves, Professor Agrawal recommended the provision of community based social development and advocated the use of community centres, asserting that “[m]ulti-service neighbourhood centres are one of the best ways of serving some of these deprived neighbourhoods.”\textsuperscript{108} The committee takes note of this recommendation which promises to offset the disadvantages inherent in negative enclaves. Accordingly, the committee recommends:

**RECOMMENDATION 9**

That the Government of Canada work with the provincial and territorial governments and municipalities to support programs that identify neighbourhoods at risk and to help provide services and infrastructure to overcome negative effects of enclaves arising from poverty.

**NEW CANADIANS AND CIVIC ENGAGEMENT**

Many newly arrived immigrants come from countries in which democratic institutions do not exist and the rights of citizenship are either curtailed or non-existent. One of the features that attract immigrants to Canada is the existence of a mature, well-established system of democratic institutions. However, on arrival in Canada, many will be unfamiliar with their rights – as well as their responsibilities – as citizens of a democratic nation.

\textsuperscript{105} Evidence, 15 February 2012, Sandeep Kumar Agrawal.
\textsuperscript{106} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{107} Evidence, 15 February 2012, Alain Mercier.
\textsuperscript{108} Evidence, 15 February 2012, Sandeep Kumar Agrawal The development of multi-service community centres is one of the projects that could fall under the local initiatives referenced by Recommendation 2 of this report.
The federal government, under the Citizenship Program delivered by CIC, assists immigrants in the acquisition of Canadian citizenship. One of the important goals of the Program is to promote the rights and responsibilities of Canadian citizenship. In addition to their rights and responsibilities as citizens of Canada, immigrants also need to know what they can expect in terms of their rights at the local level, as well as their responsibilities. Accordingly, the committee recommends:

**RECOMMENDATION 10**

That the Government of Canada work in partnership with provincial, territorial and municipal levels of government to promote civic awareness among new Canadians. Such programs should emphasize both the rights and responsibilities of citizens vis-à-vis their communities.

**ECONOMIC INTEGRATION OF RECENT IMMIGRANTS**

One of the best ways of fostering a sense of inclusion is through active and successful participation in the labour market. This is particularly so when there is a close alignment between a person’s skills and levels of education and the nature of the work they do. As Lori Wilkinson, Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Manitoba testified “[t]hose [younger immigrants] with jobs that are fulfilling and that recognize their skill set and experience tend to be happier, better adjusted and will become more engaged citizens in the long run than those who have problems in the short term.”

However, evidence demonstrates that the economic outcomes of recent immigrants are below what Canadians and immigrants expect and desire. Immigrants recently arrived in Canada experience high rates of unemployment and underemployment. Both circumstances represent a loss, not only to immigrants and their families, but to the Canadian economy as a whole and thus to all Canadians.

---

The committee heard extensive testimony from its witnesses regarding the changing economic fortunes of immigrants over the past three decades. Garnett Picot stated that the economic outcomes of new immigrants to Canada (less than five years in Canada) have been in decline since the 1980s. The low-income rate for newly arrived immigrants rose from 24.6% in 1980 to approximately 36% in 2005; in comparison the low-income rate for the Canadian-born population declined from 17.2% to 13.3% over the same period.\textsuperscript{110}


\begin{quote}
Unlike the previous generation of immigrants, newcomers are not catching up to their Canadian-born counterparts within the first ten years of arrival. Newcomers are earning less and taking longer to find affordable housing and jobs that match their education and skills levels.

\textit{Ben Henderson, Chair, Federation of Canadian Municipalities Standing Committee on Social-Economic Development, Evidence, 3 February 2011}
\end{quote}

Witnesses cited rising unemployment rates and poverty levels among the immigrant population as a cause for concern. Mr. Picot indicated that unemployment rates for both men and women tend to be higher among immigrants than the Canadian-born no matter how long they have been in Canada.\textsuperscript{111} Mr. Henderson stated that newcomers are overrepresented in poverty cycles, face significant barriers to success and are falling behind their non-immigrant counterparts.\textsuperscript{112}

An inability to secure employment in fields related to their professional skills and education - a phenomenon known as “underemployment” - represents a problem for many newcomers. Professor Agrawal told the committee that:

\begin{quote}
Most of the immigrants, especially new immigrants, find their first footing in the service industry, waste management industry, low-paying manufacturing industry, and they get stuck there for the rest of their lives.\textsuperscript{113}
\end{quote}

Professor Agrawal added that, for many recent immigrants, “[t]he problem is access to jobs. Most of these folks are not unemployed; they are underemployed.”\textsuperscript{114} Katherine Scott indicated that “[n]ewcomer Canadians are working, but they are working in jobs that do not pay adequate wages [...] employment levels among new immigrants are high. They are comparable to rates among Canadian-born people.”\textsuperscript{115} The committee addressed these issues in its report \textit{In}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
  \item[110] Evidence, 3 February 2011, Garnett Picot.
  \item[111] Evidence, 3 February 2011, Garnett Picot.
  \item[112] Evidence, 3 February 2011, Ben Henderson.
  \item[113] Evidence, 15 February 2012, Sandeep Kumar Agrawal
  \item[114] Ibid.
  \item[115] Evidence, 15 February 2012, Katherine Scott.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
From the Margins, calling for tax credits for employer who hire immigrants for their first jobs in their areas of expertise and for bridging programs to assist immigrants with professional qualifications (see Appendix B.I, recommendations 59 and 64).

Credentials and Credentialism\textsuperscript{116}

A lack of credentials recognized by Canadian employers combined with the absence of Canadian work experience are significant obstacles for recent immigrants trying to enter the labour market at a level and salary appropriate to their skills and education.

In some instances, immigrants may arrive in Canada only to discover that their credentials do not match the standards required by Canadian employers. Under such circumstances, immigrants should have been informed that they may experience difficulty in finding employment within their fields of expertise. To avoid such knowledge being acquired only after an individual arrives in Canada, the committee recommends:

RECOMMENDATION 11

That, as part of the pre-departure services, prospective immigrants be advised when their academic or other credentials do not meet the standards required by Canadian employers.

Poor labour market outcomes of skilled immigrants cost the Canadian economy between $2 billion and $5 billion annually. That is an estimate. The underuse of the skills and employment potential of immigrants also results in unnecessary increases to social services costs, a decreased ability of employers to find employees with the required skills and loss of potential tax revenue. In addition, it reduces the chances of successful social integration of newcomers and their families.

Jean-François LaRue, Director General of the Foreign Credentials Referral Office Human Resources and Skills Development Canada Evidence, 10 February 2011

The Federal Government and Immigrant Labour Market Integration

With a rapidly aging population, declining birth rates, and occupational skills shortages in some areas, the federal government has assigned a priority to attracting skilled immigrants who can fill pressing labour market requirements. An increasing emphasis has been placed on ensuring that there is a better match between these requirements and the attributes possessed by immigrants at the point of selection. As the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration stated in the introduction to his Department’s Annual Report to Parliament for 2011,

\textsuperscript{116} “Credentialism” refers to the challenges faced by employers in recognizing and verifying that education and job experience obtained in another country are equivalent to the standards established for Canadians.
Recent initiatives taken by the federal government to improve the selection of economic class immigrants have already been mentioned. A better match between the medium- to longer term labour market needs of Canadian employers and more careful attention to the linguistic skills of prospective immigrants are expected to produce better results for the economic integration of newcomers. A more rigorous introduction to Canadian social and economic realities prior to departure should also ensure an easier transition to Canadian society and workplace standards and norms.

The federal government is taking new measures and improving existing ones to bring about better economic outcomes for immigrants following their arrival. In particular, the Government of Canada is taking concrete steps to address the challenges presented by credentialism. To that end, the federal government has taken a two-pronged approach by establishing the Foreign Credentials Referral Office (FCRO) at Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) and the Foreign Credential Recognition (FCR) Program managed by the Labour Market Integration Directorate in Human Resources and Skills Development Canada (HRSDC).

The Foreign Credentials Referral Office (FCRO), Citizenship and Immigration Canada

The Foreign Credentials Referral Office (FCRO) was created in 2007 with the mandate to:

provide internationally trained workers with the information, path-finding and referral services they need to have their credentials recognized as quickly as possible so that they can find work in their field of expertise more quickly.  

The FCRO works with other federal government departments, provincial and territorial governments, regulatory bodies, credential assessment agencies, industry associations and employers. Ms. Prince-St-Amand pointed out that this work is extremely complex, particularly given that the provinces and territories are responsible, through delegation to regulatory bodies, for assessing and recognizing credentials. She went on to testify that:

Over 440 regulatory bodies across Canada govern over 55 professions. More than 200 post-secondary educational institutions assess credentials for the purposes of academic placement, as well as the five provincially mandated assessment agencies that

---

117 Evidence, 10 February 2011, Corrine Prince-St-Amand.
evaluate credentials for both academic placement and workplace entry. There are many players. When you add employers to that, we are into the thousands.\textsuperscript{118}

To work with these complexities, the FCRO is using a variety of initiatives including website development, providing information to individuals before they immigrate, and supporting innovative projects, partnerships, and mentoring programs. Services are offered in person to individual immigrants across Canada through Service Canada centres, outreach sites, and a toll-free telephone service.

Tools created by the FCRO assist prospective employers and immigrants seeking employment. The \textit{Employer’s Roadmap: Hiring and Retaining Internationally Trained Workers}, was development by the FCRO working with The Alliance of Sector Councils (TASC), to help employers navigate the complexities involved in hiring workers with foreign credentials and determine which options would best suit their requirements.\textsuperscript{119}

\textit{Foreign Credential Recognition (FCR) Program – Human Resources and Skills Development Canada}

The Labour Market Integration Directorate in Human Resources and Skills Development Canada (HRSDC) manages the Foreign Credential Recognition (FCR) Program. The Director General in charge of the Directorate, Jean-François LaRue, explained that his office “is responsible for reducing labour mobility barriers faced by Canadians in regulated occupations as they move from province to province and also faced by internationally trained workers trying to integrate into the Canadian economy.” He noted that the role of his Directorate “is different than Citizenship and Immigration Canada’s, in that they work with individuals while we work with systems.”\textsuperscript{120} Specifically, the Directorate’s FCR Program:

promotes systemic change related to foreign credential recognition processes, which includes, among others, bridge training initiatives. This program works closely with and provides funding to partners and stakeholders such as provinces, territories, associations of regulatory bodies, employers' groups and others to develop fair, transparent, consistent and timely FCR practices across Canada.\textsuperscript{121}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{118} Ibid.
  \item \textsuperscript{119} The Roadmap is made available on the FCRO’s website: http://www.credentials.gc.ca/employers/roadmap/index.asp To assist individuals hoping to immigrate to Canada, the FCRO has produced \textit{Planning to Work in Canada? An Essential Workbook for Newcomers}, also available on its website: http://www.credentials.gc.ca/immigrants/workbook/workbook.pdf
  \item \textsuperscript{120} Evidence, 10 February 2011, Jean-François LaRue.
  \item \textsuperscript{121} Ibid.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
The Pan-Canadian Framework for the Assessment and Recognition of Foreign Qualifications

The Pan-Canadian Framework for the Assessment and Recognition of Foreign Qualifications (the Framework)\textsuperscript{122} is a major initiative supported jointly by the FCRO and the Labour Market Integration Directorate. The Framework is being implemented by HRSDC and Health Canada, along with provincial governments, and establishes:

\begin{itemize}
\item[a)] principles that the federal, provincial and territorial governments agree will guide the recognition of foreign credentials;
\item[b)] standards for the timely treatment of people looking to have their qualifications recognized;
\item[c)] occupations that will be the first priority for coordinated action to achieve the standards for timeliness; and
\item[d)] a consistent approach that will see applications for licensing and credential assessment processes increasingly begin overseas.\textsuperscript{123}
\end{itemize}

In Budget 2009, the federal government allocated $50 million to help governments support implementation of the Framework. Mr. LaRue testified that as of 31 December 2010, the FCR Program had concluded 66 agreements, 36 of which were with regulated occupations, 23 with non-regulated occupations, and seven with provinces and territories. In its report \textit{In From the Margins}, the committee recommended that the federal government work with provincial and territorial governments to expedite the development and implementation of the Framework. (See Appendix B.I, recommendation 63.)

\section*{Beyond the First Generation: The Children of Immigrants}

One could take a longer-term view of economic integration and think about the children of immigrants. In this area Canada is doing quite well.\textsuperscript{124}

The children’s outcomes are sometimes considered the benchmark by which integration is judged.\textsuperscript{125}

The children of immigrants fall into two general categories: those under the age of 12 who immigrated with their parents (sometimes referred to as “generation 1.5”)\textsuperscript{126} and those born in

\textsuperscript{122}Forum of Labour Market Ministers, Pan-Canadian Framework for the Assessment and Recognition of Foreign Qualifications, 2009, \url{http://www.hrsdc.gc.ca/eng/workplaceskills/publications/fcr/pcf_folder/PDF/pcf.pdf}
\textsuperscript{124}\textit{Evidence}, 3 February 2011, Garnett Picot.
\textsuperscript{126}\textit{Evidence}, 3 February 2011, Garnett Picot.
Canada of immigrant parents. Overall, immigrants to Canada are predominately young. In 2006, for example, most were between 25 and 44 years of age. The median age of these newcomers was 29.8 years, a full nine years younger than Canada’s overall population.\textsuperscript{127} Professor Wilkinson told the committee that “57 per cent of all people who come to Canada come here before their 29\textsuperscript{th} birthday.” Accordingly, “understanding the labour market entrance experiences of this group has significant repercussions for determining the economic integration of all immigrants.”\textsuperscript{128}

In spite of worrying trends among first-generation immigrants, from a longer term view of economic integration, there is reason to be optimistic. Garnett Picot testified that the educational attainment of immigrant children is higher than the educational attainment of the children of Canadian-born:

\begin{quote}
36\% of the children of immigrants had a university degree... 24 per cent of the children of Canadian-born parents had a university degree.... The children are achieving quite high levels of educational attainment.\textsuperscript{129}
\end{quote}

According to Mr. Picot, data also indicate that the rates of employment among the children of immigrants are as good as or better than those of the children of Canadian-born parents. Children of immigrants are more likely to be in professional occupations because of their high level of educational attainment, and their earnings are 6\% to 10\% higher than the earnings of the children of Canadian-born parents.\textsuperscript{130}

However, Professor Wilkinson sounded a caution about the future educational and labour market outcomes for the children of immigrants. Her research, which followed immigrant youth who arrived in Canada between October 2000 and September 2001 for 10 years after their arrival, suggested that recent waves of young immigrants could experience difficulty.\textsuperscript{131} Of those between the ages of 15 to 19, only 18\% had completed high school and only 19\% were pursuing post-secondary education. Among older age groups, only 14\% of those aged 24 to 28, and 17\% of those aged 29 to 34 had completed a college diploma or trade certificate. On the other hand, a third had completed a university degree.\textsuperscript{132} These findings may have serious consequences for the social inclusion of younger immigrants. As Professor Wilkinson noted, “[w]hen they are

\textsuperscript{128} Evidence, 10 February 2011, Lori Wilkinson.
\textsuperscript{129} Evidence, 3 February 2011, Garnett Picot.
\textsuperscript{130} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{132} Evidence, 10 February 2011, Lori Wilkinson.
satisfied with their education and their jobs, their satisfaction tends to have a trickle-down effect in other aspects of their lives, including social, community, political and family.”

The good news, according to Professor Wilkinson, is that participation in the labour market by immigrant youth increased in the four years following their arrival. Six months after settling in Canada, 54% were working and four years later, 84% of those she studied had found employment. In the medium (three to 10 years after arrival) and long term (10 years and more after arrival), in spite of difficulties during their first four years, “many of these young immigrants experience a high degree of success in the labour market [...].” On this basis, Professor Wilkinson concluded “that the evidence suggests that, on the whole, immigrant youth experience successful integration in the labour market in the long term.” Nonetheless, the recession which began in 2008 has had a particularly harsh impact on young immigrants.

Professor Wilkinson stated that:

Recent research suggests that being an immigrant or a refugee has a significant effect on unemployment, with immigrants and refugees being twice as likely to be unemployed, and that the effect of recessions on immigrant youth is significant. A person who enters the labour market during a recession earns 8 per cent to 10 per cent less in their lifetime than someone who enters the labour market during a healthy economy.

Garnett Picot testified in similar vein that immigrants as a whole are harder hit by recessions than the Canadian-born population. He indicated that:

Immigrants are affected disproportionately during recessions. During the recent recession, their employment rate fell, and their unemployment rate rose more than you would see among the Canadian-born. That was also true during the early 1990s recession.

**Generational Differences**

A study by Lloyd L. Wong and Roland R. Simon found that first-generation immigrants have a very strong sense of attachment to Canada. However, this sense of attachment began to deteriorate among the children and grandchildren of immigrants. In this regard, Professor Paul [Ibid.](#)

---

133 Ibid.
134 Ibid.
135 Ibid.
136 Evidence, 3 February 2011, Garnett Picot
Bramadat, Director, Centre for Studies in Religion and Society at the University of Victoria testified that the traditional narrative in which the children of immigrants are fully integrated into Canadian society is breaking down as evidenced by signs of radicalization among some of them:

> When we look at why it is breaking down, and among whom, it seems to be that radicalization is the principal vector of the breakdown [...] someone coming from a war-torn country in Africa or certain other parts of the world may suffer other kinds of discrimination – racial or religious discrimination, according to their credentials...\(^{138}\)

In further comments regarding generational differences, Professor Bramadat noted that with first-generation immigrants, the “immigration process itself tends to preselect; namely, people who will be eager to sign on to this new project of being Canadian. They have [...] a higher degree of attachment.”\(^{139}\) Although reluctant to generalize, Professor Bramadat observed that members of the second generation:

> do not speak with accents. They are more comfortable. They are not surprised by Canadian society, and they see some of its flaws more clearly – perhaps, than their parents do – especially around race and inclusion.\(^{140}\)

Kristopher Wells commented generally on the radicalization of minority youth, telling the committee that “[i]t is that isolation and alienation when they feel disconnected that can lead to [...] the radicalization where they look for community to find that sense of belonging. Extremists out there can prey on them...”\(^{141}\)

The children of immigrants, whether born in Canada, or immigrants themselves, have been relatively successful in obtaining post-secondary education and integrating into Canadian society and the labour market. Nevertheless, there are reasons for concern. These Canadians, along with their parents, tended to be more adversely affected by the recession than their counterparts. Those who also happen to be members of a visible and/or religious minority have sometimes been vulnerable to prejudice and discrimination. In some rare instances, negative experience has produced a sense of isolation and exclusion that has led some to seek out other identities and to turn to radicalism. To counter these tendencies, Canada must rely on its traditional approaches to newcomers, one that is welcoming yet insistent upon adherence to the rule of law and Canadian values. The committee is of the view that for immigrant youth and the children of immigrants,

\(^{138}\) Evidence, 17 February 2011, Paul Bramadat.
\(^{139}\) Ibid.
\(^{140}\) Ibid.
\(^{141}\) Evidence, 17 February 2011, Kristopher Wells.
acquaintance with Canadian values and the principles involved in adherence to the rule of law is best fostered through the educational system (see recommendation 11).

In addition to identifying a number of promising practices with regard to immigrant integration, the committee’s witnesses also provided a number of practical suggestions to guide the actions of governments at all three levels, organizations representing and serving immigrant communities, and individual immigrants. Suggestions included taking into account best practices from other immigrant-receiving countries,\textsuperscript{142} building ties with municipal police forces,\textsuperscript{143} and in-person encounters with other Canadians through such activities as team sports, cultural events, and volunteering.\textsuperscript{144}

\textsuperscript{142} Evidence, 2 February 2011, Ratna Omidvar.
\textsuperscript{143} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{144} Evidence, 3 February 2011, Fran Klodawsky.
CHAPTER FOUR: VISIBLE MINORITIES

Social inclusion, or more accurately, social exclusion, is a critical issue facing members of the racialized and immigrant communities today. We are among the most marginalized historically, and that is still the case.

Avvy Go, Director, Metro Toronto Chinese and Southeast Asian Legal Clinic, Evidence, 7 March 2012

INTRODUCTION

It is important to distinguish visible minorities from immigrants. Visible minorities have been present in Canada from this country’s inception and prior to it. While many immigrants – the majority in recent years – are members of a visible minority, other visible minority Canadians have been in Canada for generations. Yet despite this fact, these Canadians still face significant challenges when it comes to social inclusion and, for them, labour market participation can be especially difficult. As the face of immigration has changed from European countries to other sources, Canada’s racial diversity will continue to grow, potentially producing what some have called a “majority-minority” state in which visible minorities collectively form the largest segment of the population.145

The Employment Equity Act defines visible minorities as “persons, other than aboriginal peoples, who are non-Caucasian in race or non-white in colour.”146 The term “racialized groups” is also used to describe people who are not white.147 In 2006, 5.3 million Canadians belonged to a visible minority group, or 16% of the population. This is in contrast to the 4 million Canadians – 13.4% of the population – who reported membership in a visible minority group in the 2001 Census, which in turn was an increase from the 4.7% of the population who reported such membership in 1981.148 The Conference Board of Canada reports that between 2001 and 2006, Canada’s visible minority population increased by 27%, five times faster than the growth rate of the overall population.149

According to demographic projections, by 2031, 29% to 32% of the population, or between 11.4 and 14.4 million people, could belong to a visible minority group.150 The largest visible

---

147 Canadian Race Relations Foundation, Glossary of Terms, http://www.crr.ca/en/component/glossary/Glossary-70/V/Visible-Minority-115/ According to the Canadian Race Relations Foundation, people who are labelled as ‘visible minorities’ prefer the terms ‘racialized minority,’ or ‘people of colour.’
minority group is currently made up of South Asians who comprised 25% of the visible minority population in 2006; by 2031, they could represent 28% of the entire visible minority population. Currently making up 24% of the visible minority population, Canadians of Chinese ancestry could decline to 21% of that population by 2031. In 2006, Black and Filipino populations made up the third- and fourth-largest visible minority groups; by 2031, they could double in size. Arab and West Asian groups could represent the fastest growing populations of all visible minority groups, more than tripling in size by 2031.\textsuperscript{151} Collectively, Canada’s visible minority population is concentrated in Canada’s urban centres; by 2031, they are forecast to make up as much as 63% of the population of Toronto, 59% of Vancouver’s population, and 31% of the population of Montréal.\textsuperscript{152}

\textsuperscript{151} Ibid, p. 181.
\textsuperscript{152} Ibid, p. 180.
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ECONOMIC INCLUSION

2006 Census results showed that visible minority groups collectively experienced an unemployment rate of 8.6%, 2.4 percentage points above that experienced by Canadians who were not members of a visible minority (6.2%). The labour market participation rate (the number of employed and unemployed as a percentage of the labour force) was 67% for visible minority Canadians in contrast with 66.7% for Canadians who were not visible minorities, indicating that visible minority Canadians were as willing to work as their counterparts, but more likely to be unemployed. Furthermore, the jobs they manage to secure are more likely to be located in sectors of the economy where employment is precarious, temporary and low-paying. Employed visible minority Canadians tend to earn less – 81.4 cents for every dollar paid to non-visible minority Canadians.

Low incomes, precarious employment, and rates of unemployment among visible minorities result in higher levels of poverty among those Canadians. This is reflected in data from Toronto, where the highest concentrations of visible minority Canadians are located. In April 2004, the United Way of Greater Toronto reported that between 1981 and 2000, the poverty rate for the visible minority family population in Toronto “increased steadily,” from just over 20% in 1981 to 29.5% in 2001. In contrast the poverty rates for non-visible minorities stayed the same over the 20 year period, at 12%. In terms of numbers, the number of low-income visible minority families increased by 362% between 1980 and 2001, while within the low-income non-visible family population, numbers declined by 28%. Avvy Go told the committee that “similar studies from other cities across Ontario found similar disparities,” and pointed out that “it is not just for immigrants [...] 33 per cent of racialized groups that are Canadian-born also experience a similar kind of exclusion.”

---

155 Ibid., p. 17.
156 Ibid., p. 11.
158 Ibid., p. 50.
159 Ibid.
160 Evidence, 7 March 2012, Avvy Go.
### Table 2: Visible Minority Labour Force Activity, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visible minority groups (14)</th>
<th>Total - Labour force activity (25,664,220)</th>
<th>In the labour force</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Not in the labour force</th>
<th>Participation rate</th>
<th>Employment rate</th>
<th>Unemployment rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total - Population by visible minority groups</td>
<td>25,664,220</td>
<td>17,146,135</td>
<td>16,021,180</td>
<td>1,124,955</td>
<td>8,518,090</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total visible minority population</td>
<td>3,922,695</td>
<td>2,639,520</td>
<td>2,413,610</td>
<td>225,915</td>
<td>1,283,180</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1,005,640</td>
<td>623,225</td>
<td>576,195</td>
<td>47,025</td>
<td>382,410</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>957,645</td>
<td>599,525</td>
<td>56,685</td>
<td>42,365</td>
<td>301,445</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>562,135</td>
<td>355,090</td>
<td>248,265</td>
<td>42,365</td>
<td>164,675</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>320,915</td>
<td>233,540</td>
<td>12,310</td>
<td>75,060</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American</td>
<td>244,330</td>
<td>159,750</td>
<td>15,820</td>
<td>68,760</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian</td>
<td>184,580</td>
<td>116,405</td>
<td>10,745</td>
<td>57,430</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab / West Asian</td>
<td>321,755</td>
<td>181,130</td>
<td>24,965</td>
<td>115,660</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>114,615</td>
<td>57,465</td>
<td>5,355</td>
<td>51,795</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>66,400</td>
<td>38,815</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td>25,505</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible minority, n.i.e.</td>
<td>57,120</td>
<td>37,445</td>
<td>3,380</td>
<td>16,490</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple visible minority</td>
<td>87,565</td>
<td>58,250</td>
<td>5,380</td>
<td>23,935</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a visible minority</td>
<td>21,741,525</td>
<td>14,506,615</td>
<td>13,607,565</td>
<td>899,045</td>
<td>7,234,910</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Activity, Visible Minority Groups, [http://www12.statcan.ca/census-recensement/2006/dp-pd/rp-eng-cfm?TABID=1&LANG=E&A=Ar&RAPH=3&DETAIL=0&DIM=0&FL=A&FREE=0&GC=01&GID=837928&GK=1&GRP=1&O=D&PID=92340&P RID=0&PTYPE=8897197154&S=0&SHOWALL=0&Temporal=2006&THEME=80&VID=0&VNAMEE=&VNAMEF=&D1=0&D2=0&D3=0&D 4=0&D5=0&D6=0](http://www12.statcan.ca/census-recensement/2006/dp-pd/rp-eng-cfm?TABID=1&LANG=E&A=Ar&RAPH=3&DETAIL=0&DIM=0&FL=A&FREE=0&GC=01&GID=837928&GK=1&GRP=1&O=D&PID=92340&P RID=0&PTYPE=8897197154&S=0&SHOWALL=0&Temporal=2006&THEME=80&VID=0&VNAMEE=&VNAMEF=&D1=0&D2=0&D3=0&D 4=0&D5=0&D6=0)

### SOCIAL INCLUSION

Avvy Go told the committee that low levels of appropriate labour market engagement for visible minorities make a significant contribution to their social exclusion.

> Employment inequity and resulting income disparity poses one of the most important and significant barriers to full social inclusion by members of racialized communities, be they immigrants or Canadian-born.\(^{161}\)

She also testified that:

> ...economic disadvantage [...] translates into other forms of exclusion as members of racialized groups experience more criminalization, poorer health, higher levels of homelessness, [and] greater barriers in accessing education... \(^{162}\)

---

\(^{161}\) *Ibid.*  
\(^{162}\) *Ibid.*
In earlier testimony, Ratna Omidvar stressed the importance of having immigrant and visible minority representation at the centres of community decision making. This view was echoed by Sandeep Kumar Agrawal, who told the committee:

> The empowerment of minorities through representation in city councils, planning boards or departments is increasing but not in the same proportion as the increase in the number of visible minority immigrants. For instance, visible minorities comprise almost 40 per cent of the population across the Greater Toronto Area [...] but they account for only 7 per cent of all municipal council members.\(^\text{163}\)

Professor Agrawal recommended that to overcome this lack of representation, governments should “...invite, solicit and facilitate expressions of interest and concerns of groups in policy making and implementation [and] empower members of minority communities to become staff, managers and elected or appointed public representatives.”\(^\text{164}\) The committee endorses these approaches and notes that the City of Edmonton, through its review of voluntary boards and commissions is already taking steps in this direction.\(^\text{165}\) As noted earlier, representation on and participation in decision making bodies is essential for those who are at risk of exclusion. Such participation brings the voices of excluded communities into decision making forums, builds social capital, and can result in decisions that better reflect the full spectrum of community needs. While some progress has been made at the municipal level, the committee believes that opportunities exist to foster this kind of inclusion at the federal level. The committee recommends accordingly:

**RECOMMENDATION 12**

**That the Government of Canada support initiatives that empower members of minority communities to become better represented in federal boards, commissions, and in public office.**

The committee’s witnesses suggested actions that should be taken to overcome barriers to social and economic inclusion encountered by visible minority citizens. John Reilly spoke favorably of Canada’s Action Plan against Racism, issued by the federal government in 2005.\(^\text{166}\) The Plan contained the following six points to combat racism and discrimination:

1. assist victims and groups vulnerable to racism and related forms of discrimination;
2. develop forward-looking approaches to promote diversity and combat racism;

---

\(^{163}\) *Evidence*, 15 February 2012, Sandeep Kumar Agrawal.

\(^{164}\) *Ibid.*

\(^{165}\) See, for example, *Evidence*, 19 February 2011, John Reilly.

3. strengthen the role of civil society;
4. strengthen regional and international cooperation;
5. educate children and youth on diversity and anti-racism; and
6. counter hate and bias.\textsuperscript{167}

The Racism-Free Workplace Strategy, one of the initiatives under Canada’s Action Plan against Racism, focused on reducing racism and discrimination and promoting diversity in workplaces subject to the \textit{Employment Equity Act}. An evaluation released in 2011 found that the Strategy had made progress in generating expected impacts with employers.\textsuperscript{168}

The necessity to combat racism extends well beyond federally regulated workplaces. The time to eliminate racism is before it takes root. One way to prevent racism is through education. The committee therefore recommends:

**RECOMMENDATION 13**

That the Government of Canada encourage the provinces and territories to develop a national comprehensive educational policy to challenge and address underlying structural issues such as racism, religious and sexual intolerance, and bullying in schools and society.

The comprehensive anti-racism/educational funding must be transparent and linked to policy development implementation, education and accountability and the components of a comprehensive educational policy must address: a) curriculum, training, teaching, b) bullying and “Safe School” policies, and c) second-language training in either official language.

As part of the Action Plan, the federal government committed to monitor progress and report back to Canadians in the \textit{Annual Report on the Operations of the Canadian Multiculturalism Act} tabled in Parliament.\textsuperscript{169} The Department of Canadian Heritage was to work with the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) to develop a set of indicators to monitor the progress of efforts to counteract racism.

Mr. Reilly emphasized that “[s]upport for, and extension of, the work of Canada’s Action Plan on Racism, and efforts to eliminate racism at systemic and community levels, will help promote a more cohesive society in Canada.”\textsuperscript{170} The committee agrees that the Government of

\begin{footnotes}
\item[167] \textit{Ibid.}, p. 6.
\item[169] This report is now tabled in Parliament by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration Canada whose Department is now responsible for the \textit{Canadian Multiculturalism Act}. It is available on-line at \url{http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/resources/publications/multi-report2011/index.asp}.
\item[170] \textit{Evidence}, 10 February 2011, John Reilly.
\end{footnotes}
Canada has an important role to play in efforts to combat racism and discrimination and therefore recommends:

**RECOMMENDATION 14**

That the Government of Canada continue actions to combat racism and discrimination as set forth in Canada’s Action Plan against Racism.

Federal legislation in the form of the *Employment Equity Act* seeks to:

> [a]chieve equality in the workplace so that no person shall be denied employment opportunities or benefits for reasons unrelated to ability and, in the fulfillment of that goal, to correct the conditions of disadvantage in employment experienced by women, aboriginal peoples, persons with disabilities and members of visible minorities by giving effect to the principle that employment equity means more than treating persons in the same way but also requires special measures and the accommodation of difference.\(^{171}\)

The Act applies to both federally regulated private sector employers and the federal public service, and is thus applicable to approximately 13% of the Canadian workforce and 600 employers.\(^{172}\) Under the terms of the Act, the Canadian Human Rights Commission is responsible for the enforcement of the Act’s obligations, a task that is partly fulfilled through compliance audits. Employers who fail to comply with the Act’s provisions are subject to monetary penalties.

Avvy Go called for more regular compliance audits “so that [employers] know that they have to follow it and be contract compliant.”\(^{173}\) In 2011, the Canadian Human Rights Commission implemented a new employment equity audit process. If an employer is found to be experiencing difficulty in hiring and retaining designated groups compared with its industry counterparts, it is then subjected to a full compliance audit. In 2011, the Commission acknowledged 45 top performers in employment equity and audited 53 other organizations.\(^{174}\)

Under the terms of the *Public Service Employment Act*, visible minorities are one of four groups whose representation in the federal public service must be factored into hiring and retention practices. For 2011, Treasury Board Secretariat reported that although visible minority representation in the public service had increased over the previous year, it still fell slightly

---


\(^{173}\) *Evidence*, 7 March 2012, Avvy Go.

below their workforce availability. The Public Service Commission of Canada reported that the number and proportion of external appointments for visible minorities fell during 2010-2011; the number of visible minority applications had also declined. As Canada’s largest employer, whose employees both serve and are paid by the public, the federal government must have a workforce that is representative of Canadians. The committee therefore recommends:

RECOMMENDATION 15

That the Government of Canada accelerate equitable hiring and staffing processes for visible minorities and other designated groups as called for under the federal Public Service Employment Act, and

That the Government of Canada invite employers in federally regulated industries to hire and retain members of the four groups designated under the Employment Equity Act in proportion to their workforce availability.

CHAPTER FIVE: RELIGIOUS MINORITIES

INTRODUCTION

A majority of Canadians – seven out of 10 in the 2001 Census – identify themselves as either Catholic or Protestant. While there had been a slight decline in the number of people who reported adherence to Protestant denominations and a slight increase in the numbers claiming affiliation with the Catholic Church, the number of Canadians who reported affiliation with Islam, Hinduism, Sikhism and Buddhism in 2001 had increased substantially. The numbers of Canadians reporting that they either had no religious affiliation or do not attend religious services had also risen.

Between 1991 and 2001, the number of Canadians who identify themselves as Muslim increased by 129%; the number of Hindus by 8%; the number of Buddhists by 84%; the number of Sikhs by 89%; and the number of Jews by 4%. While the number of Canadians who identify with faiths other than Christian is relatively small (6% overall), this number has grown from 3.8% in 1991, and almost all of the dramatic increases have come as a result of immigration. Professor Bramadat spoke of the religious diversity that characterizes contemporary Canada and forecast that “[b]y 2017, we are looking at reaching about 10 per cent of non-Christian folks.”

Table 3: Population by religion, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion/Religious Denomination</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>29,639,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>12,936,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>8,654,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Orthodox</td>
<td>479,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian not included elsewhere</td>
<td>780,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>579,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>329,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>300,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>297,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikh</td>
<td>278,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern religions</td>
<td>37,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other religions</td>
<td>63,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religious affiliation</td>
<td>4,900,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada, Population by religion, 2001 Census. Note: Statistics Canada only collects data on religion every ten years.

179 Evidence, 17 February 2011, Paul Bramadat
The Charter and Religious Minorities

In 1982, the introduction of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and its Clause 2a (which asserts that among the fundamental freedoms enjoyed by all Canadians is the “freedom of conscience and religion”) in the Constitution, provided Canadians of minority religious faith with the protection of the Constitution and Canadian courts. Discussing the impact of the Charter, Pauline Côté, of the Department of Political Science at Université Laval, writes that:

The Charter seems to have made it easier for religious minorities to state their case and have a voice in public debates. Because of the Charter, the general public is much more aware of religious discrimination, and public institutions are committed at least in general terms, to religious equality.\textsuperscript{180}

Côté adds that the Charter “also proved effective in striking down important measures of preferential treatment of religion in the public sphere, mainly in schools.”\textsuperscript{181}

Victimization and Discrimination

While Canadians generally think of themselves and their country as open and tolerant, Canadian history contains multiple instances in which this tolerance has not been forthcoming with regard to religious minorities. Some of this intolerance is in evidence today. A recent poll, for example, found that anti-Semitism is still present in Canada and that there has been a rise Islamophobia in the wake of the terrorist attacks of September 2001.\textsuperscript{182} In 2010, approximately 395 hate crimes motivated by religion were reported by police. Members of the Jewish faith were the most common targets, accounting for just over half (204 incidents or 55%) of such incidents, followed by Muslims (50 incidents or 14% of the total), and Catholics (50 incidents or 14% of the total). The remaining 17% of hate crimes were committed against other religious groups such as Sikhs, Hindus, and Buddhists.\textsuperscript{183}

Professor Bramadat indicated, however, that Canada has done relatively well in keeping the peace between different religious affiliations, explaining that “[t]he good news [...] is that

\textsuperscript{181} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{182} Marina Jiminez, “Anti-Semitism, Islamophobia on the rise: poll,” The Globe and Mail, 14 September 2008, http://v1.theglobeandmail.com/servlet/story/RTGAM.20080919.wattitudes0919/front/Front/Front/. The story reported on a poll conducted by Leger Marketing based on a survey of 1,500 respondents across Canada. The survey, which had a 3.9% margin of error, found anti-Muslim sentiment among 36% of its respondents, while 73% expressed favorable feelings toward Jews, down from 78% the previous year (2007).
compared to many other Western liberal democracies, Canada is performing well” in terms of managing religious pluralism.¹⁸⁴

Legal and political mechanisms such as the Charter, human rights codes, employment legislation and the criminal code, do exist for religious minorities to seek redress for discrimination, and federal bodies such as Citizenship and Immigration Canada and a variety of provincial ministries and programs do exist to provide funding and other forms of support for a number of anti-racist and pro-inclusion initiatives that promote the social and cultural inclusion of minority religious communities. However, even better than these structural supports, there is a political culture and a widespread- if not unconditional- ethos here that promotes inclusion and diversity.

Paul Bramadat, Director, Centre for Studies in Religion and Society, University of Victoria, Evidence, 17 February 2011

Professor Bramadat observed that in major Canadian urban centres, there is increased acceptance of religious diversity, particularly among young people and that this acceptance is mirrored in the results of opinion surveys that show that “many people in their 30s and 40s have a much higher tolerance” for intermarriage than previous generations.¹⁸⁵

Secularism: Open and Closed

In his testimony, Professor Bramadat spoke of “closed” and “open” secularism. Under the former,

...people leave their religious identities at the door when they enter city hall, the courtroom, a classroom, Parliament and other public spaces. In these spaces, we say they should simply function as citizens, not as religious citizens, and they should translate their religious motivations into secular terms that can be understood by all other citizens, in theory.¹⁸⁶

At first glance, closed secularism would appear to be desirable. Professor Bramadat said that it “sounds like a good way to keep the tribalism, misogyny and violence often associated with religion out of the public arena [...] in theory, it protects the rights won by women, won by religion and won by gays and lesbians, among others.”¹⁸⁷

Yet closed secularism has drawbacks: “...for those religious minorities who cannot, or will not, conceive of themselves as anything but religious citizens,” for whom “an explicitly or

¹⁸⁴ Evidence, 17 February 2011, Paul Bramadat
¹⁸⁵ Ibid.
¹⁸⁶ Ibid.
¹⁸⁷ Ibid.
implicitly closed secularism conveys the message that Canada does not welcome them as they are.”\textsuperscript{188} In contrast, open secularism would allow for the inclusion of religious minorities who feel that they cannot separate their beliefs from their roles as citizens. In an open secular society, however, “one can and must say no to religious groups from time to time” with care to ensure that the ‘no’ is delivered in a respectful way.\textsuperscript{189}

Professor Bramadat discussed the differences between ‘closed secularism’ as currently practiced in Canada and ‘open secularism’ and recommended that Canada adopt the latter:

One new way forward is to adopt, and perhaps to enhance, open secularism; to aim for a society in which we are guided by the much-valued Charter principles but in which we strive to develop laws, policies and a broader ethos in which religious claims, and identities are welcomed in virtually all parts of our society.\textsuperscript{190}

Professor Bramadat cited, as examples of open secularism, Canadian hospitals and hospices that are increasingly open to the diverse religious needs of their patients. However, governments can exercise only very limited means to promote the acceptance of religious diversity; as noted above, laws already in place provide protection for the freedom of religious choice. One area in which governments could facilitate open secularism and the acceptance of religious diversity is through the education system.

Professor Bramadat observed that “provincial policies around education about religion are a patchwork set of policies across the country.”\textsuperscript{191} While education at the primary and secondary levels lies outside the constitutional competency of the federal government, the federal government could assume a leadership role in promoting an approach to religious education similar to the one practiced in Québec. As Professor Bramadat told the committee, “[i]t would be a great idea if other provinces tried to learn from the Quebec experience with regard to how to educate kids about religion; to learn what works and does not work.”\textsuperscript{192} The committee believes that its recommendation 13 at page 60 will help promote the religious literacy that can serve as a foundation for greater understanding and acceptance of a plurality of religious faiths in Canadian communities.

\textbf{The Role of the Federal Government}

The federal government employs a variety of strategies and instruments designed to protect freedom of religion. In addition to the \textit{Charter of Rights and Freedoms}, and other measures, the Government of Canada has initiated two new approaches to defend freedom of worship.

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|}
\hline
\textsuperscript{188} \textit{Ibid.} \\
\textsuperscript{189} \textit{Ibid.} \\
\textsuperscript{190} \textit{Ibid.} \\
\textsuperscript{191} \textit{Ibid.} \\
\textsuperscript{192} \textit{Ibid.} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}
In March 2011, the federal government announced that the Security Infrastructure Program, initially launched as a pilot project, would be made permanent. The Program is designed to provide financial support to groups at risk of hate-motivated crime. The funding, amounting to $1 million annually, is for the development of security infrastructure for places of worship, educational institutions and community centres. In 2010-2011, while still at the pilot stage, the Program funded 20 projects, a total investment of $565,000.\[193\]

CHAPTER SIX: URBAN ABORIGINAL CANADIANS

Urban Aboriginal people are a key part of the future for urban communities and urban economies, but to realize this potential we need to fully support community development for all urban Aboriginal peoples.\(^{194}\)

INTRODUCTION

According to Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada,\(^{195}\) Aboriginal peoples is “a collective name for the original peoples of North America and their descendants. Section 35 of the Canadian Constitution recognizes three groups of Aboriginal people: Indians (commonly referred to as First Nations), Métis and Inuit.”\(^{196}\) Aboriginal Canadians face many challenges to becoming fully engaged in urban Canadian society and economy.

These challenges have their roots in a complex history that includes past government policies, including Indian residential schools.\(^{197}\) The Prime Minister’s historic apology recognized the “lasting and damaging impact” of residential schools on Aboriginal cultures, heritage and language.\(^{198}\) Some of these impacts are evident today, with poorer health, education, social and economic outcomes for Aboriginal people relative to their non-Aboriginal Canadian counterparts, including among the growing Aboriginal population moving to Canadian cities.

Earlier, in Chapter 2 of this Report, the committee emphasized that to achieve social inclusion and cohesion, “one-size-fits all” solutions adopted by one or even a handful of stakeholders would not succeed. There is perhaps no other area in which this is more so than with regard to Aboriginal Canadians who are varied in cultural, linguistic, and geographic composition.

Aboriginal Canadians: A Profile

In 2006, the Census recorded a total of 1,172,785 Aboriginal people, 3.8% of the Canadian population. In spite of this minority status, the Aboriginal population is the fastest growing in Canada, increasing by 20.1% between 2001 and 2006.\(^{199}\) According to population forecasts, Aboriginal peoples could comprise 4.1% of Canada’s population by 2017.

\(^{194}\) Ray Gerow, written submission, February 2012.
\(^{195}\) Formerly Indian and Northern Affairs Canada.
\(^{197}\) For more information about these institutions, see Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, “Indian Residential Schools – Key Milestones.”
\(^{198}\) Prime Minister Stephen Harper, [Statement of Apology to former students of Indian Residential Schools](http://www4.hrsdc.gc.ca/indic.1t.4r-@-eng.jsp?iid=36), 11 June 2008.
\(^{199}\) Human Resources and Skills Development Canada, “Canadians in Context – Aboriginal Population,” [Indicators of Well-being in Canada](http://www4.hrsdc.gc.ca/3indic.1t.4r-@-eng.jsp?iid=36). Note that the growing Aboriginal Canadian population is the result of births plus an increased willingness to self-identify as Aboriginal.
The numbers of Aboriginal Canadians are increasing at either end of the age spectrum. At one end, Aboriginal Canadians are younger on average than the rest of the overall population. The 2006 Census found that the median age of the Aboriginal population was 27 years, while the median age for non-Aboriginal people was 40 years.\(^{200}\) While seniors aged 65 and older only make up 5% of the Aboriginal population (among non-Aboriginal people, seniors make up approximately 13% of the population), the percentage of senior Aboriginal people doubled between 1996 and 2006.\(^{201}\) The chart below also demonstrates the relative youth of the Aboriginal population, addressed in more specific urban contexts below.

**Chart 3: Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal population age, 2006 (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Aboriginal</th>
<th>Non-Aboriginal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-14 years</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24 years</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 years</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ years</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**A Diverse Population**

Aboriginal Canadians are not monolithic. Apart from the three main groups that compose Canada’s Aboriginal peoples (First Nations, Métis, and Inuit), First Nations peoples are composed of many nations such as Cree, Ojibway, and Mohawk. There are approximately 615

---


First Nations communities which represent more than 50 nations and nearly 60 Aboriginal languages.\textsuperscript{202}

Every Canadian city is unique in terms of the composition of its Aboriginal citizens. Leona Carter, the Director of the Aboriginal Relations Office, Community Services for the City of Edmonton, spoke of this diversity in terms of her city, which is a microcosm of the Canadian urban Aboriginal population. She told the committee that:

\begin{quote}
We include diverse First Nations peoples, though predominately Cree, more than half of us are Métis, we include a growing Inuit population and we never forget our non-status brothers and sisters as well. We share a common history, some common world views; however, our languages, customs and our cultures represent a wide range of differences.\textsuperscript{203}
\end{quote}

Ms. Carter also spoke of the age profile of Aboriginal Canadians in her city: “Nearly half [...] are younger than 25 years of age. More than one in four [...] is under 15 years of age. [Urban Aboriginal] population growth is three times that of other Edmontonians.”\textsuperscript{204}

\textit{Jurisdictional Issues}

Under Section 91(24) of the Constitution, the federal government has responsibility for “Indians and Lands reserved for Indians.” This responsibility is reflected in the \textit{Indian Act}. However, unless it involves First Nation reserves located within municipalities, this responsibility is unclear when it relates to Aboriginal people living in Canadian cities.

In spite of the broad definition contained in the Constitution, the federal government’s “current policy is that its responsibility – with a few exceptions – extends only to First Nations people resident on-reserve, while provincial governments have a general responsibility for Aboriginal peoples living off-reserve. Neither the federal nor the provincial governments have accepted any special responsibility for the Métis and non-status Indian population.”\textsuperscript{205}

In the 1990s, provincial and territorial governments transferred many responsibilities to the municipal level, often including responsibility for delivering programs and services to Aboriginal


\textsuperscript{203} \textit{Evidence}, 9 February 2012, Leona Carter. Non-status Aboriginal people are those who identify themselves as Indians but who are not entitled to register on the Indian Register pursuant to the \textit{Indian Act}, even though many may be members of a First Nation. For more information, see \url{http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100014433/1100100014437}

\textsuperscript{204} \textit{Evidence}, 9 February 2012, Leona Carter.
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peoples living within their boundaries and often, according to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, without transferring adequate fiscal resources.\footnote{Federation of Canadian Municipalities, “Policy Statement on Municipal Finance and Intergovernmental Arrangements,” \url{http://www.fcm.ca/Documents/corporate-resources/policy-statements/2012_Municipal_Finance_and_Intergovernmental_Arrangements_Policy_Statement_EN.pdf}; This decision can be found online at \url{http://cas-nce-nter03.cas-satj.gc.ca/rss/T-2172-99%20reasons%20jan-8-2013%20ENG.pdf}}

The committee notes that in a decision handed down on 8 January 2013, the Federal Court of Canada ruled that Métis and non-status Indians are “Indians” within the meaning of section 91 (24) of the \textit{Constitution Act, 1867}, and thus fall under the jurisdiction of the federal government.\footnote{Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada, \textit{“Statement from Minister Duncan – Daniels Court Decision,”} 6 February 2013.} The committee also notes that on 6 February 2013, the then-Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, John Duncan, issued the following statement:

\begin{quote}
Given that the Federal Court decision in [this] case raises complex legal issues, it is prudent for Canada to obtain a decision from a higher court. After careful consideration of the decision, Canada has filed an appeal, and it would be inappropriate to comment further as the case is before the courts.\footnote{Evidence, 2 March 2011, Allan MacDonald.}
\end{quote}

Speaking to the committee on the issue of jurisdiction, Allan MacDonald, Director of the Office of the Federal Interlocutor at Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada, testified that he doubted that “one party has to own it, but there needs to be some leadership,” and that because the federal government has an interest in the urban Aboriginal population, it is showing that leadership.\footnote{Evidence, 2 March 2011, Betty Ann Lavallée.} Representatives of national Aboriginal organizations saw things somewhat differently, arguing that the issue of which level of government has jurisdiction constitutes a major roadblock to progress and needs to be resolved. Betty Ann Lavallée, National Chief, Congress of Aboriginal Peoples (CAP), told the committee that:

\begin{quote}
Canada denies jurisdiction over Métis and non-status Indians under section 91.24 of the Constitution Act. Most provinces take the position that non-status Indians and Métis are a federal responsibility. The consequence is that 600,000 Métis and non-status Indians have become trapped in a jurisdictional vacuum where there are few government programs for Aboriginal peoples. This is the principal reason why we have not reached our full potential in Canadian society.\footnote{Evidence, 2 March 2011, Betty Ann Lavallée.}
\end{quote}
In its report 14 years ago, the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP) observed that the jurisdictional issue “is the most basic current form of governmental discrimination.” RCAP recommended unblocking this issue by action in the courts and observed that until this discriminatory practice has been changed, no other remedial measures can be as effective as they should be.211

Allan MacDonald asserted that “if you start arguing over whose jurisdiction it is, you will get nothing done.”212 Rick Simon, Regional Chief, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, of the Assembly of First Nations (AFN), indicated that the AFN does not want to see wrangling between the federal and provincial governments over jurisdiction: “we are standing on the outside watching you guys argue about what is best for us, and that is not acceptable.” Mr. Simon added that Aboriginal Canadians “need a more comprehensive continuum of care across jurisdictional divides and uncertainties.”213

---

212 Evidence, 2 March 2011, Allan MacDonald.
213 Evidence, 2 March 2011, Rick Simon.
What is life like for Aboriginal peoples living in Canadian cities? The answer, unfortunately, for [the] most part is that it is bleak.

The lot of life for Aboriginal peoples living in Canadian cities is not much different than it is for Aboriginal peoples living in rural, remote and isolated communities. Yes, there are some positive examples of success, of people employed, of owning businesses and of good health. Unfortunately, and for the most part, our conditions of life include low education and literacy rates, poor employment training opportunities in spite of federal funding...

We have poor health and are experiencing high rates of diseases such as diabetes. Our youth are challenged to decide whether to join gangs or to seek a better, more wholesome life.

*Jeffrey Cyr, Executive Director*
National Association of Friendship Centres
Evidence, 8 February 2012

Aboriginal Canadians are increasingly urban. In 2006 in Canada as a whole, slightly more than half the Aboriginal population lived in urban centres, up from 47% in 1996.214 Although the results of the 2011 Census as they relate to Aboriginal Canadians had yet to be released at the time of writing, Jeffrey Cyr, Executive Director of the National Association of Friendship Centres, estimated, almost 60% of Canada’s total Aboriginal population currently live in cities.215 Larry Cachene, Chief of the Yellow Quill First Nation, Saskatoon Tribal Council, indicated that his Nation mirrors this trend, telling the committee that the Yellow Quill First Nation has “2,700 band members [...] on our list, and 800 of them are in the community while 1,600 are off the reserve.”216 Projected demographic trends predict that the urban Aboriginal population will continue to grow.

---

215 Evidence, 8 February 2012, Jeffrey Cyr.
216 Evidence, 2 February 2012, Larry Cachene.
Table 4: Aboriginal populations in major urban centres, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CENSUS METROPOLITAN AREA (CMA)</th>
<th>ABORIGINAL IDENTITY</th>
<th>Percentage Growth since 2001</th>
<th>As a Percentage of Total CMA Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winnipeg</td>
<td>68,380</td>
<td>+22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>52,105</td>
<td>+27%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>40,310</td>
<td>+9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>26,575</td>
<td>+26%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>26,575</td>
<td>+31%</td>
<td>.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatoon</td>
<td>21,535</td>
<td>+6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montréal</td>
<td>17,870</td>
<td>+60%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina</td>
<td>17,105</td>
<td>+9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada, Population by Aboriginal Group, by census metropolitan area (2006 Census) [http://www40.statcan.gc.ca/l01/cst01/demo64a-eng.htm](http://www40.statcan.gc.ca/l01/cst01/demo64a-eng.htm).

Urban Aboriginal Women

The 2006 Census found that approximately 16,500 more Aboriginal women than men live in the ten census metropolitan areas reporting the largest Aboriginal population. Women have tended to leave reserves for the city to gain access to better housing and better educational opportunities for their children. Data show that a higher proportion of Aboriginal children living in population centres are living with one parent compared to their counterparts living in rural Canada. Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada reports that nearly one in four families are lone-parent families. Based on anecdotal evidence, the majority of these sole-parent families are headed by women. Rick Simon reminded the committee that Aboriginal women in urban centres do not feel safe and that many of them are among those who have been made missing, murdered or disappeared in recent years.

Urban Aboriginal Youth

Reflecting the age profile of the Aboriginal population as a whole, Aboriginal people living in cities are very young. In 2006, 28% of Aboriginal people in urban centres were under 15 years of age compared with 17% of the non-Aboriginal population. The proportion of urban Aboriginal youth under the age of 25 also tended to be higher than in the non-Aboriginal population.
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population, ranging from a high of 56% and 55% of the Aboriginal populations in Regina and Saskatoon respectively, to a low of 33% of the Aboriginal population in Montréal.  

The National Association of Friendship Centres reported that in 2006, Aboriginal youth between 15 and 24 were twice as likely as non-Aboriginal people in the same age range to be unemployed.  

**Educational Attainment**

Right now, we are asking our people to run before they can walk, so we need to get the skills for them to move forward, the personal skills development that they need to deal with a range of issues.  

Aboriginal youth are falling through the cracks of the current educational system.  

Educational attainment among Aboriginal Canadians tends to be lower, and in some instances significantly lower, than among their non-Aboriginal counterparts. A much higher proportion of Aboriginal Canadians are without high school diplomas compared to non-Aboriginal Canadians (34% versus 15%), while there is an equal level of attainment for college and trade certification among Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people. In 2006, 8% of the Aboriginal population held a university degree while 23% of the non-Aboriginal population did.  

When comparing attainment by gender in 2006, more Aboriginal women than men have completed high school and college, and have received post-secondary diplomas and university degrees. Only in apprenticeship did the proportion of men exceed that of women.  

Educational attainment among Aboriginal peoples can also vary by city. In Edmonton, for example, almost half of Aboriginal women (49%) and men (48%) between the ages of 25 and 64 in 2006 had completed post-secondary education, compared with approximately six in 10 of non-Aboriginal people in the same age range.  

The dropout rate for Aboriginal youth below the post-secondary level is particularly troubling; Statistics Canada’s Labour Force Survey found that the three-year average dropout  
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rate for 2007-2010 for off-reserve Aboriginal youth aged 20 to 24 was 22.6%; the corresponding rate for non-Aboriginal youth was 8.5%.229

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education, non-Aboriginal and Aboriginal populations, aged 25-34 years, 2006 (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Without high school diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Aboriginal population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Representatives of national Aboriginal organizations stressed the importance of education in helping Aboriginal people integrate into Canadian economy and society. Rick Simon told the committee that education “is the key to unlocking the full potential of Aboriginal citizens […] education will be the foundation for lasting and positive change.”230 He indicated that educational attainment for Aboriginal peoples is improving and that improvements need to continue. Mr. Chartrand told the committee that education “is the light bulb of the future. If we can get more emphasis on the educational side, we will see a great change.”231

In Budget 2012, the Government of Canada announced that it would spend $275 million over three years to support First Nations education and build and renovate schools on reserve.232 Although this expenditure will not be directed at Aboriginal Canadians living in cities, the committee notes that with increasing migration of Aboriginal people into urban areas, improved
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education at the reserve level should result in enhanced ability for Aboriginal adults moving to cities to access employment opportunities.

From the perspective of the committee and that of its witnesses, access to education and training at the post-secondary level offers one of the best opportunities for Aboriginal Canadians to enrich their lives and that of the communities in which they reside. In recommendations 7 to 11 of Opening the Door: Reducing Barriers to Post-Secondary Education in Canada, and recommendations 19 and 21 of In From the Margins, the committee recommended measures directed toward improving educational opportunities for Aboriginal Canadians. These recommendations can be found at Appendix B.I-B.II of this report.

Aboriginal Youth Gangs

Pride and an acknowledged cultural identity, is critical to Aboriginal youth not engaging in substance abuse, joining gangs or criminal activities.\textsuperscript{233}

In a relatively recent study, it was demonstrated that approximately 20,000 Aboriginal children under the age of 17 are in government care, three times the number enrolled in the residential schools at the height of their operation. Other studies demonstrate that Aboriginal children outnumber non-Aboriginal children by a rate of eight to one in their proportion of being in care. This is particularly relevant because we know that children in care are at a much higher risk of later trajectories in juvenile offending.

\textit{Daniel Sansfaçon, Director, Policy, Research and Evaluation, National Crime Prevention Centre, Public Safety Canada, Evidence, 7 March 2012}

Aboriginal youth gangs are of particular concern to the committee and its witnesses. Young Aboriginal people make up the second highest proportion of youth gang members in Canada, and their participation in street gangs is particularly worrisome in western provinces.\textsuperscript{234}

Betty Ann Lavallée linked participation in youth gangs to poverty, exclusion and oppression. The Congress of Aboriginal Peoples has learned that participation in gangs “is often not a conscious choice, but a choice made out of what some call ‘habit.’” Ms. Lavallée told the committee that the majority of the youth involved in youth gangs are at or below the low-income cut-offs for the cities they live in. She indicated that:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{233} \textit{Evidence}, 2 February 2012, Dwight Dorey
\end{itemize}
[t]heir parents and other family members and their circle of friends live in similar conditions in the same city neighbourhoods or another nearby. These similarities of ‘living in poverty’ and ‘living in urban areas’ combined with a relatively long history of social exclusion, oppression, discrimination and shame are the indicators for the development of the habit [of joining youth gangs].

Rick Simon agreed with Ms. Lavallée, telling the committee that “[f]or too many First Nations and young adults, gang involvement and violence are part of their reality.” In like manner, Dwight Dorey testified that:

[I]t has been discovered that their participation is not necessarily a conscious decision. Their families and friends live in low-income areas within urban centres, and this lifelong exposure to this lifestyle situation results in similarly focused living patterns and activities. We are now starting to see and witness second generation gang members.

Rick Simon indicated that the AFN is working on a strategy to combat gang violence, but that “there is no money within government to do the work.” Dwight Dorey, of the Congress of Aboriginal Peoples, offered similar testimony, stating that the problem that his organization faces when attempting to counter the attraction of youth gangs to Aboriginal youth is that of a “lack of adequate resources to facilitate the kinds of [alternative] activity that the youth would like to engage in.”

All three representatives of national Aboriginal organizations indicated that they had taken steps to divert Aboriginal youth away from youth gangs. The Métis National Council has implemented a program – Standing Tall – in which family members are directly involved with their children in school settings. The AFN worked with a former member of the RCMP to develop an anti-gang strategy but failed to secure government funding for the initiative.

Rick Simon told the committee that he had not heard of the federal government’s Youth Gang Prevention Fund. David Chartrand, Vice-President of the Metis National Council asserted that there “is no question that the gang initiative the government is trying to deal with is not working.”
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The Youth Gang Prevention Fund

The federal government’s Youth Gang Prevention Fund (YGPF) focuses on youth who have a history of serious violence and/or are at risk of joining youth gangs or are already members. An evaluation of the Youth Gang Prevention Fund released by Public Safety Canada in March 2011 found that the 19 projects supported by the Fund had engaged approximately 1,100 youth over the five years (2006 to 2011) of its existence.242

While there are no details with regard to the Fund’s support of projects that are specifically aimed at Aboriginal youth, some projects such as the Turning the Tides project in Winnipeg are partly based on Aboriginal teachings. In its Departmental Performance Report for 2010-2011, Public Safety Canada, the federal department responsible for the Youth Gang Prevention Fund, reported that in two examples, both in Saskatchewan, YGPF projects had managed to achieve successful gang exits of 72% and 78% respectively.243

The Youth Gang Prevention Fund was set to expire at the end of fiscal year 2010-2011. However, funding for the program was subsequently renewed on 15 March 2011. The federal government has announced that the Fund will receive $37.5 million over five years and $7.5 million thereafter in ongoing annual funding.

The committee welcomes the renewal of the Youth Gang Prevention Fund and notes that youth gang violence is a problem that plagues other segments of Canadian society, not just the Aboriginal Canadian communities, and is a serious and growing phenomenon that affects all of Canada’s major cities. The committee found that representatives of national Aboriginal organizations tended to have minimal information about the Fund, and thus may not have benefited from it. The committee therefore recommends:

**RECOMMENDATION 16**

That the Government of Canada enhance efforts to communicate information regarding the Youth Gang Prevention Fund to national Aboriginal organizations and consult with those organizations regarding the design and opportunities available under the program, with a view to enhancing its overall effectiveness.

Cultural Connections for Aboriginal Youth (CCAY) Program

The Cultural Connections for Aboriginal Youth program began as the Urban Multipurpose Aboriginal Youth Centers Initiative funded by Canadian Heritage and administered by Aboriginal Friendship Centres. In 2012, the Initiative was transferred to Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada where it was renamed the Cultural Connections for Aboriginal Youth (CCAY) Program.
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Youth (CCAY) Program. The Program was suspended following transfer, while the Department engaged in discussions with the National Association of Friendship Centres about the Program with plans to renovate and ultimately reintroduce it.\textsuperscript{244} Subsequently, on 30 July 2012, the federal government announced that funds for the Program had been unfrozen under new terms and conditions that focus on preparing Aboriginal youth for fuller participation in the Canadian economy.\textsuperscript{245}

The committee welcomes the reintroduction of the Program, and expects that attention will be paid to accessibility in the redesign process. Given the economic and cultural diversity of Aboriginal Canadians living in urban centres, it is vital that local communities have a strong voice in shaping the content and delivery of the CCAY Program. This will ultimately strengthen the Program and help ensure that Aboriginal youth take full advantage of it. The committee therefore recommends:

**RECOMMENDATION 17**

That in developing and delivering the Cultural Connections for Aboriginal Youth (CCAY) Program, Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada and the National Association of Friendship Centres work together to ensure that local Aboriginal communities are given a prominent role in shaping the Program to respond to community needs.

*The Urban Aboriginal Strategy (UAS)*

As an Aboriginal person, for most of my life I have been told that Aboriginal peoples need to change to fully benefit from the good fortune of being Canadian. Experience, and hopefully, wisdom now tell me that our government is working together to change and true collaboration with Aboriginal people will determine success. To achieve our objectives with Aboriginal peoples, I believe that all three orders of government would do best to collaborate on sustainable initiatives that support our Aboriginal communities, reclaiming our identities, our languages, our culture, our prosperity and our autonomy.

*Leona Carter, Director, Aboriginal Relations Office*
*Community Services City of Edmonton*
*Evidence, 8 February 2012*


The federal government is engaged in a number of initiatives to assist Aboriginal peoples living in urban centres. These initiatives are gathered collectively under Aboriginal Peoples Program (APP). The APP was initially led by the Department of Canadian Heritage and integrates 15 elements that were managed separately prior to 2005. The principal element among these initiatives that is focused on Aboriginal Canadians living in cities is the Urban Aboriginal Strategy (UAS) which falls under the responsibility of the Office of the Federal Interlocutor, located in the Department of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development.

The Urban Aboriginal Strategy was first developed in 1997 with a four-year mandate and a budget of $40 million. Funding was subsequently renewed in 2003. In 2007, the UAS was renewed again and enhanced. That year, the federal government made a long-term commitment to the UAS, allocating $68.5 million over five years to the program. In 2010-2011, a total of $14.5 million was invested in the UAS, approximately $1 million above planned spending, a move that was made to address priority issues.246 For that fiscal year, working with partners, the UAS supported 144 community projects and invested $9.3 million, coordinated $2.5 million from other federal departments and agencies, leveraged $5.8 million from provinces and municipalities, and $3.6 million from non-public sector partners. In its Departmental Performance Report for that period, Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada indicated that a precursory analysis of census data from 2001 to 2006 had shown that high school attainment, employment, and average total income rates for Aboriginal Canadians living in cities where the UAS was in operation had increased by one per cent.247

The UAS was set to expire in 2012, but in Budget 2012, the Government of Canada renewed the Strategy and invested $27 million over two years (2012-2013 and 2013-2014) in order to improve economic opportunities for Aboriginal Canadians living in cities.248 UAS investments focus on three priority areas: improving life skills (through school attendance and activities outside the formal educational system, such as mentoring), promoting job training, skills and entrepreneurship, and supporting Aboriginal women, children and families.249

One of the Strategy’s leading goals is improve coordination and foster efficiencies among federal departments and agencies already delivering programs to urban Aboriginal people. Participating federal entities include:
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Human Resources and Skills Development Canada (Aboriginal Human Resource Development Strategy, Homelessness Partnering Strategy, Aboriginal Skills and Employment Partnership Program);
Health Canada (Head Start Program),
Canadian Heritage (Urban Multi-Purpose Aboriginal Youth Program, now the Cultural Connections for Aboriginal Youth (CCAY) Program, administered by Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada), and
Public Safety Canada (National Crime Prevention Strategy) and Justice Canada (Aboriginal Affairs Portfolio).

Each of these programs operates with budgets that are separate from the UAS. Horizontal terms and conditions have been created with the aim of enhancing federal coordination. This is a mechanism by which other federal government departments can pool their funds and direct them through a single agreement to a recipient, which not only coordinates federal efforts around a project but also makes it easier for the recipient to interact with government. This innovation also seeks to ensure that federal financial investments are maximized, well aligned and mutually supportive.

Under the Strategy, the Government of Canada works with other levels of government and community organizations to sustain projects that support urban Aboriginal peoples and that correspond with local priorities and needs. The UAS aims to promote self-reliance among Aboriginal people in thirteen cities whose Aboriginal population represents more than 25% of Canada’s total Aboriginal population. Cities where the UAS is in operation include Vancouver, Prince George, Lethbridge, Calgary, Edmonton, Prince Albert, Regina, Saskatoon, Winnipeg, Thompson, Toronto, and Thunder Bay. The federal government is currently conducting preliminary work with Aboriginal people in Montréal and Halifax to explore the potential of extending the UAS to those cities.

The UAS works in these cities through community steering committees, and these committees have participation from the local urban Aboriginal community and all levels of government. In some cases, existing community structures are used to deliver the Strategy, and in others, community steering committees have been established for this purpose. The task of the committees is to work with the private sector and all levels of government to expedite planning, funding decisions and responses to urban Aboriginal issues.

While each city is unique and has developed its own priorities, all of these cities target the same three national priorities that have been established under the UAS. Mr. MacDonald indicated that when local priorities are established, federal programming is targeted and coordinated to meet those needs rather than having communities adjust their needs to meet federal programming requirements.
Mr. MacDonald told the committee that, under the UAS, the federal government has funded life-skills training for young Aboriginal mothers seeking to move into the workforce from bad domestic situations, supported training and apprenticeships for Aboriginal youth and helped urban Aboriginal youth exit the gang life. He added that the federal government has “also influenced municipalities to provide greater focus in this area and formalized our relationships with governments to align and coordinate our efforts to address urban Aboriginal issues.”

Opinions about the Urban Aboriginal Strategies varied among the committee’s witnesses. Denis Carignan, Saskatchewan Director of the Office of the Federal Interlocutor, gave a personal endorsement of the UAS. Mr. Carignan, himself a member of a First Nation, testified that:

This particular strategy is the reason that I came to work for the federal government. It allows us to be connected to the communities; it allows us, as a management culture, to listen to the community interests first and then find partners willing to work with us. This is something that really represents the future of government.

A contrary view was expressed by David Chartrand who stated that the UAS:

[i]s not working. In fact, it is in worse shape than ever.... the Métis received 6 per cent of [$65 million spent by the federal government on the UAS], yet we dominate such a large populous base in Western Canada. We are not a participant of the process. We tried to be a partner from the beginning; we tried to work with it. It did not take us anywhere. In fact, we are not very proud of it.

Mr. Chartrand added that community steering committees “are such a mishmash everywhere,” so that “[y]ou do not know who is going left or right or which door is being opened or closed; there is no coordination.”

In his written submission, Ray Gerow, President and Chief Executive Officer of the Aboriginal Business and Community Development Centre in Prince George, British Columbia, asserted that “[t]here is great potential for activities like the Urban Aboriginal Strategy to be used...

---

250 Evidence, 2 March 2011, Allan MacDonald
251 Evidence, 2 March 2011, Denis Carignan
252 Evidence, 2 March 2011, David Chartrand
253 Ibid.
as a mechanism for dialogue across urban Aboriginal populations,” but because the UAS is tied to funding allocations, it “creates competition between urban service providers.”

Regardless of mixed views, the UAS represents a model for cooperation among all levels of government including municipalities, and Aboriginal Canadians living in an urban environment. Apart from its ability to convene stakeholders and facilitate the coordination of program delivery, another important aspect of the UAS is its ability to secure financial and other forms of investment from its partners, as noted above. Because the Strategy is an excellent vehicle to bring about improved social inclusion, as well as better economic outcomes, for Aboriginal Canadians living in cities, the committee recommends:

**RECOMMENDATION 18**

That the Government of Canada, in partnership with national Aboriginal organizations and other levels of government, expand the Urban Aboriginal Strategy beyond the thirteen municipalities where it is already in operation.

The committee takes note of the observations made by Mr. Gerow and Mr. Chartrand and believes that the federal government should continue to take steps aimed at improving the Urban Aboriginal Strategy. The committee therefore recommends:

**RECOMMENDATION 19**

That the Government of Canada work with national Aboriginal organizations and other levels of government to bring about better coordination and distributional fairness within community steering committees established under the Urban Aboriginal Strategy.

*Making the Transition to Urban Life*

The shift to increasing urbanization of Aboriginal peoples brings with it significant cultural and economic challenges as Aboriginal Canadians adjust to life in Canadian cities.

Witnesses were asked about the level of preparedness among Aboriginal people, and especially Aboriginal youth, relocating from rural reserves to urban centres. The committee wondered whether those migrating to cities have information about the resources that are available upon arrival. Dwight Dorey testified that young Aboriginal people moving to cities to attend universities and colleges are well supported, but others are not.\(^{255}\)

In their report on urban Aboriginal people, Dominique M. Gross and John Richardson note that local labour market indicators such as unemployment and median income do not influence
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the choice of Aboriginal people to move to an urban area, indicating that weak integration might be the result of a lack of information. An individual’s recent arrival in a CMA could be the reason for reporting limited professional connections with potential employers or a lack of contacts with government employment agencies.  

Jeffrey Cyr asserted that “[t]he same way we think about immigration services for new Canadians coming in, we should think about immigration or emigration services for existing First Peoples in this country.”

The committee supports the observations and recommendations of its witnesses and notes that Aboriginal Friendship Centres provide important services to Aboriginal peoples making the move to Canadian cities. These centres, operated by Canadian Aboriginal people, provide the best means to assist Aboriginal peoples adapt to urban life. The committee recommends, therefore:

**RECOMMENDATION 20**

That the Government of Canada continue to work in partnership with Aboriginal Friendship Centres to support transition services for Aboriginal peoples moving to Canadian cities.

**ECONOMIC INCLUSION**

Aboriginal Canadians face numerous challenges to full inclusion in the Canadian economy. At the same time, there have been some encouraging developments upon which to build. Business development among Aboriginal people, for example, has been increasing. According to data from the 2007 Small and Medium Enterprise Financing Initiative cited by the Aboriginal Affairs Working Group, approximately 2.4% of small businesses in Canada were majority owned by Aboriginal peoples. This represented approximately 27,000 businesses, both on- and
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258 The Aboriginal Affairs Working Group brings together provincial and territorial ministers responsible for Aboriginal affairs and will be described in more detail later on in this report.
off-reserve, not counting incorporated and community-owned enterprises.\textsuperscript{259} About 22\% of the self-employed Aboriginal people in 2006 were found on reserve, with a similar number in rural off-reserve locations and the balance in urban areas. Women entrepreneurs made up 38\% of the total number of Aboriginal entrepreneurs.\textsuperscript{260} The federal government has been active in supporting training and employment opportunities for Aboriginal peoples. In its report \textit{In from the Margins: A Call to Action on Poverty, Housing and Homelessness}, the committee recommended enhancing this support and opening up new economic opportunities for Aboriginal Canadians. (See recommendation 67, Appendix B.1 of this report.)

\textit{Challenging Trends}

Though as a group we are increasingly well educated, Aboriginal peoples in Edmonton experience chronic unemployment, underemployment, and low incomes.\textsuperscript{261}

Demographic changes should paint a promising picture for the future growth of Aboriginal economic and business development, but this is a promise that has yet to be realized fully. As a rapidly growing and increasingly urban population, Aboriginal Canadians represent a potentially important group of future entrepreneurs and important labour source for business.\textsuperscript{262}

Over the past decade, improvements have been made in the levels of education, employment and income of Aboriginal peoples, and in many cases, the gap between the Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal population has been reduced. However, despite better economic fortunes for many Aboriginal Canadians, a number of disturbing economic trends have remained constant, including high levels of unemployment and persistent levels of low income.

Aboriginal peoples continue to have poorer labour market outcomes than non-Aboriginal Canadians. Employment rates improved for Aboriginal peoples between 2001 and 2006, but they still remained less likely than non-Aboriginal people to be employed.\textsuperscript{263} In 2006, the unemployment rate for Aboriginal peoples was 13.2\%, nearly three times that of the non-Aboriginal population (5.2\%). Further, much of the improvement in employment between 2001 and 2006 reflected gains among older Aboriginal Canadians, while those under 25 years
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continued to record high jobless rates. In the case of First Nations people, the unemployment rate for those under 25 years of age hovered at about 30% in 2006. In that same year, people of Aboriginal status living in census metropolitan areas had a median income of $22,100, much lower than the median income of non-Aboriginal people which stood at $28,900.

In 2009, First Nation communities were still, on average, the most disadvantaged social/cultural group in Canada on a host of measures including income, unemployment, health, education, child welfare, housing and other forms of infrastructure. In one analysis, Aboriginal people are shown to be under-represented in fields such as finance, insurance and real estate, and to have quite low participation rates in professional health occupations.

Aboriginal Canadians were hit harder and longer by the recession that began in 2008 than non-Aboriginal Canadians. Statistics Canada data, which include only Aboriginal people living off-reserve, show that Aboriginal Canadians aged 15 and older experienced a decline in employment of 3.5% in 2009, for a loss of 13,000 jobs. In 2010, employment among these Canadians fell by 3.7% representing a loss of 14,000 jobs.
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The committee notes with concern the high levels of unemployment among Aboriginal young people. Given their large and growing numbers and the potential contribution they could make in light of Canada’s aging workforce and skills shortages in certain areas, priority should be given, in any programs or initiatives designed to improve workforce participation, to their needs. The committee therefore recommends:

**RECOMMENDATION 21**

That the Government of Canada continue to place an emphasis, in all federal government employment programs or initiatives, on making sure that there are skills training and employment opportunities for Aboriginal youth.

*Private Sector Involvement*

Canadian businesses are experiencing skills shortages in certain sectors and have become increasingly engaged in efforts to encourage, mentor, and train Aboriginal Canadians to enter employment. The federal government frequently works in partnership with the private sector in this endeavor, an engagement that the committee supports. The committee recommends therefore:
RECOMMENDATION 22

That the Government of Canada continue to work with private sector partners to stimulate efforts to open up employment and skills training opportunities for Aboriginal youth in all sectors of the Canadian economy.

Barriers to Aboriginal Economic Inclusion

While the majority of Aboriginal businesses face the same challenges as any small or medium-sized business in Canada, many face additional and unique challenges as a result of their socio-economic circumstances and other factors.

One of the biggest challenges for Aboriginal businesses is obtaining the initial capital necessary to sustain a business enterprise. Insufficient education and training and difficult socio-economic conditions make it challenging for many Aboriginal peoples to acquire the necessary capital to amass resources and make investments in new technology. According to the Conference Board of Canada, the wealth disparity between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal populations in Canada, and the corresponding gap in the means to access capital, puts Aboriginal businesses at a disadvantage. Access to capital was also identified by national Aboriginal organizations as a major hurdle for Aboriginal people seeking greater economic engagement. Larry Cachene testified that “[t]he first problem we face is the financial resources we need to develop programming and support services.” Dwight Dorey echoed these comments, testifying that the Congress of Aboriginal Peoples (CAP) is examining the possibility of hiring economic development officers or workers within each of its provincial affiliate organizations. These officers would assist “off-reserve people in the major urban centres and help them access [...] capital, training, and mentoring.” The stumbling block to this plan is that CAP does not have “the resources to put them in place” and thus has turned to the federal government for resources needed to implement it. As noted in subsequent sections, the federal government and the private sector have been taking steps to facilitate better access to capital for Aboriginal entrepreneurs.
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Racism and Prejudice

There are many issues that together we must address and they are challenging issues. For us, these include sustained initiative aimed at dispelling the negative myths and stereotypes about Aboriginal peoples that prevent full inclusion and employment services and opportunities experienced by other citizens; a need for the continuous sharing of Aboriginal history with all Canadians through the rewriting of history books and embedding of Aboriginal history as a central part of our collective Canadian history. This can be accomplished by ensuring that stories and histories are shared that provide positive Aboriginal profile in such things as Aboriginal street names, public buildings and displays showing the history of our cities. This will help engender a sense of belonging and pride in our Aboriginal peoples. For non-Aboriginal peoples, it will educate and promote a culture of inclusion and opportunities for intercultural learning.

Leona Carter, Director, Aboriginal Relations Office
Community Services City of Edmonton
Evidence, 9 February 2012

Stereotyping and racism are significant challenges faced by Aboriginal entrepreneurs, as well as other members of the Aboriginal communities living in Canadian cities. A 2003 survey reported that 46% of off-reserve Aboriginal respondents felt that they had been a victim of racism or discrimination at least once over the previous two years. In addition, more than half of Canadian respondents to a 2002 Ipsos Reid survey reported that “racism separates Aboriginal peoples from the rest of society.” These findings were confirmed by the Environics Institute, which reported in 2010 that almost all Aboriginal Canadians living in cities agreed that non-Aboriginal people behave in an unfair or negative way towards Aboriginal peoples. The committee also heard that discrimination as a root cause for the higher incarceration rates of Aboriginal peoples relative to the non-Aboriginal people.

The existence of racism and discrimination acts as a barrier that discourages many Aboriginal entrepreneurs from learning from and engaging with their non-Aboriginal counterparts. Asked if racism, discrimination and stereotyping posed a problem for Aboriginal people seeking to become more fully engaged in the labour market and business development, Chief Dorey replied in the affirmative, adding that because of it, “our people have a tendency to
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keep among themselves.” He added “[t]here always continues to be some of our people who do fairly well at advancing and integrating [...] but it is a rare kind of quality.”

Stereotyping, prejudice and racism constitute formidable barriers to social and economic inclusion of Aboriginal peoples, including those who live in major urban centres. Leona Carter asserted that one important way in which these barriers can be reduced through the introduction of Aboriginal history in curricula at the primary level of instruction. The committee is therefore pleased to note that most provinces and territories have now incorporated Aboriginal histories and cultures into their educational curricula from kindergarten to grade 12. For example, in 2000, Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, the Northwest Territories, Saskatchewan, and Yukon developed a common approach to teaching Aboriginal languages and cultures in kindergarten to grade 12 and other provinces had adopted similar approaches.

**Initiatives to Increase Aboriginal Economic and Business Development**

Linkages made between the economic fortunes and the social well-being of Aboriginal Canadians have led to a proliferation of initiatives aimed at Aboriginal economic and business development. The federal government, through Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC) and Human Resources and Skills Development Canada (HRSDC), has undertaken several initiatives with the provinces and territories, and national Aboriginal organizations to increase the economic opportunities of Aboriginal peoples.

In 2009, the federal government launched the *Federal Framework for Aboriginal Economic Development* to encourage better integration of Aboriginal peoples into the Canadian labour market. This strategy focuses on engaging the private sector and the whole of government, including provinces and territories, in promoting economic development and self-sufficiency of Aboriginal communities. The five pillars of the Framework are: strengthening Aboriginal entrepreneurship on reserve and in the North; developing Aboriginal human capital by supporting demand-driven labour markets; enhancing the value of Aboriginal assets by aligning federal investments with economic opportunities; promoting Aboriginal partnerships with the provinces and private sector; and improving federal government effectiveness and efficiency with clearer direction, greater coordination and more linkages.
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Human Resources and Skills Development Canada (HRSDC) administers funding for a number of labour market programs addressed toward Aboriginal skills development and training. These programs include:

a) The Aboriginal Skills and Training Strategic Investment Fund (ASTSIF). In 2009, the federal government invested $75 million over two years to support Aboriginal people in gaining the skills needed for the labour market. The Fund also supports investments in training for individuals who face barriers to employment, such as low literacy and a lack of essential skills.\(^\text{280}\)

b) The Aboriginal Skills and Employment Partnership (ASEP) program. ASEP was a nationally managed and project-based program that promoted increased participation of Aboriginal people in major economic industries. The program supported multi-year training strategies developed by Aboriginal organizations and industry employers. As part of the 2009 Economic Action Plan, the federal government invested an additional $100 million over three years in ASEP. On 31 March 2012, the Program ended, and its successful elements were added to the Aboriginal Skills and Employment Training Strategy (ASETS) and the Skills and Partnership Fund (see below).\(^\text{281}\)

c) The Aboriginal Skills and Employment and Training Strategy (ASETS) program is a five-year strategy that focuses on three priorities: supporting demand-driven skills development, fostering partnerships with the private sector and the provinces and territories, and placing emphasis on accountability and results.\(^\text{282}\) The Vice-President of the Métis National Council, David Chartrand, called ASETS “one of Canada’s best programs,” saying that “it has worked wonders”\(^\text{283}\) and

d) The Skills and Partnership Fund – Aboriginal (SPF). SPF supports federal and provincial/territorial priorities by funding projects that contribute to the development of skills and training of Aboriginal workers. The Fund was created in July 2010 and given an investment of $210 million over five years. SPF is designed to complement the Aboriginal Skills and Employment Training Strategy (ASETS).\(^\text{284}\)

---


\(^\text{283}\) Evidence, 2 March 2011, David Chartrand.

Private sector organizations and municipalities are also deeply involved in Aboriginal economic and business development. Examples include:

a) The Canadian Council for Aboriginal Business (CCAB) delivers programs intended to facilitate the growth of Aboriginal business and connect Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal entrepreneurs. The CCAB was created on the initiative of Murray Koffler, founder of Shoppers Drug Mart and co-founder of Four Seasons Hotels and Resorts, who brought together Aboriginal leaders, members of the business community, and government representatives in 1984 to seek out ways to bolster Aboriginal business activity;  

b) Business Development Canada (BDC) administers the Aboriginal Business Development Fund. The Fund provides access to capital for Aboriginal entrepreneurs who would not normally qualify for a loan and administers a management training and mentorship program. BDC has allocated $1 million for 4 Aboriginal Development Funds (ABDFs). Funds are provided at the local level in repayable loans ranging from $5,000 to $20,000; and 

c) In 2007, the City of Edmonton, and the governments of Alberta and Canada entered into an Aboriginal Workforce Participation Initiative. As part of the initiative, all parties agreed to develop and support practices that resulted in the recruitment of Aboriginal staff; facilitated training opportunities focused on Aboriginal cultural competence for City staff; linked the Aboriginal labour force to employment opportunities; and promoted career development opportunities for Aboriginal employees. 

These programs have a common goal to provide skills and training to Aboriginal Canadians so that they can enter the labour market as employees. These efforts are important but should be complemented by programs that develop entrepreneurial skills so that Aboriginal Canadians can start and expand enterprises of their own. The committee recommends therefore

RECOMMENDATION 23

That the Government of Canada, along with provincial/territorial governments, place additional emphasis on working with national Aboriginal organizations to support the development of Aboriginal entrepreneurs, with a focus on new and

---

existing Aboriginal businesses through such activities as business assessments, business and marketing plans, and mentoring for business owners; and

That the Government of Canada, in partnership with national Aboriginal organizations, place additional emphasis on developing Aboriginal human capital, through such measures as arranging full access for Aboriginal peoples for skills development and training specific to their businesses, and the provision of business skills training that would assist Aboriginal entrepreneurs to own and manage a successful business.

The Aboriginal Affairs Working Group (AAWG)

In 2009, provincial premiers and representatives of national Aboriginal organizations met prior to the meeting of the Council of the Federation to discuss how to address issues confronting Aboriginal Canadians. Following this meeting, the premiers directed their ministers responsible for Aboriginal affairs to form a working group. Subsequently, the Aboriginal Affairs Working Group (AAWG) held its first meeting in Toronto, in October 2009. The AAWG has chosen, as its three key goals:

1. increasing the graduation rates for Aboriginal students;
2. supporting economic development in Aboriginal communities; and
3. taking action to end violence against Aboriginal women and girls.

Chief Dorey referred to a document adopted by the AAWG on 28 April 2010 entitled A Framework for Action in Education, Economic Development and Violence Against Women and Girls. He cited one of the three goals that were highlighted in the document and that the premiers directed the Aboriginal Affairs Working Group to explore: regional opportunities related to infrastructure, micro financing and resource revenue sharing, as well as sharing of economic development best practices. Chief Dorey also testified that members of the Working Group have acknowledged that federal participation in the Group would be desirable.

However, Jerry Peltier, the National Advisor to the Congress of Aboriginal Peoples, testified that the federal government has not been participating in the AAWG.

A horizontal initiative, the Strategic Partnerships Initiative (SPI) led by Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada, began in June 2010 and “builds partnerships among federal

---

288 The national Aboriginal organizations included Assembly of First Nations, Métis National Council, Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, Congress of Aboriginal Peoples and the Native Women’s Association of Canada.
291 Evidence, 9 February 2012, Dwight Dorey.
292 Evidence, 9 February 2012, Jerry Peltier.
departments, Aboriginal communities, provincial and territorial governments and the private sector.” The SPI brings together officials with the goal of assisting to Aboriginal people “take advantage of complex market-driven opportunities in key sectors of the economy,” principally in forestry, fisheries, mining, energy and agriculture. There is, however, a need for higher level consideration of broader issues affecting Aboriginal Canadians.

The Aboriginal Affairs Working Group constitutes a useful forum for the discussion at the ministerial level of the broad range of needs and interests of Aboriginal Canadians. As such, it is desirable that the Government of Canada participate in this forum. The committee therefore recommends:

**RECOMMENDATION 24**

That the Government of Canada explore, with provincial and territorial governments, its involvement in the Aboriginal Affairs Working Group.

*Service Providers: Federal Government Involvement*

As mentioned, it is unclear which level of government has responsibility to provide services to Aboriginal peoples living in cities. Nevertheless, the federal government does provide services under the Urban Aboriginal Strategy (UAS) administered and coordinated by Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada.

In addition to the services delivered under the Urban Aboriginal Strategy, there are a number of other services offered to support urban Aboriginal people by federal government departments, including the following initiatives by Health Canada and Public Health Agency of Canada:

1. The First Nations and Inuit Health Branch at Health Canada provide a health benefits program (Non-Insured Health Benefits Program) for First Nations people and Inuit, including those who live in cities. The Plan covers the costs of medical services not covered by provincial and territorial health care plans, or by private insurance plans.
2. Health Canada also administers the Aboriginal Diabetes Initiative which covers Aboriginal people living in cities as well as on rural reserves. In 2010, the Government of Canada committed $275 million over five years (2010-2015) for the third phase of the Initiative. In addition, the Department has created a version of

---


the Canada Food Guide specifically tailored to the needs of First Nations, Métis, and Inuit Canadians which it makes available in four Aboriginal languages and distributes to Aboriginal peoples living in cities as well as on reserves.  

3. The Public Health Agency of Canada delivers a community-based program – the Aboriginal Head Start in Urban and Northern Communities (AHSUNC) program – that focuses on early childhood development for First Nations, Inuit and Métis children living off-reserve. While the program falls under the umbrella of the Urban Aboriginal Strategy,

AHSUNC is locally controlled and designed. Each year, it supports more than 4,800 Aboriginal children in 129 sites in urban and northern communities and deals with issues such as childhood obesity, mental health problems and children with special needs. AHSUNC sites provide structured half-day preschool experiences for Aboriginal children focused on six program components: Aboriginal culture and language, education and school readiness, health promotion, nutrition, social support, and parental involvement. Begun in 1995, the program received five-year funding (2010–2015).

Aboriginal Friendship Centres

The most significant efforts to build social and economic inclusion for urban Aboriginal people and to ease the transition from rural to urban living are being taken by Aboriginal peoples themselves in the form of Aboriginal Friendship Centres.

The first Aboriginal Friendship Centre opened its doors in Toronto in 1951. In the 62 years since, 119 Friendship Centres serving First Nations, Métis, and Inuit in urban centres have been established across Canada. As such, they are the largest off-reserve Aboriginal infrastructure in Canada, providing services in the areas of housing, education, human resource development and employment, youth and family, health, recreation, and culture. Collectively, local Friendship Centres and seven Provincial/Territorial Associations belong to the National Association of Friendship Centres (NAFC) whose mission is to improve the quality of life for Aboriginal peoples in an urban environment.

The NAFC estimates that on average, it costs approximately $300,000 annually to operate a Friendship Centre. The federal government, through Aboriginal Affairs and Northern

---

Development Canada \textsuperscript{300} and its Aboriginal Friendship Centre Program (AFCP), provides core funding to support Aboriginal Friendship Centres. This funding is used to pay for basic staff and operations. Additional staff are hired to work on programs funded by the provincial and federal governments. Friendship Centres must apply to the National Association of Friendship Centres which took over responsibility from Canadian Heritage in 1996 for allocating the funds. The NAFC indicates that it allocates approximately $130,000 of core funding each to the majority of Centres and that the Centres must find additional funding from other sources to cover their full operating costs. \textsuperscript{301}

In addition to the AFCP, the National Association of Friendship Centres also administers and delivers other programs including Cultural Connections for Aboriginal Youth (CCAY) and the Aboriginal component of the Young Canada Works Program. The NAFC has an Aboriginal Youth Council (AYC) that identifies youth priority issues, including: stay in school initiatives; healing and wellness; suicide; preserving culture and heritage; cross cultural awareness; homelessness; youth leadership; employment and training; youth involvement at all levels of the Friendship Centre Movement; and more specifically, youth involvement in decision-making processes.

The NAFC asserts that federal funding has not changed from 1996 levels of $16 million annually. NAFC indicates that as a result of inflation, technological change, and a growing population of urban Aboriginal people, combined with frozen funding levels, the capacity of Friendship Centres to adequately serve their clientele will be compromised.

Mr. Cyr told the committee that more programs and funding are needed to support direct urban-based services for employment and training; more Aboriginal awareness; more Aboriginal content in school curriculums; and more programming to improve literacy and education for Aboriginal peoples. \textsuperscript{302}

Friendship Centres provide vital services to the growing number of Aboriginal Canadians moving to and living in Canada’s cities. Managed and directed by Aboriginal Canadians, the Centres facilitate and build self-sufficiency. Financial self-sufficiency and autonomy are built through raising and leveraging funds to support core operations. Nevertheless, the federal government retains a principal role in the provision of core funding for the Centres. However, funding levels have been fixed for 16 years in the face of inflation, growing urban Aboriginal populations, and expansion of the number of Friendship Centres. The committee believes that core funding levels should be reconsidered and recommends:

\textsuperscript{300} Prior to 2012, the Aboriginal Friendship Centre Program was funded by the Department of Canadian Heritage. 
\textsuperscript{301} National Association of Friendship Centres, “Friendship Centres call upon the Government of Canada for an increase to current AFCP core funding.” \textit{Press Releases}, 22 November 2010.  
\textsuperscript{302} \textit{Evidence}, 9 February 2012, Jeffrey Cyr.
RECOMMENDATION 25

That the Government of Canada review core funding under the Aboriginal Friendship Centre Program and, where warranted, adjust funding to appropriate levels.
CHAPTER SEVEN: CANADIANS WITH DISABILITIES

An inclusive and accessible Canada is where Canadians with disabilities – children, youth, working-age adults, and seniors – have the necessary support to fully access and benefit from all that Canada has to offer. Independent living principles of choice, consumer control, and autonomy are made real. Canadians with disabilities have safe, adequate, accessible housing within their communities and live free from residential institutions and their confinements. Canadians with disabilities have income, aids and devices, personal supports, medications, environmental accommodations that make social, cultural and political citizenship accessible and inclusive to all. Women with disabilities, Aboriginal people with disabilities, persons with disabilities from visible minority communities, and those from other marginalized communities should have equal access and benefits from Canadian society. Canadians with invisible disabilities, chronic illness, episodic disabilities, or environmental sensitivity, and living in remote or rural areas, are equally able to access benefits from Canadian society. People with disabilities should be able to contribute to and benefit from Canadian society in the same way as other citizens. This is our Canada. It is just the quality of citizenship and wanting that.

Tony Dolan, Chairperson, Council of Canadians with Disabilities, Evidence, 7 March 2012

INTRODUCTION

According to Statistics Canada, in 2006, an estimated 4.4 million Canadians – or one out of every seven people – reported having a disability. This represented an increase since 2001 when the last survey (Participation and Activity Limitation Survey or PALS) was conducted by Statistics Canada. Thus, the number of people reporting a disability increased by more than three-quarters of a million or by 21.2% over five years. Statistics Canada indicated that significant changes in way that society perceives disability may have played a role making Canadians more willing to report having a disability. 303 While in 2001 12.4% of the population reported a disability; by 2006 this rate had risen to 14.3%. Of those aged 15 and older reporting a disability in 2006, 35.4% had mild limitations, 24.8% reported moderate limitations, and 39.8% had severe to very severe limitations.

Among seniors aged 65 and older, mobility limitations were the most common. An aging population accounted for only a portion of the increase in reported disabilities; As Canada’s population ages, however, the proportion of Canadians experiencing disabilities is likely to grow.

---

Even though, as the Chairperson of the Canadian Council of Persons with Disabilities, Tony Dolan, told the committee, Canadians with disabilities “have come a long way in employment,” people with disabilities are still overrepresented among Canada’s low-income population. As Mr. Dolan stated, citing data from Statistics Canada’s 2006 Participation and Activity Limitation Survey, “almost half a million people, 20.5% of working-age adults between 15 and 64 with disabilities lived on a low income. People of working age with disabilities are about twice as likely as their counterparts without disabilities to live on a low income.” Mr. Dolan added that “the incidence [of low income] among Aboriginal people with disabilities is even higher.” In light of the significant financial challenges faced by Canadians coping with severe disabilities, the committee called for enhanced support for these Canadians in recommendations 53 and 54 of its report In From the Margins. These recommendations can be found at Appendix B.I of this report.

In 2010, Human Resources and Skills Development Canada (HRSDC) reported that the average income among working age disabled Canadians was $29,393 compared to an average of $37,994 for adults without disabilities, or 22.5% lower. When income from all sources was accounted for, disabled adult Canadians had lower household incomes than their non-disabled counterparts ($64,565 vs. $89,480). Close to 10% (9.9%) lived in houses that were in need of major repair (or “inadequate” housing) while just over 6% of adults without disabilities did.

Canadian cities are faced with the challenge of fostering greater inclusion for their citizens with disabilities, a challenge that will grow as the Canadian population ages. Measures that are taken often coincide with efforts to make cities more age-friendly (see Chapter 8 on Senior and Youth). Alain Mercier of the Canadian Urban Transit Association, made reference to this when he told the committee that “[o]ne of the greatest challenges across Canadian cities today is how to provide specialized mobility for those who do not have the ability to leave their homes or walk more than five or ten feet.”
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306 Evidence, 8 March 2012, Tony Dolan. In 2006, PALS reported a total of 4,215,530 Canadians 15 and over as having a disability. Of these, 2,457,940 were between the ages of 15 and 64.
307 Ibid.
309 Ibid., p. 11.
310 Ibid., p. 12.
311 Evidence, 15 February 2012, Alain Mercier.
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT

In Budget 2007, the Government of Canada announced the introduction of the Registered Disability Savings Plan (RDSP) which was subsequently implemented in December 2008. Vangelis Nikias, Project Manager with the Council of Canadians with Disabilities, told the committee that the RDSP is a “great step forward because it does provide possibilities for improving financial security for many members” of the disability community.312

Since its introduction, close to 55,000 RDSPs have been opened. Contributions from beneficiaries and their families have amounted to over $220 million. For its part, the federal government has contributed approximately $450 million through Canada Disability Savings Grants and Canada Disability Savings Bonds. In its 2011 Budget, the Government of Canada indicated that it would conduct a review of the RDSP program that year, a review that was subsequently launched in October 2011. In its Budget tabled on 29 March 2012, the Government proposed several changes to the RDSP, including the provision of greater access to RDSP savings for small withdrawals and giving enhanced flexibility for parents who save in Registered Education Savings Plans (RESPs) for children with disabilities by allowing the transfer of investment income earned in RESPs to an RESP beneficiary’s RDSP on a tax-free basis.313

Also in Budget 2012, the Government announced the creation of a panel on the labour market opportunities for persons with disabilities. The panel was given the task of identifying successes and best practices achieved by private sector employers in facilitating the participation of disabled Canadians. The panel’s report was reviewed by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development Canada by the end of 2012, and released in January 2013.314

Bilateral Labour Market Agreements

The Government of Canada has bilateral Labour Market Agreements with each of the provinces and territories to assist Canadians in finding work and to develop a skilled labour force. Similarly, the federal government has bilateral cost-shared agreements – Labour Market Agreements for Persons with Disabilities (LMAPD) – with all provinces except Québec. LMAPDs are based on a Multilateral Framework for Labour Market Agreements for Persons

312 Evidence, 7 March 2012, Vangelis Nikias.
with Disabilities. Each year, the federal government transfers approximately $218 million to the provinces to implement the agreements.

Witnesses from the Council of Canadians with Disabilities recommended the following with regard to Labour Market Agreements:

- Expand the Multilateral Framework for Labour Market Agreements for Persons with Disabilities to provide greater capacity at the provincial and territorial levels to address barriers to employment;
- That the Government of Canada work collaboratively with all levels of government on labour market strategies and broad social policy initiatives to address the needs of persons with disabilities; and
- Establish specific targets for Canadians with disabilities in labour force development agreements negotiated with the provinces.

**Disability Tax Credit**

The federal government provides a non-refundable income tax credit (Disability Tax Credit, or DTC) for Canadians with disabilities, given they face unavoidable, additional expenses that are not borne by non-disabled Canadians. Under the terms of the DTC, recipients must have a taxable income and must meet an eligibility test to determine that they have a prolonged impairment (at least 12 continuous months) that restricts the basic activities of daily life.

Representatives of the Council of Canadians with Disabilities called for the conversion of the Disability Tax Credit to a refundable tax credit. Mr. Nikias stated that such a conversion “is probably the first thing that the federal government can do.”

In 2010, the Caledon Institute of Social Policy proposed that the Disability Tax Credit be made refundable for all persons between the ages of 18 and 65 with severe or very severe disabilities. Qualifying persons would receive $2,000 annually either as an income tax credit for those earning a taxable income or as a cash payment for those of low or no income. Provincial disability tax credits would be eliminated giving the provinces an estimated additional revenue of $100 million annually. Caledon calculated that the total cost to the federal

---
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government would be approximately $1.9 billion. The authors estimated that current federal costs, including transferred claims were roughly $450 million, so that the net cost of refundability would be approximately $1.45 billion.

The committee concurs that the federal government should consider making the Disability Tax Credit refundable to assist working age Canadians with severe disabilities to meet additional expenses, and made that recommendation in its report, In from the Margins. (See Appendix B.I, recommendation 52)

Opportunities Fund for Persons with Disabilities

The Opportunities Fund for Persons with Disabilities (administered by Human Resources and Skills Development Canada, HRSDC) provides funding for projects that are delivered by third parties and are designed to increase labour market participation for persons with disabilities. Businesses, organizations, individuals with disabilities, public health and educational institutions, band or tribal councils, and municipal governments can apply for funding. Witnesses from the Council of Canadians with Disabilities called upon the federal government to strengthen the accountability (reporting) requirements for the Opportunities Fund for Persons with Disabilities.

In 2008, HRSDC completed an evaluation of the Fund that covered the period 2004-2005. Evaluations, however, do not occur at regular intervals, thus do not satisfy the need for ongoing scrutiny. In its annual Departmental Performance Reports, HRSDC groups together its employment programs for Canadians underrepresented in the labour force. As a result there is no separate reporting on the outcomes achieved by the Fund, or resources allocated to it. In its Federal Disability Report, HRSDC provides a wealth of data on the labour force participation of disabled Canadians, but no mention of the results achieved by its programs (such as the Opportunities Fund) to stimulate that participation. Parliament and Canadians should know about the outcomes achieved by the Fund. The committee recommends therefore:

RECOMMENDATION 26

That Human Resources and Skills Development Canada provide information on the resources allocated to, and the outcomes achieved by, the Opportunities Fund for Persons with Disabilities in its annual Departmental Performance Reports tabled in Parliament.

324 Evidence, 8 March 2012, Tony Dolan.
The Council of Canadians with Disabilities also called on the federal government to expand the Fund to provide greater capacity at the provincial and territorial levels to address barriers to employment.\footnote{Evidence, 7 March 2012, Tony Dolan}

**UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities**

In March 2010, the Government of Canada ratified the United Nations *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*\footnote{United Nations, *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*, \url{http://www.un.org/disabilities/convention/conventionfull.shtml}} intended to protect the rights and dignity of persons with disabilities. As a party to the Convention, Canada is required to promote, protect and ensure the full enjoyment of human rights by Canadians with disabilities, and to ensure that they have full equality under the law. The Convention contains an Article (no. 33) that requires ratifying parties to establish an independent mechanism to ‘promote, protect and monitor implementation’ of the Convention. It specifies that persons with disabilities and their representative organizations should be actively involved in the monitoring process (33.3).

Monitoring of Canada’s compliance with the terms of the Convention is needed to confirm that Canada is meeting its obligations and to provide Canadians with the assurance that the rights of persons with disabilities are being fully protected. The committee recommends therefore:

**RECOMMENDATION 27**

That the Government of Canada, with provincial and territorial partners, monitor implementation of UN *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*. Monitoring should include the active involvement of Canadians with disabilities and organizations that represent them, as specified in Article 33.3 of the Convention.

**EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR CANADIANS WITH DISABILITIES**

**The Federal Government**

As noted above, Canada’s *Public Service Employment Act*\footnote{Department of Justice, *Public Service Employment Act*, \url{http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/P-33.01/}} identifies representativeness and diversity as being integral to the composition of the federal public service and names four groups (as defined in the *Employment Equity Act*) whose representation in the public service must be taken into account in terms of hiring and retention. Those designated groups are women, aboriginal peoples, persons with disabilities, and members of visible minorities.\footnote{Department of Justice, *Employment Equity Act*, Section 3, \url{http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/e-5.401/index.html}}

A 2011 report by the Treasury Board Secretariat indicated that the representation of the four designated groups including persons with disabilities had increased moderately since 2006.
and that all groups continued to exceed their workforce availability.\textsuperscript{330} A review conducted that same year by the Public Service Commission found that over the previous 10 years, the representation of persons with disabilities in the federal public service had exceeded their workforce availability.\textsuperscript{331} However, the review noted that employees with disabilities tended to be older and closer to retirement.\textsuperscript{332} The report indicated that the rate of departure from the public service of persons with disabilities was double their hiring rate for several years, which could have implications for the future representation of Canadians with disabilities within the core public service.\textsuperscript{333} In its annual report to Parliament for 2010-2011, the Commission reported that while other designated groups were appointed to the public service at a proportion exceeding their respective workforce availability, this was not the case for persons with disabilities.\textsuperscript{334}

The committee applauds the Government of Canada’s ongoing efforts to create a workforce that is representative of the Canadian people with particular attention to disadvantaged groups. As Canada’s largest single employer, the federal public service plays an important role, not only in ensuring that designated groups are hired in proportion to their workforce availability, but in setting an example for other Canadian employers. In recommendation 13 of this report, the committee recommends that the federal government continue its efforts to hire and retain people with disabilities, women, visible minorities and Aboriginal peoples in proportion to their workforce availability.

\textit{Private Sector Employers}

While the \textit{Employment Equity Act} applies to federally regulated private sector employers, one witness called for incentives to encourage the hiring and retention of Canadians with disabilities in workplaces outside the federal public service.\textsuperscript{335}

The committee favors the use of incentives for the purpose of increasing employment for Canadians with disabilities and recommends:

\textbf{RECOMMENDATION 28}

That the Government of Canada, in partnership with provincial and territorial governments, continue to identify and implement measures designed to assist Canadians with disabilities to enter the labour market.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{330} Treasury Board Secretariat, \textit{Demographic Snapshot of the Federal Public Service, 2011}, \url{http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/res/stats/demo11-eng.asp}
\item \textsuperscript{331} Public Service Commission of Canada, \textit{Recruitment of Persons with Disabilities: A Literature Review}, May 2011, p. 5. \url{http://www.psc-cfp.gc.ca/plcy-pltq/ead-eeed/rprt/pwd-ph/index-eng.htm#toc17}
\item \textsuperscript{332} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 7.
\item \textsuperscript{333} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 12.
\item \textsuperscript{334} Public Service Commission of Canada, \textit{2010-2011 Annual Report}, Chapter 3, paragraph 3.63, \url{http://www.psc-cfp.gc.ca/arp-rpa/2011/chapter3-chapitre3-eng.htm#ch3anc1}
\item \textsuperscript{335} Evidence, 2 May 2012, Charles Beach.
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CHAPTER EIGHT: YOUTH AND SENIORS

In dealing with youth, particularly marginalized youth, we need to break away from the systemic silos within which youth services and programs are being delivered. Many sectors affect young people’s lives, but rarely do they work together or with them in a strength-based approach.

Kristopher Wells, Researcher, Institute for Sexual Minority Studies and Services, University of Alberta, Evidence, 17 February 2011

YOUTH

According to Statistics Canada, Canadian youth (defined as people aged 24 and younger) have been a declining proportion of Canada’s population for the past 40 years. In 1971, young people (including children as well as those 15 to 24 years of age) comprised 48.1% of the population; by 2010 that percentage had fallen to 29.9%. As of 1 July 2010, there were approximately 4.4 million Canadians between the ages of 15 and 24.

Despite their declining proportion of the population, Canadian youth are increasingly diverse. In addition, they experience higher levels of unemployment and underemployment than the national average and tend to be particularly affected by economic downturns.

Youth and Social Inclusion

We say that youth need at least one trusted adult in their lives that they can turn to; hopefully they have a lot more supports. Having one person they can reach out to when they are having a difficult time, or if they are feeling alone or isolated, can make a world of difference. That person needs to be accepting, inclusive and nonjudgmental.


---

338 Ibid., p. 6.
339 Recent research by the Certified General Accountants Association of Canada, however, has found that youth employment has experienced a better recovery following the 2008 recession than after previous recessions. Certified General Accountants Association of Canada, Youth Unemployment in Canada: Challenging Conventional Thinking? October 2012, p. 20. http://ppm.cga-canada.org/en-ca/Documents/ca_rep_2012-10_youthunemployment.pdf
Natasha Blanchet-Cohen, Assistant Professor with the International Institute for Child Rights and Development, spoke of how to address the exclusion of youth. She indicated that “[a]t the centre, it is about bringing forth youth voice, energy and insight and recognizing that young people can play a critical role in strengthening the social fabric of Canadian society.” But, she pointed out, youth “also need to be given opportunities to carry out their potential.”

Ms. Blanchet-Cohen described the inclusion strategy for youth that was part of YouthScape, a project that was conceived and funded over a four-year period by the J.W. McConnell Family Foundation. Organizations in five communities – the United Way in Thunder Bay, Child and Youth Friendly in Calgary (now Youth Central), the HeartWood Centre for Community Youth Development in Halifax, Boscoville 2000 in Rivière-des-Prairies, and Youthcore in Victoria – were involved.

YouthScape’s vision was about “imagining how marginalized and diverse youth are problem solvers instead of problems,” and sought to create a society in which “engagement of youth is an automatic reflex.” Ms. Blanchet-Cohen identified several lessons that can be drawn from the YouthScape initiative. The first is that reliance on a single method of fostering youth involvement will not work. As she indicated,

[t]here is a need to support a broad range of approaches to engage youth. It is not enough just to think of involving youth on boards; we need to provide them with meaningful opportunities to carry out their ideas.

This will require innovation combined with trust. In the case of the YouthScape initiative, innovation involved “giving money to youth so that they [could] realize their ideas and projects.” This approach, seemingly risky, produced good results.

Recommendations

Ms. Blanchet-Cohen offered a number of recommendations aimed at bringing youth in from the margins and encouraging them to become involved in their communities. Akin to other witnesses, she emphasized a requirement for cross-sector collaboration. She pointed to the need to break away from systemic silos within which youth services and programs are delivered, noting that “[m]any sectors affect young people’s lives, but rarely do they work together or with
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them in a strength-based approach." She also called for support for social entrepreneurship and the provision of youth grants aimed at community development.

There is a variety of federal government programs that are available for youth who are unemployed, Aboriginal, disabled or newcomers. Because it is important that youth have access to this information in a format that is readily accessible to them, the committee recommends:

**RECOMMENDATION 29**

That the Government of Canada use youth-friendly language in materials intended to inform the public and enhance the use of social media for that purpose.

Furthermore, the committee is aware that even as Canada emerges from recession, many young Canadians are faced with a difficult transition from the classroom to a work environment. Because it is vital that these young people make informed decisions about future career and education choices, the committee recommends:

**RECOMMENDATION 30**

That the Government of Canada work with the provinces and territories to support school-to-work transition programs that increase opportunities in training, co-op, apprenticeship and education programs, and that increase labour mobility to enter the workforce, and also consider tax incentives for companies that hire and invest in young Canadians.

It should be noted that in its report *In From the Margins*, the committee called for measures that would reduce drop-out rates among disadvantaged youth (recommendations 17 and 18, Appendix B.I of this report) and recommended that post-secondary student aid programs be monitored (recommendation 20, Appendix B.I of this report).

**SENIORS**

For most of Canada’s history, seniors (women and men 65 years of age and older) have made up a relatively small proportion of the population. This has changed; Canada now has a “greying population”. Beginning in 1981, the numbers of seniors began to grow so that by 2005,

---

347 Information on federal government services for youth can be found at Youth Canada, [www.youth.gc.ca](http://www.youth.gc.ca).
348 In the 1920s and 1930s, seniors made up approximately 5% of the population. In the 1950s, less than 8% of the population was comprised of those 65 years of age and older. This proportion grew markedly from 1981 to 2005, as the number of seniors increased from 2.4 million to 4.2 million and their share of the population went from 9.6% to 13.1%. Statistics Canada, *A Portrait of Seniors in Canada*, 2006, 2007, Catalogue no. 89-519-XIE, pp. 11–12. [http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-519-x/89-519-x2006001-eng.pdf](http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-519-x/89-519-x2006001-eng.pdf)
they made up 131% of the population. On 1 July 2010, there were 4.8 million Canadian seniors, or 14% of the population.

In 2011, the first baby boomers (Canada’s largest birth cohort, born between 1946 and 1965) began to turn 65, representing the beginning of a rapid expansion of Canada’s senior population. Statistics Canada has projected that between 2005 and 2036, the number of Canadian seniors will increase from 4.2 million to 9.8 million and their share of the population from 13.2% to 24.5%. By as early as 2015, the proportion of seniors will exceed the proportion of youth in the Canadian population.

Canada’s seniors are diverse, with significant numbers belonging to groups that are vulnerable to exclusion. Statistics Canada reports that the proportion of seniors belonging to a visible minority grew from 2.3% in 1981 to 7.2% in 2001. In 2005, 52% of Canadian seniors between the ages of 65 and 69 were women; due to the shorter life expectancy of men, almost 75% among those 90 years of age and older were women.

Seniors and Poverty

Social inclusion of seniors is affected by their levels of income and health status. In 2006, Statistics Canada reported that the financial situation of Canadian seniors had been steadily improving over the previous 25 years. In particular, lower income seniors had experienced rising income levels, due in part to the maturation of Canada and Quebec Pension Plans (CPP/QPP) as well as expanded coverage from private pension plans.

At the same time, after years of decline followed by relative stability, the proportion of seniors working beyond the standard retirement age of 65 has begun to increase.

After years of improvement in the economic status of Canadian seniors, poverty among seniors has become of growing concern, particularly in the aftermath of the 2008 recession. The Conference Board of Canada has reported that after 20 years during which low-income rates in seniors had declined, these rates began to rise again between the 1990s and the mid-2000s. Peter Cook, President of Seniors for Seniors told the committee that “many thousands of seniors are approaching the end of their lives in poverty, and it is [...] sad to hear.” In its In From the
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352 *Ibid.*, p. 13. As the gap in life expectancy between men and women narrows, the gender composition of Canadian seniors is expected to become more balanced in the future.
Margins report, this committee recognized the important contribution that the CPP/QPP, OAS (Old Age Security) and GIS (Guaranteed Income Supplement) have made to reducing poverty among seniors and called for an increase in the Guaranteed Income Supplement for low-income seniors to lift them out of poverty. (See Appendix B.I, recommendation 33).

Seniors in Urban Centres

Seniors have become concentrated in urban centres while their presence in rural areas and small cities and towns is declining. Between 1981 and 2001, the proportion of seniors living in census metropolitan areas grew from 53.8% to 60.7%. In 2006, in the three largest urban centres – Toronto, Vancouver and Montréal – seniors made up 11.1%, 12.1% and 13% of the population respectively. Collectively, almost one-third of Canadian seniors (31.6%) live in one of these three cities. The demographic change receives considerable attention focused primarily on the strain some believe will be placed on housing, transportation, health and community-support services.

In 2007, the World Health Organization (WHO) developed Global Age-friendly Cities: A Guide to help assess the age-friendliness of cities. According to the WHO, an age-friendly city is one that optimizes its opportunities for health, participation and security, and that adapts its structures and services to the varying needs and capacities of older citizens.

Of the 33 cities involved in the WHO Age-Friendly Initiative, four were located in Canada: Saanich, British Columbia; Portage La Prairie, Manitoba; Sherbrooke, Québec; and Halifax, Nova Scotia. Working with municipalities abroad, these cities used the WHO guide to identify key elements needed to ensure that they are supporting healthy aging.

From a national perspective, working through the Public Health Agency of Canada, the federal government supports the Age-Friendly Communities Initiative. The purpose of the Initiative is to make communities better, healthier and safer places for seniors to live. Included among its goals are ensuring that public and private transportation is accessible, that streets and buildings are hazard-free, and that there are opportunities for seniors to participate in civic, cultural, and employment and volunteer activities in their communities.
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Elder Abuse Awareness

According to the Department of Justice, in 2009 police reported that close to 7,900 seniors were victims of violent crime. Thirty five per cent of these crimes were committed by a family member, 35% were committed by a friend, and 29% were committed by a stranger. The federal government has responded to concerns about elder abuse (which may involve mistreatment, physical or verbal abuse, or neglect). In the June 2011 Speech from the Throne, the Government announced that it would impose tougher sentences on those found guilty of senior abuse. Subsequently, the federal government introduced legislation to amend the Criminal Code to take into account elder abuse as an aggravating factor for sentencing purposes.\textsuperscript{363} This legislation received Royal Assent on 14 December 2012.

The federal government had also launched a campaign coordinated by the Ministry of State for Seniors to raise awareness of elder abuse. Peter Cook testified that the elder abuse awareness program “is a good campaign,” but expressed concerns that “if you are an isolated senior, you do not become aware of the issues.”\textsuperscript{364} Results of the 2011 Census show that most seniors (92.1%) aged 65 and over lived in private households while 7.9% lived in nursing homes or residents for senior citizens.\textsuperscript{365} These data suggest that it may be challenging to reach independent seniors with needed program information. The committee takes note of Mr. Cook’s observation, and recommends:

**RECOMMENDATION 31**

*That as part of its efforts to raise public awareness about elder abuse, the Government of Canada devote particular attention to reaching seniors who are living independently or in isolation.*

The New Horizons for Seniors Program

In 2004, the federal government launched the New Horizons for Seniors Program that funds projects led by seniors (or inspired by them) to encourage seniors to volunteer in their communities. The Program supports projects that are designed to improve seniors’ facilities and to increase awareness of elder abuse.\textsuperscript{366} Non-profit organizations, community-based coalitions, municipal governments, band and tribal councils, and research and educational institutions are among those who can apply for project funding. In 2012-2013, Human Resources and Skills Development Canada plans, on the basis of commitments made in the 2011 Speech from the


\textsuperscript{364} Evidence, 8 March 2012, Peter Cook.


Throne, to focus on providing enhanced funding for the New Horizons for Seniors Program. The Program will continue to support projects that engage seniors in sharing their knowledge, experience, and expertise. For example, the federal government has provided $675,000 in funding to the Registered Nurses’ Association to create and disseminate a best-practices guideline on elder abuse awareness for nurses across Canada.

Mr. Cook noted, “The health of too many seniors needlessly deteriorates in a system that relies too much on hospitals and not enough on community.”

Mr. Cook offered recommendations to address the exclusion of Canadian seniors and help them maintain an independent, autonomous life style. These included the reduction of funding for institutionalization and reallocating the funding to help seniors remain in their homes. As Mr. Cook indicated, Canada should “…take the money out of hospitals, out of institutions and put it in home care.” In recommendation 19 of its report Time for Transformative Change: A Review of the 2004 Health Accord, the committee called on the federal and provincial/territorial governments to take steps to integrate continuing home care fully within health-care systems. (See Appendix B.III)

In his written submission, Mr. Cook called for more public education and public service campaigns that “emphasize that to be a senior is not a detriment but rather an honor.” Along with other witnesses, Mr. Cook advocated the elimination of silos that separate the panoply of government programs and services for seniors. He told the committee that:

[g]overnment programs are all siloed so one does not know what the other one is doing. It is very hard. We have offered seminars in my business to try to elucidate what issues are out there, but we get confused. If you do not like this program, wait until next week; there is another program, but no one seems to know who does or does not qualify, and it is tough.

369 Evidence, 8 March 2012, Peter Cook.
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INTRODUCTION

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people cross all socio-economic, ethno-racial, age, gender, (dis)ability, religious, geographical location, educational, and relationship status lines. While Statistics Canada has neither the definitive number of people whose sexual orientation is lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender, it does attempt to quantify some estimates based on various surveys. In 2009, the Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS) became the first Statistics Canada survey to include a question on sexual orientation. According to the CCHS, 1.1% of Canadians aged 18 to 59 consider themselves to be homosexual, and 0.9% of Canadians of the same age group consider themselves to be bisexual. The 2011 Census counted same-sex couples (married and common-law) and found an increase of 42.4% since the previous (2006) Census. The number of same-sex married couples had nearly tripled following the first five-year period during which same-sex marriage had been legalized across Canada. Similar to the findings of the 2006 Census, most same-sex couples were concentrated in Toronto, Montréal, and Vancouver.

Surveys in the past decade have provided select information on the socio-economic make-up of those identifying as lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender (LGBT). In a 2008 article, the authors calculated that gay men in Canada earn on average 12% less, and lesbian women 15% more, than their heterosexual counterparts. The study calculated that bisexual people earn on

average 15 to 30% less than heterosexuals, suggesting that bisexual identity in particular may be associated with socioeconomic deprivation.\textsuperscript{377} Research indicates that youth identifying with a sexual minority are at greater risk of homelessness and street involvement than non-sexual minority youth and that sexual-minority youth are 1.5 to 1.7 times more likely to commit suicide than their heterosexual peers.\textsuperscript{378}

**Victimization and Discrimination**

Police data from the Uniform Crime Reporting Survey show that 159 hate crimes were motivated by sexual orientation in Canada in 2008, roughly double the number in 2007. Crimes motivated by sexual orientation accounted for approximately 16\% of all 2008 hate crimes.\textsuperscript{379} In addition to these more general risk factors, sexual minority youth face additional risk factors, such as a lack of family acceptance and bullying or conflict at school.\textsuperscript{380} A 2009 national safe schools climate survey of over 3,500 youth found that 75\% reported hearing homophobic comments on a daily basis in schools, and six out of 10 LGBT students reported being verbally harassed about their sexual orientation.\textsuperscript{381} According to a Statistics Canada report, when all factors all held constant, being gay, lesbian or bisexual significantly increases the odds of being victimized.\textsuperscript{382} A 2007 study found that lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth, when compared to their heterosexual peers, were more likely to have experienced physical and sexual abuse, harassment in school, and discrimination in the community.\textsuperscript{383}

**Legal Rights and Protections for LGBT People**

The legal rights and protections for gay men and lesbian women in Canada changed considerably with the coming into effect of the equality rights provision in Section 15 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.\textsuperscript{384} Although sexual orientation was not explicitly included as a prohibited ground of discrimination, the courts accepted that Section 15 was to be

\textsuperscript{377} Mule et al. (2009).
\textsuperscript{379} Statistics Canada, “Gay pride…by the numbers.”
\textsuperscript{380} Kristopher Wells, “No Place for Homophobia in Schools,” Edmonton Journal, 18 October 2010.
\textsuperscript{383} Wells (2009), p. 6.
interpreted broadly, and that “analogous” grounds, i.e., personal characteristics other than those listed, may also form the basis for discrimination against a group or an individual.

The legal rights of lesbians and gay men in Canada have been the subject of considerable judicial, political and legislative activity, and in recent years, a broad framework of laws and policies that support diversity and inclusion has been implemented. In 2003, Ontario became the first Canadian province to allow same-sex marriage. In 2005, Canada became the fourth country in the world to legalize marriage for same-sex couples nationwide. In the workplace, the Charter has been interpreted to protect employees from discriminatory practices. For example, when employers offer health benefits that include coverage for a spouse or partner, they must by law include same-sex partners. Similarly, same-sex couples have the same benefits as opposite sex common-law couples for income tax, Canada Pension Plan, and Employment Insurance purposes.

Social Inclusion for Sexual Minorities: What Needs to be done

Kristopher Wells offered suggestions aimed at the social inclusion of sexual minorities. A feature which sets sexual minorities apart from other minorities is that, as Mr. Wells pointed out, they are “invisible” minorities, “which means that one cannot readily identify a person as belonging to this community by simply looking at them or speaking with them.” As a consequence of this “invisible” status, sexual minorities are frequently left out of programs and legislation designed to address the challenges faced by other minority groups at risk of exclusion. It is critical therefore, according to Mr. Wells, “that we talk about the recognition of sexual minorities as a distinct minority group, as we do with cultural, linguistic, religious or ethnic communities.” He recommended that a key focus should be on their inclusion and integration in all federal and civic programs and policies, as well as legislation, designed to support and protect minorities. “Ultimately,” Mr. Wells told the committee, “people need to see themselves included in law and legislation.” He added that inclusion in law and legislation is “particularly important for the transgender and transsexual community whom, research indicates are amongst the most marginalized and vulnerable groups in our society.”

Sexual minorities require the same recognition in government policies and legal protection as other minorities vulnerable to exclusion. In Recommendation 11 of this report, the committee
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calls for measures that it expects will lead to greater understanding and protection of sexual minorities. In addition, the committee recommends:

RECOMMENDATION 32

That the Government of Canada recognize sexual minorities as distinct minority groups like other cultural, linguistic, religious, and ethnic communities in all federal programs and policies designed to support minorities; and

That the Government of Canada include identity and gender expression in the hate crime provisions of the Criminal Code of Canada as aggravating circumstances to be taken into consideration at the time of sentencing.

Lastly, Mr. Wells and Professor Bramadat emphasized the need to move beyond tolerance to acceptance, recognition and celebration, not just with regard to sexual and religious minorities, but in a broader sense to everyone. Mr. Wells pointed out that:

[t]olerance is an often used yet incredibly power-laden concept. To tolerate someone means that I choose to put up with them and invite them to the table without having to interrogate any of my own values or beliefs. Tolerance is a shallow form of inclusion. In a truly inclusive, multicultural and pluralistic society, we need to move beyond tolerance to acceptance, appreciation and hopefully to the celebration of diversity and difference. 391

391 Evidence, 17 February 2011, Kristopher Wells.
CHAPTER TEN: BUILDING SAFER COMMUNITIES

[I]nclusive communities ensure both individual and broad community safety and security so that no one feels at risk in their homes or moving around the neighborhood and city.  

[I]f you plan to try and make urban places safe and inclusive for the most marginalized of the population, you will indeed make them safe for everybody – safe and inclusive.

INTRODUCTION

During the committee’s first meeting on social inclusion, a witness stated that “inclusion is about feeling part of things, and feeling part of things means that you are connected to others; you are not isolated.” Social inclusion occurs in large measure via the public spaces of Canadian communities; parks, schools, libraries, recreation facilities, public transit facilities, and the streets of our cities. If Canadians do not feel safe in these and other spaces, the goal of social inclusion will not be achieved fully. This is particularly so when one considers that those who are most at risk of exclusion – such as seniors, women, and people with disabilities – are also among the most vulnerable to crime in our society.

As a consequence, there is a strong link between social inclusion and cohesion, and the need for citizens to feel safe in their communities. The presence of crime disrupts the connections between people, isolating them and jeopardizing social cohesion.

CRIME LEVELS IN CANADA

Each year since 1962, the Canadian Centre for Crime Statistics (the Centre) at Statistics Canada has released data on crime in Canada. These statistics are presented for Canada as a whole; they are also broken down by province/territory and by Census Metropolitan Areas. The data are based on crimes “known to, and substantiated by, police services,” drawn from the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Survey. Beginning with its report for 2008, the Centre began to include information on the volume and severity of police-reported crime.
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For 2009, Statistics Canada reported that police-reported crime in Canada – in terms of both volume and severity – had dropped.\(^{396}\) This is consistent with a declining trend in the numbers of reported crimes. For 2010, Statistics Canada found that this trend had continued, with both the volume and severity of crime down by 5% and 6%, respectively, from 2009 levels. The volume of crime was reported to have dropped to its lowest level since the 1970s while the Crime Severity Index fell to its lowest point since those data were first been recorded in 1998.\(^{397}\) Once again, these same overall trends emerged in Statistics Canada’s 2011 report on police-reported crime statistics. These data show that crimes reported to the police in 2011 consisted of two million Criminal Code offences in 2011, roughly 110,000 fewer than the number reported in 2010.\(^{398}\)

These assessments, however, are based on aggregations of crime data at the national level and while average national crime rates have declined, they remain high at the local level in certain instances; crime is concentrated in specific areas rather than spread evenly across Canada.\(^{399}\)

Statistics Canada also gathers crime data through its General Social Survey on Victimization (GSS) which it conducts every five years – these data are self-reported from a representative sample of Canadians 15 years of age and older. It is common for the GSS to produce higher rates of crime than the UCR Survey because not all incidents are reported to police. The 2004 GSS, for example, indicated that roughly one-third (34%) of incidents were reported to police. As Heidi Illingworth, Executive Director of the Canadian Resource Centre for the Victims of Crime, reminded the committee, police-reported crime statistics tell only a partial story about Canadian crime rates. Ms. Illingworth testified that “[A]ccording [...] to the 2009 GSS, 69 per cent of violent victimizations, 62 per cent of household victimizations, and 71 per cent of personal property thefts were not reported to the police.”\(^{400}\) However, regardless of crime levels, whether reported or not, from a victim’s perspective (and those close to victims), any criminal act is still one criminal act too many.
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Most Canadians feel safe in their communities. In 2009, Statistics Canada found that 93% of all Canadians 15 years of age and older were satisfied with their personal safety from crime. All told, over eight in 10 Canadians reported that they were not worried when home alone in the evening (83%) and 90% indicated that they felt safe walking alone in their neighbourhoods at night.

Men were more likely to have higher levels of satisfaction with their personal safety. Ninety per cent of men, for example, reported that they felt safe at home compared with 76% of women. Over seven in 10 men (73%) said they did not worry for their personal safety when using public transit while just over four in 10 women (42%) expressed the same level of satisfaction.

Canadians felt less safe using public transportation in their communities, with fewer than 6 in 10 (58%) saying that they were not at all worried when waiting for or using public transportation at night. Over nine in 10 men and over eight in 10 women reported feeling very safe or reasonably safe walking alone in their neighbourhoods at night.

Canadians living in western Canada tended to have lower levels of satisfaction, a possible reflection of rates of crime and victimization that tend to be higher in western provinces. These variations also appear at the municipal level. While most Canadians living in Census Metropolitan Areas expressed satisfaction with their personal safety from crime, the three CMA’s reporting among the lowest levels of satisfaction (Vancouver, Winnipeg, and Calgary) were located in western Canada.

The results of Statistics Canada’s 2009 survey were reflected in a survey conducted by Environics Research Group in 2011. The survey found that fewer than half (46%) of Canadians believe that crime rates are on the rise (down 6 percentage points since 2010), while
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the same proportion believed that crime is falling; this trend was most noticeable in Ontario, Saskatchewan, and Alberta. Concerns about rising crime rates were more widespread among Canadians living in Atlantic Canada and Manitoba. Reports of crime victimization were slightly higher than the national average in Saskatchewan (13%) and British Columbia (9%) and among those aged 18 to 29 (11%). Among those who reported having been the victim of a crime, just over 7 in 10 (72%) indicated that they had reported the incident to the police.

Nonetheless, a significant number of Canadians believe that crime rates in their communities are neither declining nor on the rise; instead, they perceive that local crime rates are unchanged. As Julie McAuley, Director of the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, testified, “62 per cent of Canadians, when they were asked in 2009 through the General Social Survey, stated they felt crime in their neighborhood had remained the same.”

**Crime and Canadians Vulnerable to Exclusion**

Social exclusion may be also linked to increased risk of victimization. Studies have argued that street youth, for example, are likely to be victims of crime due to experiences of social exclusion in terms of restricted access to housing, employment and public spaces.

*Daniel Sansfaçon, Director, Policy Research and Evaluation, National Crime Prevention Centre, Public Safety Canada, Evidence, 8 March 2012*

We are seeing that areas have high crime rates where you have people living in situations of social disadvantage, family break-up, young single males and transiency. People from Aboriginal populations are [....] disproportionately in those groups, as are the mentally ill.

*Irwin Waller, Full Professor, Department of Criminology, University of Ottawa, Evidence, 14 March 2012.*

Many who are among the most vulnerable to social exclusion are also the most susceptible to acts of crime. Canadians who are already marginalized are in effect forced further onto the margins and kept there by the presence of crime that is directed toward them. In particular, Aboriginal Canadians, women, visible minorities (who include immigrants among their number), sexual minorities, and religious minorities, are often the targets of criminal acts, including hate crimes. Furthermore, as Heidi Illingworth testified, crime victims themselves (regardless of membership in a vulnerable group) all too often become socially excluded.
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Many of our clients become socially isolated as a result of being victimized. Their friends and family members do not understand the trauma they endured in some cases and expect them to get over it quickly and get on with their lives.

Heidi Illingsworth, Executive Director, Canadian Resource Centre for the Victims of Crime, Evidence, 8 March 2011

In the case of members of communities already at risk of exclusion, becoming a crime victim can thus lead to a form of double exclusion.

Urban Aboriginal People

Canadian Aboriginal peoples are more apt than the non-Aboriginal population to be the victims of crime. For example, at the provincial level in 2009, 37% of Aboriginal people – almost 322,000 individuals – reported that they were victims of crime compared with 26% of the non-Aboriginal population. In 2004, Aboriginal Canadians were three times more likely to have been the victims of sexual assault, robbery or physical assault (319 versus 101 incidents per 1,000 population).
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Despite the overrepresentation of Aboriginal peoples among the victims of crime, the majority (89%) are satisfied with their personal safety and Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples share similar perceptions about crime. In spite of feeling safe in their communities, however, Aboriginal people were more likely than non-Aboriginal people to report having taken some steps to protect themselves from crime. Forty-three per cent, for example, said they had changed their daily routines and/or activities, or avoided certain people or places, to protect themselves from crime.

While most urban Aboriginal people who have had contact with the criminal justice system believe they were treated fairly, they have little confidence in the system itself. Surveys have found that among urban Aboriginal people with serious involvement (either as a victim, witness, arrested or charged with a crime) with the criminal justice system, close to six in 10 felt they had
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been fairly treated.\textsuperscript{411} However, regardless of feeling they had been dealt with fairly, the majority responding to this survey said they had little confidence in the criminal justice system and were in favor of creating a separate system for Aboriginal people.\textsuperscript{412} More than half of respondents had little (33\%) to no (22\%) confidence in the criminal justice system.\textsuperscript{413}

Women

There is clear evidence that the fear of violence is stronger in women. [...] The fear results in changes in behavior that restricts women’s participation in urban areas. The question is not the rate of violence, but the question of mode of behavior. That means that women do not go out at night and restrict their activities.

\begin{flushright}
\textit{Caroline Andrew, Director, Centre on Governance, University of Ottawa, Evidence, 15 February 2012}
\end{flushright}

Testimony that “evidence that feeling safe in one’s neighborhood is of much greater concern and impact for women than it is for their male peers” reflects data that show that women are overrepresented among victims of certain types of crime.\textsuperscript{414} Women are particularly vulnerable to criminal harassment, commonly known as stalking. This form of criminal conduct is repeated over time and “causes victims to reasonably fear for their safety.”\textsuperscript{415}

Sixty-nine per cent of the victims of criminal harassment were harassed in their own homes, or in another residence. Eleven per cent of incidents took place in an outdoor public location (street, road, highway, or parking lot), and 4\% took place at school or university. The rest – 16\% – occurred in commercial or corporate areas, transit areas and other public or non-profit institutions.\textsuperscript{416}

\textsuperscript{411} The Environics Institute, \textit{Urban Aboriginal Peoples Study –Main Report}, p. 98,
\textsuperscript{412} Ibid., p. 99-100.
\textsuperscript{413} Ibid., p. 99.
\textsuperscript{414} \textit{Evidence}, 2 February 2011, Fran Klodawsky.
\textsuperscript{416} Ibid., pp.4, 6.
The statistics may underrepresent the actual numbers of women who are the targets of criminal activity. Irwin Waller, of the Department of Criminology at the University of Ottawa and President of the Intergovernmental Organization for Victim Assistance, indicated that “[m]ore than 90 per cent of the women who are sexually assaulted in this country do not report to the police.”

Given the right of women to feel safe and secure in the communities where they live, there needs to be an emphasis placed on efforts to reduce their vulnerability to assault, both by former offenders and others. The committee therefore recommends:
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Note: Rates are calculated on the basis of 100,000 population.

Evidence, 15 March 2012, Irvin Waller.
RECOMMENDATION 33

That the Government of Canada support awareness and education programs to combat sexual assault and harassment, including cyber-bullying.

Sexual Minorities

In Canada, the latest report from the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics (2008) identifies that lesbians, gays, and bisexuals are amongst the top three targeted groups in Canada for hate and bias crimes. Hate crimes motivated by sexual orientation were also identified as the most violent in nature of all those reported. It is also important to note that approximately only 1 in 10 hate crimes are ever reported to law enforcement.

Kristopher Wells, Researcher,
Institute for Sexual Minority Studies and Services, University of Alberta,
Evidence, 17 February 2011

Violence directed at sexual minorities has been a longstanding issue of concern in Canada. In 2008, a study by Statistics Canada found that lesbians and gay men were almost 2.5 times as likely to be victims of violence, including sexual and physical assault, as heterosexual persons, and that bisexual persons were over four times more likely to be victimized. The survey also found that:

- Gays, lesbians and bisexuals expressed lower levels of satisfaction with police performance than their heterosexual counterparts. For example, fewer gays, lesbians and bisexuals felt that the police were doing a good job of treating people fairly compared to heterosexuals (42% of gays/lesbians and 47% of bisexuals versus 60% of heterosexuals); and
- The proportion of gays, lesbians and bisexuals who felt they had experienced discrimination was about 3 times higher than that of heterosexuals. Furthermore, 78% of gays and lesbians who experienced discrimination believed it was because of their sexual orientation compared to 29% of bisexuals and 2% of heterosexuals.

According to police data from the UCR Survey, hate crimes motivated by sexual orientation in 2009 were up 18% in 2009 from 2008. Crimes motivated by sexual orientation accounted for approximately 13% of all hate crimes reported in 2009. Seventy-four per cent of the hate crimes motivated by sexual orientation in 2009 were violent in nature.419
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When asked if the police were doing a good job at supplying information to the public on ways to reduce crime, 42% of gays and lesbians and 38% of bisexuals responded positively, compared to 51% of heterosexuals. Furthermore, 58% of gays and lesbians and 52% of bisexuals perceived the police as doing a good job at being approachable compared to 66% of heterosexuals. There was no difference between the views of gays, lesbians, and bisexuals, and the views of the rest of the population with regard to the criminal courts or prison system.420

Immigrants and Visible Minorities

We know that the more we go out into minority communities, particularly those that might have had a difficult relationship with the police service as in the example of people coming to Canada from a war-torn, lawless country, they do not interface with the police service in the same way.

Kristopher Wells, Researcher,
Institute for Sexual Minority Studies and Services, University of Alberta,
Evidence, 17 February 2011

Data gathered by Statistics Canada for 2004 show that visible minorities experienced rates of violent crime similar to those experienced by non-visible minority Canadians, and that older visible minorities (25 years of age and older) experienced lower rates of crime than their counterparts in the non-visible minority population.421 However, visible minorities are apt to feel less safe in public places and underserved by law enforcement officials. Statistics Canada reported that:

- About 47% of visible minority females and 39% of males reported that they would use public transportation alone after dark more often if they felt safer, compared to 29% and 22% of non-visible minorities;
- Visible minorities were less likely than non-visible minorities to rate the police as doing a good job with tasks that were related to police accessibility and attitudes such as: being approachable and easy to talk to, supplying the public with information on ways to reduce crime and treating people fairly;
- Visible minorities were more likely than non-visible minorities to feel that loitering, people sleeping on the streets, harassment and attacks motivated by racial intolerance and prostitution posed a problem in their neighborhoods; and
- The proportion of visible minorities who felt they had experienced discrimination was twice that of non-visible minorities. Overall, 81% of visible minorities who felt

421 Perreault (2011).
that they had experienced discrimination believed that it was because of their race or ethnic origin.422

Canadians with Disabilities

[T]he issue of violence against persons with disabilities [...] tends to be [...] an issue for persons with fairly severe disabilities, where they feel vulnerable in society. [...] For women, especially, there have been reported cases of people who feel a sense of vulnerability. [...] [I]n some larger cities people with disabilities do feel a sense of vulnerability and of being the object of attack.

Tony Dolan, Chairperson,
Council of Canadians with Disabilities,
Evidence, 7 March 2012

As noted above, the 2006 Participation and Activity Limitation Survey (PALS) indicated that more than 4.4 million Canadians, or 14% of the total population, had at least one physical or mental condition that restricted their daily activities,423 as the population ages, it is anticipated that this number will increase. Using data gathered by the General Social Survey (GSS) on Crime Victimization of 2004, the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics at Statistics Canada reported that in 2004:

- The rate of criminal victimization, including sexual assault, robbery and physical assault, was two times higher for persons with activity limitations than for persons without limitations (147 compared to 101 incidents per 1,000 persons).
- The personal victimization rate, which is violent victimization or theft of personal property, for persons with mental or behavioral disorder, was four times higher than the rate for persons with no mental disorder.424

Disabled Canadians may feel less secure than non-disabled people due to their physical or mental vulnerabilities, and higher rates of criminal victimization. The GSS found that in 2004 25% of those with a disability did not feel safe when walking alone in their neighborhood compared with 14% of those without a disability. In addition, disabled persons were more likely to be fearful when they are alone at home at night (26% versus 19% of non-disabled Canadians) and to stay home at night rather than venture outside because they were afraid to do so alone (37% versus 29%).425

Disabled victims of crime are less likely than other Canadians to be satisfied with police response.426 Disabled persons generally were also less likely to have a favorable opinion of the justice system at large. For example, 46% (versus 35% of non-disabled Canadians) rated Canadian courts poorly in terms of the courts’ ability to render justice quickly.

Notes: Rates include offences among spouses. In all the crime categories, the differences are statistically significant.
Source: Perreault (2009), p. 8

425 Ibid., p. 13.
426 Ibid.
Crime, whether against property or individuals or against public order (so called “victimless” crimes such as the consumption of illicit drugs or prostitution) imposes significant costs on individuals and their communities. Costs borne by victims and those close to them are particularly onerous. Of the estimated $70 billion cost of crime in 2003, the majority of these costs - $47 billion, or 67% - were borne by victims. These costs have gone up. In her testimony, Heidi Illingworth emphasized that the cost of crime falls on the shoulders of victims:

According to the Department of Justice, the cost of crime in 2008 is estimated to be $99.6 billion, a majority of which, $68.2 billion or 68 per cent is borne directly by the victims. Victim costs include tangible losses such as damaged or stolen property, loss of income and productivity, and health care services, as well as intangible cost such as pain and suffering and loss of life.

**Government Support for Victims**

Senior levels of government recognize that victims must be given greater attention. In 1988, federal, provincial and territorial governments agreed to the Canadian Statement of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime, which was subsequently updated in 2003. Since that time, the federal government has undertaken several initiatives with regard to crime victims.

In 2007, the federal government created the Office of the Federal Ombudsman for Victims of Crime. The Ombudsman was given the mandate to promote and facilitate access to federal programs and services for crime victims and raise awareness of victims’ needs and concerns among criminal justice personnel and policy makers. The Ombudsman reports directly to the Minister of Justice. The Department of Justice has also created a Policy Centre for Victim Issues that:

---

428 *Evidence*, 8 March 2012, Heidi Illingworth, p. 84.
• assists victims and their families understand their role in the criminal justice system and
the laws, services and assistance available to support them;
• ensures that the views of victims are taken into consideration in the development of
federal legislation and policies; and
• increases awareness about the needs of victims and how to address those needs.431

More recently, the Government of Canada introduced amendments to the Canada Labour
Code and the Employment Insurance Act to provide support to parents of children who have died
or disappeared as the probable result of crime.432

Canadian Police Services: Recruitment and Retention of Groups at Risk of Exclusion

…in spite of concerted efforts to increase diversity in police
services in Canada, women, members of visible and ethnic
minority groups, as well as Aboriginal peoples, remain
significantly underrepresented, compared to their representation in
the communities being policed.433

[A] significant proportion of people simply do not believe the
police will solve their problems. When you add young Aboriginal
males, young Black males or young Asian males in certain sectors
of the city, they have little or no reason to believe that is where
they go for solutions; they take care of themselves.434

In policing, recruitment strategies must inform, attract, and select the best
and brightest candidates - ensuring representation of the population in
terms of gender, and culture.435

As noted above, many Canadians most at risk of social exclusion lack faith in local police
services and the criminal justice system. As a possible consequence, a significant amount of
crime committed in Canada goes unreported to the police. When crime is not reported, not only
does it mean that a crime goes unsolved, it also complicates efforts to allocate resources to areas

432 Bill C-44, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code and the Employment Insurance Act and to make
consequential amendments to the Income Tax Act and Income Tax Regulations. The Act received Royal Ascent
433 Law Commission of Canada, 2006, cited in Geoffrey Li, “Private security and public policing,” Juristat,
435 Police Sector Council, “Recruitment and Retention,” HR Practices Centre
http://www.policecouncil.ca/pages/hr.html
in which they are most needed. These challenges can be partially addressed by taking steps to ensure that police forces in Canada more closely resemble the communities they serve.

In his testimony to the committee, Professor Waller asserted that “gendering policing makes a difference to whether women report or not. If you have a lot of women police officers, you have a better chance of reporting.”\textsuperscript{436} In its report on Canadian police resources in 2011, Statistics Canada reported that across Canada, the numbers of female police officers has continued to increase. There were 285 more female officers in 2011 than in 2010, part of a consistently rising trend. For example, in 2001, women made up 14\% of all police officers in Canada; by 2011, that proportion had grown to 20\%.\textsuperscript{437} While this progress is welcome, women in Canadian police forces are still vastly out of proportion with their numbers in Canada. In 2011, Statistics Canada indicated that women and girls made up just over half – 50.4\% – of the total population.\textsuperscript{438}

In 2006, Statistics Canada reported that the percentage of visible minorities in Canadian police forces had been steadily increasing, from 3\% in 1996, to 4\% in 2001, rising to 6\% in 2006.\textsuperscript{439} In contrast, in 2006 visible minorities made up approximately 16\% of the population and their numbers are projected to grow, most choosing to live in one of Canada’s largest cities. In response, municipal police forces are stepping up efforts to recruit visible minorities into their ranks.\textsuperscript{440}

Canadian police forces are actively engaged in efforts to reach out to communities that are most vulnerable to crime. As part of these efforts, police forces are focusing recruitment and retention efforts on women and members of minority communities with the result that police are becoming more representative of the communities they serve.

The committee wishes to encourage these efforts in the belief that they will lead to an increase in reported crime and, most importantly, to the reduction and prevention of crime. Therefore, the committee recommends:

\textsuperscript{436} Evidence, 15 March 2012, Irvin Waller.
\textsuperscript{439} Li (2008).
\textsuperscript{440} See, for example, Toronto Police Service, “More minority police,” http://www.torontopolice.on.ca/modules.php?op=modload&name=News&file=article&sid=1219
RECOMMENDATION 34

That the Government of Canada support efforts by Canadian police forces to enhance the recruitment and retention of women and members of Canadian minority communities in proportion to their labour market availability.

Federal Government Crime Prevention Initiatives

What Canadians want is for all orders of government to work better together, work smarter together and to rethink and reinvest in policies and programs that keep our communities safe and stop crime from happening in the first place.

Karen Leibovici, Federation of Canadian Municipalities, Evidence, 14 March 2012

Interest in municipal and community mobilization for crime prevention by the federal government began to gather momentum in the 1980s and 1990s, particularly in relation to community policing and community safety strategies. In 1994, the federal government initiated the National Strategy on Community Safety and Crime Prevention, which assisted communities in developing and implementing community-based solutions to crime. In 1998, the National Crime Prevention Strategy (NCPS) was introduced to provide a policy framework for implementing crime prevention interventions across Canada.

Administered by Public Safety Canada’s National Crime Prevention Centre (NCPC), the NCPS works to reduce crime by addressing known risk factors and identifying effective and cost-efficient ways to prevent crime in high-risk populations. Managed in collaboration with the provinces and territories, municipal and Aboriginal police forces, the NCPS provides a policy framework for implementing crime prevention intervention across Canada. To achieve the Strategy’s goal of reducing crime, the NCPC focuses on two key streams of activities:

- community funding to support projects that deliver social crime prevention measures aimed at those most at risk of offending; and
- building and sharing practical knowledge of successful crime prevention measures, and promoting their use by stakeholders.

In 2008, the federal government increased the funding to the National Crime Prevention Centre and crime prevention programming. The NCPC administers three funding programs:

---

443 Ibid., p. 4.
the Crime Prevention Action Fund, the Northern and Aboriginal Crime Prevention Fund, and the Youth Gang Prevention Fund.

The Crime Prevention Action Fund provides funding to assist communities and organizations in developing and implementing crime prevention and knowledge transfer initiatives. The Northern and Aboriginal Crime Prevention Fund provides funding to support culturally sensitive initiatives that foster the development and implementation of crime prevention approaches in Aboriginal communities, both on-and-off-reserve and in the North. The Youth Gang Prevention Fund (discussed in Chapter 6) invests in communities where youth gangs are an existing or emerging threat and supports initiatives that clearly target youth in gangs or at greatest risk of joining gangs.

In its Departmental Performance Report for 2010-2011, Public Safety Canada indicated that it had funded 143 projects in 78 communities, including 19 projects that were exclusively dedicated to addressing youth street gangs. Funding amounting to $37.5 million over five years was also allocated for 41 new projects. The Department reported that, in total, over 15,000 at risk children and youth were reached by projects funded under the Strategy and that many of these projects were delivered in cooperation with provinces, territories, municipal police forces and the RCMP, and community-based organizations.

Daniel Sansfaçon of the National Crime Prevention Centre testified that “[t]he vast majority of these projects involve interventions that target the most at-risk populations in order to prevent them from following a long-term offending trajectory.” Irvin Waller, however, was critical of the National Crime Prevention Centre, telling the committee that he did not think the re-testing that the National Crime Prevention Centre is doing is needed because “we have more than enough evidence,” adding that “[t]he NCPC is basically retesting things that have been proven empirically to work in Canada and elsewhere.

Smart Policing: Prevention and Intervention, Enforcement and Incarceration

The committee’s witnesses spoke of approaches to addressing crimes that involve a combination of strategies and better collaboration and coordination between stakeholders. Chief McFee testified that no one single approach to confronting crime works by itself. Instead, he called for a strategy that combines:

...hard on crime – enforcement and incarceration [with] soft on crime – prevention and intervention. Both [...] require tough decisions and both are absolutely mandatory to maximize returns. I

444 Ibid., p. 1.
446 Evidence, 8 March 2012, Daniel Sansfaçon.
447 Evidence, 15 March 2012, Irvin Waller.
believe in a balance between the views, or should I say, being “smart on crime,” or “smart on community safety.”

Irvin Waller made a similar observation, stating that “...combined balanced approaches that involve smart policing, rehabilitation and prevention” are needed in order to deal effectively with crime. He argued that such an approach would not require a change in the numbers of police, but instead about using police “more smartly.”

Collaboration

..in Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, we found that 27 per cent of our calls were criminal in nature. Out of these 27 per cent, 5 per cent led to an actual criminal charge. However, this leaves 73 per cent of all calls to be an area which we define as antisocial behavior, behavior that if left unchecked or without accountability often leads to criminal behavior. Antisocial behavior is often related to addictions, domestic violence, disturbances, housing, mental health, et cetera. When I think of those issues and look deeper, I have to ask myself, “How many of these issues would police be considered experts in?” The answer is, most often, none.

Chief Dale McFee,
Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police,
Evidence, 8 March 2012

Throughout all phases of the committee’s hearings on social inclusion, witnesses stressed that complex social issues are not amenable to solution by one entity or sector working alone. This was no different when the committee spoke with witnesses about finding effective ways to make Canadian communities safer and less vulnerable to crime.

Community-based holistic approaches to preventing and combating crime and victimization are most successful when developed through intergovernmental and community-based partnerships which can be accomplished through social development, notably by investing in all aspects of community infrastructure, like shelter, libraries, recreation centres, while also addressing the complex root causes of crime.

Karen Leibovici, Federation of Canadian Municipalities,
Evidence, 14 March 2012.

---

448 Evidence, 8 March 2012, Dale McFee.
449 Evidence, 15 March 2012, Irvin Waller.
Early Intervention

Witnesses emphasized the importance of collaborative early intervention to prevent crime from happening, and in particular, the need to intervene with youth who are at risk of engaging in criminal activity. Daniel Sansfaçon stressed that early intervention would save the justice system a significant amount of money, testifying that:

[T]he kinds of preventative interventions we are speaking about will cost anywhere between $5,000 and $8,000 on average per year to deliver for [...] at-risk children and youth. It is a very minimal amount when you consider what would otherwise be the costs of them entering into the justice system, of causing victimization, and ending up eventually in the federal system if nothing is done to prevent that.\(^\text{450}\)

In perhaps no other area is collaboration more necessary than when it comes to efforts to prevent crime through early intervention. Chief McFee told the committee that:

The majority of [the] 73% of calls [received by his local police force] are predictable; if they are predictable, then most often they are preventable. [...] if they are to be preventable, we must move towards a structured approach, an approach that gives all agencies – law enforcement, health, education, social services, et cetera – the ability to see the whole picture and respond at a local or regional level at an early intervention point.\(^\text{451}\)

The committee’s witnesses were in broad agreement that the best way to prevent crime is through early intervention that involves of community service providers, including police, social workers, and teachers. Thus a key to making Canadian communities safer involves everyone working in collaboration and removing or reducing the silos that stand in the way of effective prevention, intervention, and enforcement.

The Cost of Building Safer Communities

Collaborative approaches to community safety promise not only to be the most effective way of responding to crime, they also have the potential to reduce policing costs which are becoming the largest and fastest growing costs to municipal governments.

Irvin Waller argued that the federal government should be devoting more financial resources to crime prevention, an approach that might resolve some of the challenges faced by municipalities that are confronted with rising police costs. He told the committee that there is:

\(^{450}\) Evidence, 8 March 2012, Daniel Sansfaçon.
\(^{451}\) Evidence, 8 March 2012, Dale McFee.
unlimited empirical evidence to suggest that if we invested the equivalent of 5 per cent of what is currently going into mainly reactive systems – the police, courts, and Correctional Services – at the federal level, [...] and every level [of government], that we could achieve large reductions [in crime].

Professor Waller referred to a recommendation contained in a Report tabled by the House of Commons Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General in February 1993 that called on the federal government to spend a greater percentage of what it spends on policing and corrections on crime prevention. He argued that such expenditure “... will help control rising policing costs and rising prison costs.” Because crime prevention stops crime before it happens, avoids victimization, and is a cost-effective means of reducing crime, the committee recommends:

RECOMMENDATION 35

That the Government of Canada increase the share of its current criminal justice budget that is devoted to crime prevention.

Better control over policing costs can also be brought about by the smart policing approach of the kind advocated by Chief McFee who told the committee that the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police is “not suggesting a new investment; instead, we are suggesting a reinvestment. [...] there are significant opportunities for reinvestment with the existing economy based largely on the duplication of services.”

Federal Government Coordination and Other Roles

As noted above, the federal government is actively involved in a variety of initiatives designed to make Canadian communities safer. In particular, the government has devoted more attention to the needs of crime victims and has placed a greater emphasis on crime prevention while it has maintained and strengthened efforts to enforce the law and to apply sanctions to those who contravene it.

Professor Waller called for federal leadership through the establishment of a crime reduction board modeled after an initiative that took place in Alberta and has inspired a similar

---

452 Evidence, 15 March 2012, Irvin Waller

The Committee’s third recommendation read: “The Committee recommends that a share of the monies forfeited as proceeds of crime be allocated to crime prevention activities and that the federal government allocate 1% a year of the current federal budget for police, courts and corrections to crime prevention over a five year period. At the end of five years, Canada should spend 5% of the current federal criminal justice budget on crime prevention.”

454 Evidence, 8 March 2012, Dale McFee.
initiative in Saskatchewan. Such a board would bring down crime levels but would also have “the potential for controlling policing costs,” and “would make for a much better and safer place for those people who live in our cities.” In 2012, Public Safety Canada took a step in this direction, leading a federal-provincial-territorial Assistant Deputy Minister Crime Prevention Committee. The committee has been directed to recommend ways to “advance evidence-based policies and practices for effective crime prevention and reduction.”

The committee welcomes this development and recommends that Public Safety Canada take note of the following roles for the Crime Prevention Committee listed by Professor Waller: providing leadership to federal action; collaborating with the provinces and other relevant entities to agree and implement a national strategic plan and long term framework; gathering and analyzing practical knowledge in order to foster widespread application of effective and cost efficient programs; developing national standards and ways to foster practices and guidelines that meet those standards; and monitoring achievements in reducing crime and harm to victims and making recommendations for additional actions.

RETURNING TO THE COMMUNITY

Once an offender has served her or his time in a correctional facility, it essential that their rehabilitation continue in manner that supports reintegration. As Chief McFee pointed out “[t]here are people who need to go to jail, but you do not forget about them. You rehabilitate.” Rehabilitation and reintegration also must occur in a manner that guarantees community safety. As Ms. Illingworth told the committee, “we talk to the victims [...] on a monthly basis. They are concerned about the offender coming back into the community, where they live very close to them.” She suggested that some of this concern could be alleviated if offenders were better able to enter the labour market following release.

Successful efforts to rehabilitate offenders and to reduce recidivism contribute to community safety and eventually reduce costs associated with policing and incarceration. The committee therefore recommends:

RECOMMENDATION 36

That the Government of Canada increase supports for offenders to decrease recidivism and victimization by offering small incentives for offenders to receive further education and training while incarcerated in order to increase employment options upon release into the community;

Evidence, 15 March 2012, Irvin Waller
Evidence, 8 March 2012, Dale McFee
Evidence, 8 March 2012, Heidi Illingworth
That the Government of Canada make mandatory alcohol and substance abuse programs for addicted inmates while incarcerated in federal institutions and then follow up in the community with drug enforcement testing during reintegration; and

That the Government of Canada facilitate and increase access to mental health counseling and programs for offenders to increase successful reintegration in the community.

David Hulchanski, Associate Director of the Cities Centre at the University of Toronto, cited the conclusions of a report commissioned by the Government of Ontario entitled *Review of the Roots of Youth Violence*, which identified poverty as a contributing factor towards criminal activity in youth. 460 Professor Hulchanski told the committee that “poverty does not directly cause violence [...] However, if not ameliorated, poverty and low-income areas [can] nonetheless play a central role in generating alienation, a lack of hope or opportunity, self-esteem, a sense of having no future and other immediate risk factors.” 461 Thus, by working to reduce poverty, governments at all levels can indirectly prevent crime and reduce levels of criminal activity.

Heidi Illingworth suggested ways in which municipal governments could contribute towards safe and effective reintegration for former offenders:

- install outreach programs in community centres to raise awareness and educate individuals about victimization and personal safety measures;
- implement programs to help community members locate and access public funding for financial aid if they have been the victims of crime;
- have representatives of victims’ services accompany the police at crime scenes to provide assistance to victims on the spot; and that
- all governments promote and publicize the importance of reporting criminal activity as well as available community and government resources.

*Public Transit: Enhancing Safety and Mobility in Canadian Cities*

An efficient and safe transit system is an essential component of municipal infrastructure that serves to promote and enhance community safety. This is particularly so with regard to groups at risk of exclusion such as seniors, Canadians with disabilities, and those with limited incomes. Alain Mercier, of the Canadian Urban Transit Association, informed the committee that “about 40% of Canadians do not own a car,” and that “about 35% of Canadians do not own a driver’s license.” Mr. Mercier went on to cite the Canadian Automobile Association (CAA) which reports that “the average cost of owning, acquiring and operating a car in 2011 was about
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$20,000.” In contrast “[t]he cost of a year’s worth of transit passes for unlimited use might average between $1,000 to 1,200 per year.”\textsuperscript{462}

Mr. Mercier testified that for those who have no other option, public transit “is an essential service. Many studies have shown that without public transit these people are excluded from employment and access to medical, educational and recreational opportunities.” He also cited a report by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities which found that recent immigrants are “much more likely than Canadian-born residents to use public transit to commute to work. This was proven to be true even after controlling for age, gender, income and distance to work.” Mr. Mercier concluded by asserting that “[t]he bottom line […] is that improved public transit means a more inclusive society,”\textsuperscript{463} a statement that was supported by Caroline Andrew who told the committee that “[p]ublic transportation is absolutely crucial as a social inclusion” measure.\textsuperscript{464}

Mr. Mercier told the committee that the Canadian Urban Transit Association (CUTA) and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities have taken the position that “municipal tax programs by themselves are fairly regressive as a tax policy, and mobility in cities today depends largely on municipal tax contributions.” Therefore, the CUTA has recommended the following measures to the federal government:

- a long-term strategy for infrastructure financing;
- a larger share of the gas tax for municipalities “That is, that there be dedicated funding for mobility out of the federal gas tax. That represents a one-cent contribution towards creating mobility in Canadian cities.” and,
- allowing employers to have a tax credit for paying employee contributions for public transit. “[T]oday you get your parking spot from your employer and there is no tax penalty, but if your employer pays your transit pass, you have to pay tax on that.”\textsuperscript{465}

Apart from these recommendations, Mr. Mercier called for a national transit policy framework built upon a partnership of all levels of government to “provide the basic foundation of urban development and design, investment, tax policy, and research; and to optimize the role urban transit can play in ensuring the best possible levels of social inclusion.”\textsuperscript{466}

The federal government supports municipal transit in several ways. The government provides federal funding for which transit project are eligible through the Gas Tax Fund Transfer Payment Program to provinces, territories, municipalities, other public entities and First Nations for environmentally sustainable infrastructure. The transfers amount to $2 billion per year Canada-wide and are distributed according to population. Approximately $1 billion of the Gas

\textsuperscript{462} Evidence, 15 February 2012, Alain Mercier.
\textsuperscript{463} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{464} Evidence, 15 February 2012, Caroline Andrew.
\textsuperscript{465} Evidence, 15 February 2012, Alain Mercier.
\textsuperscript{466} Ibid.
Tax Fund Transfer Payments have been committed to transit projects since 2006.\textsuperscript{467} The Budget Act of 2011 contained a provision that permits the continuation of the Gas Tax Fund Transfer Payment Program beyond 2014 in an amount not exceeding $2 billion per year, subject to the terms and conditions approved by the Treasury Board.\textsuperscript{468}

Another way in which the federal government has supported public transit in Canada is through the provision of a tax deduction for transit users who buy a monthly pass.\textsuperscript{469} The initial provision was contained in Budget 2006 and the eligibility was expanded in Budget 2007 to include the cost of passes of shorter duration.

Given that municipal public transit provides low-cost access to employment, reduces social isolation, and contributes to community safety, enhancements should be made to federal support to transit. The committee recommends:

RECOMMENDATION 37

That the Government of Canada encourage the provinces and territories to identify and develop urban transit strategies;

That the Government of Canada give tax-exempt status for employer-provided transit benefits. This would complement the current federal tax credit for transit pass purchases and encourage employers to support transit commuters financially; and

That the Government of Canada consider additional allocations from the Gas Tax Fund specifically to transit capital investment.

\textsuperscript{467} House of Commons Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, \textit{Study on Transit in Canada}, 2012, p.7. \url{http://www.parl.gc.ca/content/hoc/Committee/411/TRAN/Reports/RP5301556/tranrp01/tranrp01-e.pdf}


CHAPTER ELEVEN: THE INCOME GAP AND MOVING UP THE INCOME LADDER

INTRODUCTION

Rates of low income are common among groups at risk of social exclusion and can result in lack of resources needed for full participation in community life. As the committee learned from its study of poverty, housing and homelessness, the constant effort to secure enough money to pay for the necessities of life leaves little time to build the social capital that forms the foundation for meaningful, successful engagement. In many instances, community participation may also impose financial costs which are beyond the means of those of limited income. Against this background, recent debates have focused on income inequality.

Although rising income inequality has been a concern for academics and policy makers for several years, it has become more prominent in the minds of many Canadians following the global financial crisis of 2008 and the advent of the “Occupy” movement beginning in early 2010. Evidence of this growing public concern can be found in polling results released in March 2012 which found that the growing gap between rich and the rest of society has become the top priority of Canadians, ahead of issues such as taxes and debt.

Like social inclusion, income inequality is about all of us. As noted by the Conference Board of Canada, “…high inequality can diminish economic growth if it means that the country is not fully using the skills and capabilities of all its citizens or if it undermines social cohesion, leading to increased social tensions. Second, high inequality raises a moral question about fairness and social justice.” As well, most observers recognize that extreme income inequality, even where the least well-off are still making economic gains, can undermine the sense of social cohesion necessary in a democratic society.

In their 2009 book entitled The Spirit Level: Why Equality is Better for Everyone, British epidemiologists Richard Wilkinson and Kate Pickett argue that the quality of life is worse for everyone in societies in which there are wide disparities between those at the top of the income
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scale and those at the bottom.\textsuperscript{474} Following close study of the data, they conclude (among other things) that: “[t]he evidence shows that reducing inequality [as measured by income disparities] is the best way of improving the quality of the social environment, and so the real quality of life, for all of us.”\textsuperscript{475} Income inequality, according to Wilkinson and Pickett, is an indicator of the degree of hierarchy in societies and, as they observe, social and health problems become more common further down the social hierarchy and are more common in more unequal societies.\textsuperscript{476}

\textbf{MEASURING INCOME INEQUALITY}

There are two principal methods of assessing income inequality. The first is to compare the incomes of a given percentage of top income earners with the incomes of an equivalent percentage of those at the bottom. Another frequently used method is to measure income inequality across the whole of society using more sophisticated methods such as the Gini coefficient which, in this instance, can assess the extent to which the distribution of income deviates from a perfectly equal distribution. Gini coefficients have a range between 1 and 0. Applied to the distribution of income, a Gini coefficient of 1 would indicate that one person in a society has all of the income and all the rest, none. In contrast, a coefficient of 0 would mean that everyone has exactly the same income. Since neither condition exists in any real-world situation, Gini coefficients lie somewhere between 0 and 1.

\textit{Income Inequality in Canada}

\begin{quote}
[I]t is a huge cultural change to see the total earnings of our society going to the top 1 per cent increase from about 7 per cent 20 or 30 years ago to 12 or 13 per cent now…. The top one-tenth of 1 per cent of top earners earned about 2 per cent of all income in the entire country in 1980 and earns almost 5 per cent now.

\textit{Miles Corak, Professor of Economics, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Ottawa, Evidence, 2 May 2012}
\end{quote}

With one exception, analysts from across the political spectrum in Canada are in agreement that there is a widening gap between Canada’s highest income earners and those who earn the least.\textsuperscript{477}

\textsuperscript{474} Richard Wilkinson and Kate Pickett, \textit{The Spirit Level: Why Equality is Better for Everyone}, 2010
\textsuperscript{475} Ibid., p. 29.
\textsuperscript{476} Ibid., p. 27. Wilkinson and Pickett also assert that income inequality is the only available indicator of hierarchy that can be used to make comparison s between countries.
As shown in Chart 9, Canada reduced inequality in the 1980s, with the Gini index reaching a low of 0.281 in 1989. Income inequality rose in the 1990s, but has remained around 0.32 in the 2000s. Although income inequality has generally increased over the last 35 years, it tends to fluctuate along with economic activity, as households with high incomes tend to be more exposed to stock market volatility than low income households.\(^{478}\) Furthermore, as Miles Corak told the committee, income inequality “varies a good deal” across Canada, with a higher fraction of earnings going to the very top 1% in Alberta, followed by Ontario, and British Columbia, and much less so in the other provinces.\(^{479}\)

Table 5 provides a different perspective on income inequality by illustrating the change in market income over time by income quintiles. From 1976 to 2009, two-thirds of Canadians experienced a decline in their real market income. While the wealthiest quintile of the population added 27.5% to its average market income and the next wealthiest quintile added 6.9% to its average market income, the remaining three quintiles saw their market income reduced.

top-to-bottom income quintiles, argued by the author to be a more accurate indicator of relative well-being than income, has moved towards the higher-income scale only slightly over the last 35 years. As well, the author questions the reliability of reported incomes, since they likely exclude significant revenues obtained through the underground economy.


\(^{479}\) Evidence, 2 May 2012, Miles Corak.
Table 5 – Change in market income since 1976 (All family units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quintile</th>
<th>Market Income ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>26,500</td>
<td>22,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>48,800</td>
<td>45,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>71,400</td>
<td>76,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>127,100</td>
<td>162,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Many studies point to the fact that, in Canada and across the world, globalization and technological progress is widening the disparity in labour earnings between the very rich and very poor.\(^{480}\) With globalization of production, jobs in manufacturing in Canada have decreased in favor of other countries with relatively lower average wage rates (e.g. to countries in Asia). Along with decreasing demand in Canada for lower skilled manufacturing jobs, wage rates and employment in this sector have also been decreasing. At the same time, wage rates and employment levels have increased for workers in highly-skilled occupations, especially in the information technology field, along with global growth in demand for these jobs. In testimony, committee witnesses identified similar causes for income inequality.

Miles Corak identified three principal causal factors that explain growing Canadian income inequality. The first of these is a mismatch between the skills, education, and work experience, principally among younger Canadians, and the requirements of a rapidly evolving, globalized economy.

At the same time that numbers of Canadians do not have the right skill sets to take advantage of changes in a globalized economy, a smaller group of mostly older Canadians does have the skills that are in demand and as a consequence is doing well.

The third element identified by Professor Corak “has to do with what has happened at the very top. These are the famous 1 per cent ...In fact, even [...] one tenth of 1 per cent have seen very significant gains in their economic well-being, however you measure it, in terms of wages

or other sources of income, and that has changed quite significantly over the last 20 or 30 years.\footnote{Evidence, 2 May 2012, Miles Corak.}

Charles Beach agreed, telling the committee that the increase in inequality “is largely driven by a substantial increase in inequality in workers’ earnings in the labour market,” and “is associated with increased polarization of earnings and hollowing out of formerly middle class-type jobs, a dramatic rise in top incomes, and widening differentials in earnings or gaps in earnings between low-skilled and high-skilled workers.”\footnote{Evidence, 2 May 2012, Charles Beach.}

\textit{The Impact of Taxes and Transfers on Income Inequality}

In general, research has indicated that personal income taxes and government transfers (e.g. social assistance, employment insurance, child benefits, and old age security) have helped to reduce income inequality in Canada.\footnote{For example, see Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), \textit{Divided We Stand: Why Inequality Keeps Rising, Country Note: Canada}, December 2011, \url{http://www.oecd.org/els/socialpoliciesanddata/49177689.pdf}.} Evidence suggests that more recently, however, the tax and transfer system is not reducing income inequality as much as it did prior to 1994. This can be observed by taking the difference between the Gini indices for adjusted market income and adjusted income after taxes and transfers, as shown in Chart 10.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Chart 10: Impact of taxes and transfers on inequality}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
\textbf{(Difference between Gini indices of adjusted market income and adjusted income after taxes and transfers)}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

Various explanations have been offered as to why the tax and transfer system has become less effective in reducing income inequalities in Canada since the mid-1990s. In general, though, most studies agree that the tax system has become less progressive along with reduced marginal income tax rates and the introduction of new tax expenditures. More importantly, it has been widely suggested that the effectiveness of the transfer system has been reduced through the erosion of social assistance benefits and the introduction of stricter eligibility requirements for federal and provincial income maintenance programs (e.g. employment insurance).

The Potential Consequences of Income Inequality

...we do not want social unrest. We do not want to reach that stage. I think that is why we need the conversation starting now to address income inequalities and other forms of inequalities [...]. To get there, we need to start looking at the issue of social exclusion on all the issues we are talking about. Otherwise, we will get to the stage where there will be social unrest.

Avvy Go, Director,
Metro Toronto Chinese and Southeast Asian Legal Clinic,
Evidence, 7 March 2012

[T]he literature identifies a number of points of political inefficiencies as to why we should be concerned about increases in inequality. That increase may be associated with increased social conflict, violence and crime that would reduce security of property rights, and capital investment may be less attractive. It is not that people who may be willing to make investment will not do so, they will just prefer not to do it in, for example, Argentina, and they will put it somewhere else. Those are the kinds of arguments that one should be quite concerned about.

Charles Beach, Professor of Economics,
Queen’s University,
Evidence, 2 May 2012

Some observers note that income inequality, should it continue to grow, will have dire social consequences that will affect all of society. According to a study that forecasts future outcomes based on current trends in income inequality, by 2025 (under a worst-case scenario) the opportunity and income gap between rich and poor, Canadian-born and recent immigrant, and manager and employee will continue to widen, and the number of disenfranchised will have

484 For example, see Marc Frenette, David A. Green, and Garnett Picot, “Rising Income Inequality in the 1990s: An Exploration of Three Data Sources,” in Dimensions of Inequality in Canada, David A. Green and Jonathan R. Kesselman (Eds.), 2006, pp. 65–100; Ken Battle, Michael Mendelson, and Sherri Torjman, The Modernization Mantra: Toward a New Architecture for Canada’s Adult Benefits, Caledon Institute of Social Policy, 2006; Action Canada, Prospering Together: Addressing Inequality and Poverty to Succeed in the Knowledge-Based Economy, Task Force Report, February 2012; and OECD, Divided We Stand: Why Inequality Keeps Rising, Country Note: Canada, December 2011
grown to become the more populous group.\textsuperscript{485} Unemployment, underemployment and disengagement will have given rise to an “us versus them” attitude. Marginalized groups will have become organized and vocal; increasingly, Canadians will vote in the streets through disruptive protests and general strikes.\textsuperscript{486}

**Middle-Income Canadians**

An increasing share of wealth concentrated in fewer hands, and a narrowing gap between the lowest paid and those in middle incomes has produced a phenomenon that has been labeled the “hollowing out” of the middle class. In his written submission, Charles Beach indicated that the income share of the bottom quintile, or 20\% of Canadian families “really hasn’t changed much since the late 1970s, the middle three quintile (i.e., middle 60 per cent) shares have generally declined or lost out, and the big winners over this period have been the families in the top quintile share of the distribution.”\textsuperscript{487}

While Professor Beach acknowledged that “work from the late 1990s, done around 2000, showed that there has been some decline in the proportions of families in the middle regions of the income distribution – not as much as in the U.S. – and a corresponding increase towards the upper end,” he argued that in Canada, the issue of a “declining” or “hollowing out” of the middle class is “a bit of a false one.” Instead, he indicated that:

The evidence shows that what is a more important change is that if you look at the average incomes of families’ households in the middle region of the distribution; they have been losing out relative to what has been going on at the top end of the distribution. They just have less income resources to send their kids to school, pay off mortgages […] than was the case a generation ago.\textsuperscript{488}


\textsuperscript{486} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{487} Charles Beach, “Canada’s Hollowing-Out Inequality Rise in an I.T. World,” Written submission to the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology, 2 May 2012, p. 5.

\textsuperscript{488} *Evidence*, 2 May 2012, Charles Beach
Impact on Canadian Cities

There is a sorting process going on of more rigid divisions among people in Canada on the basis of socio-economic status. It was always there, rich and poor, but now it is more rigid and dramatic.

David Hulchanski, Professor and Associate Director, Cities Centre, University of Toronto, Evidence, 14 March 2012

The changes that are taking place in income and wealth distribution are having an impact on the social geography of Canadian cities. David Hulchanski told the committee that:

For 15 to 20 years, urban planners, sociologists and others have been saying that something is happening to cities. Cities have always been divided. There have always been high- and low-income areas and ethnic enclaves. Those are facts. However, now the divisions are more pronounced. The areas of low-income are more numerous and low income and poverty is greater than in the past, and the wealth in the well-off areas is even greater.489

Professor Hulchanski has recently completed studies of Montréal and Vancouver, in which he and his research team have found that, similar to the situation in Toronto, the middle-income group is shrinking and geographic segregation between upper-, middle-, and lower-income citizens is growing.490

Economic Mobility

...there are real systematic pockets of people who no longer feel that they are a part of the big game and that they are going to move forward.491

If you look at the statistics on social mobility among the kinds of people who are in the bottom of the quadrant, none of those people move up, unless they are lucky enough to be an athletic star or a music star.492

Canada [...] does relatively well: moderate levels of inequality, but a great deal of mobility through time. A child’s outcome in life is not determined by his or her family background. Poor people can

489 Ibid.
491 Evidence, 15 March 2012, Ross Hastings.
492 Ibid
escape poverty, and rich people are not necessarily guaranteed to have children that will grow up to be rich in return. That is a sense of the labour market rewarding talents and energies.\textsuperscript{493}

To the extent that income inequality is intensifying along with polarization toward either end of the income scale, the ability to move up the income ladder becomes more important. As long as the gap remains bridgeable and access to higher income levels is feasible, then income inequality may be socially acceptable. As Charles Beach explained:

If all workers systematically progress along a given age-earnings trajectory over their careers, there is less social concern about any degree of earnings inequality in the economy. But if workers are largely stratified within lower, middle, and upper regions of the distribution throughout their careers, the degree of earnings inequality carries a much greater degree of social concern.\textsuperscript{494}

Beach adds that mobility in the labour market is good for the economy because it provides incentives and rewards for advancement as well as penalties for not keeping up. In this regard, Miles Corak explained that a certain amount of inequality is important “...both as an incentive and as an opportunity to increase your economic well-being, and it also has spillovers for economic growth and productivity in our society.”\textsuperscript{495} However, if income gaps become pronounced, and there is diminished opportunity to move from lower to higher incomes, inequality becomes problematic. Professor Corak added a caveat: “A certain amount of inequality in a society and in a labour market is a good thing, but only a certain amount. At a certain point, inequality starts eroding opportunity.”\textsuperscript{496}

Economic mobility can exist for individuals within their own lifetime (intrigenerational mobility) or from one generation to another (intergenerational mobility). To what extent is current income inequality overcome or compensated for by the ability of Canadians to better their economic circumstances? Evidence presented to the committee suggests that while intragenerational economic mobility in Canada is currently problematic, intergenerational mobility remains comparatively robust. Professor Corak highlighted the importance of opportunity in the context of intergenerational mobility, testifying that it is:

\begin{quote}
a type of gradient... The extent to which your earnings in adulthood are associated with your parents’ earnings reflects a whole series of gradients, how your children get a start in life, how healthy they are is all associated with family income background... [T]hat is a
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{493} Evidence, 2 May 2012, Miles Corak.  
\textsuperscript{494} Charles Beach, “How Has Earnings Mobility in Canada Changed,” in David A. Green and Jonathan R. Kesselman, editors, Dimensions of Inequality in Canada, University of British Columbia Press, 2006, p. 102.  
\textsuperscript{495} Evidence, 2 May 2012, Miles Corak.  
\textsuperscript{496} Ibid.
nice indicator of inclusion [...] because it is a marker of our capacity to invest in our children and to let them become all that they could be. If we all feel there is that possibility, then to some extent we can live with the type of inequalities that we face.497

In his research, Professor Corak has compared generational earnings mobility in Canada and the United States and has found that Canada is up to three times more mobile than its neighbor to the South.498 While citizens in both countries place a high value on economic mobility and individual effort, differences in the role of families, labour markets and public policies explain why there is more mobility in Canada. In particular, Corak finds that public policies in Canada compensate for inequalities in family background and the labour market to a greater extent than in the United States.499

In terms of intergenerational economic mobility, Professor Corak indicated that as long as parents are able to obtain the right skills and training for their children, there would be opportunities to benefit from changes in the economy and to move up the income ladder. As he told the committee,

when the labour market is more polarized, and [...] there are bigger returns to having skills, there is a greater incentive and an opportunity for relatively well-to-do parents to focus very much on their children, and they have the wherewithal to do that. Some groups in society can start moving ahead.500

Professor Corak was optimistic, telling the committee that he did not feel that the recent recession:

will erode the life chances of children and the best way of seeing that is in contrast with the United States. If a household goes through a permanent layoff, it suffers a permanent reduction in its economic well-being. It is hard to recover from having a job in a good, solid unionized manufacturing sector and your earnings will

497 Ibid.
499 Ibid.
500 Evidence, 2 May 2012, Miles Corak.
forever be diminished. That did not happen as much in Canada as it did in the U.S.\footnote{Ibid.}

A polarized labour market, however, also has disadvantages, because of the stress it places on families, and the impact that has on families’ ability to help better their children’s future economic prospects.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

[T]here will not be one magic bullet [...] to address these problems [the causes of income inequality].\footnote{Ibid.}

In debates about income inequality, some have suggested increasing taxes on top income earners and enhancing transfers to those at the bottom of the income distribution as a potential solution. In some instances, those who favor this approach have implied that increases in the former could finance enhancements to the latter. However, there is as yet no consensus as to whether such an approach would make a significant difference.

While Miles Corak suggested that some tax exemptions for upper income earners such as the exemption for capital gains from the sale of a principal residence could be eliminated or scaled back,\footnote{Evidence, 2 May 2012, Miles Corak.} both he and Professor Beach stressed that an emphasis should be placed on addressing the underlying causes of growing income disparities. Professor Beach argued that Canada should seek to take advantage of changes in the global economy by making adjustments to training and education:

> It would not make sense [...] to try to fight the changes that are going on. They are much bigger than Canada, and it makes sense to try to ensure that our workers are well placed and can advance and take benefits from these ongoing changes. We should facilitate that.\footnote{Evidence, 2 May 2012, Charles Beach.}

Professor Beach identified three policy directions that should be taken to reduce inequality. The first would be to develop and adhere to sound macroeconomic policy. He told the committee that the “single biggest factor in dealing with inequality issues is to ensure, through monetary and fiscal policy, that the economy is well run and the unemployment rate is brought down in the long run.”\footnote{Ibid.} Secondly, governments should focus on education, training, and upgrading skills, particularly soft skills. The third policy area which governments should turn to is fostering flexibility of labour market adjustment.

---

\footnote{Ibid.}
In terms of a focus on education, Professor Beach indicated that governments should publicize the benefits of post-secondary education (both at the university and community college level) to ensure that youth develop a better awareness of medium-to-long-term opportunities.\textsuperscript{506} In particular, Professor Beach testified that attention should be paid to the role of community and technical colleges in preparing students for labour market participation, indicating that “[c]olleges are considerably more responsive to labour market needs, particularly blue collar needs, than universities.” He added that colleges need to work more closely with universities to provide a smoother transition from the secondary to post-secondary levels, thus giving students a broader range of educational options that better fit their skills and interests.\textsuperscript{507} These suggestions were in alignment with recommendation 1 in the committee’s report \textit{Opening the Door}, which can be found at Appendix B.II of this report.

Professor Corak made similar suggestions, testifying that Canada “can certainly work at the low end of the wage distribution. We can develop more skills that will allow people to move up the value-added chain at the lower end.”\textsuperscript{508} However, Corak argued that these measures would be insufficient by themselves, indicating that Canada needs to “work at the top end as well,”\textsuperscript{509} and suggesting, for example that taxes for those at the upper end of the income scale be increased by eliminating or reducing certain capital gains tax exemptions.\textsuperscript{510}

To assist those at the bottom of the income scale, Miles Corak also suggested that the Working Income Tax Benefit (WITB) be expanded. Introduced by the Government of Canada in 2007, the WITB is a refundable tax credit that benefits Canadians 19 years and older whose annual employment income exceeds $3,000 (too low to be subject to income tax) but falls below a given upper level. The Tax Benefit is intended to assist low-income earners and to provide an incentive to other Canadians to enter the labour force. Budget 2009 increased the initial levels to expand the number of low-income Canadians who benefit from the measure. In 2010, the federal government reported that WITB was providing $1.1 billion annually in benefits to low-income Canadians.\textsuperscript{511}

After reviewing the evidence presented by its witnesses, the committee believes that one of the most effective means of addressing income inequality in Canada is through continuing improvements to education and fostering a better alignment between the educational choices made by Canadians and the medium-to-long term needs of the labour market. These improvements combined with better information made available to young Canadians prior to choosing both the kind of post-secondary educational institute and combination of programs best suited to their needs and abilities, offer the best promise to those seeking to move up the income

\textsuperscript{506} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{507} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{508} Evidence, 2 May 2012, Miles Corak.
\textsuperscript{509} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{510} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{511} Department of Finance, \textit{Budget 2010}, Chapter 3.1, \url{http://www.budget.gc.ca/2010/plan/chap3a-eng.html}
ladder as well as make a meaningful and lasting contribution to the overall economic health of the nation as a whole.

At the same time, measures already taken by the federal government have proven effective in enhancing the financial status of Canadians at the lower end of the income scale. The committee agrees that these efforts to improve the circumstances of low-income earners should continue and therefore recommends:

**RECOMMENDATION 38**

That the Government of Canada consider increasing the value of the Working Income Tax Benefit (WITB) and move toward widening eligibility for the WITB to include all households with earned income below the after-tax low income cut-off (LICO).

The income tax system is one of the most powerful instruments available to the federal government to provide incentives and redistribute wealth. In some instances, tax expenditures are used to encourage growth in certain sectors of the economy. The federal government, for example, currently offers a tax credit to encourage employers to hire apprentices.512

Canada has had an income tax regime at the federal level for over 90 years. During that time, income tax law and regulations have become increasingly complex.

As indicated above, the income tax system has become less effective in reducing income inequalities in Canada since the mid-1990s. In some instances, the income tax system benefits the well-off while there is no equivalent benefit to the disadvantaged. At the same time, non-refundable income tax credits such as the Disability Tax Credit are available only to those with taxable incomes. These credits are thus of no assistance to those at the bottom of the income distribution who pay no income tax.

The most recent review of this regime, the Royal Commission on Taxation (Carter Commission), reported its findings 46 years ago, in 1966. Given its complexity and its declining role in reducing income inequality, the time has come for a public, in-depth review of the income tax system. The committee recommends:

**RECOMMENDATION 39**

That the Government of Canada initiate a review of the Income Tax Act and its application to ensure progressivity and fairness.

---

That in conducting this review, the Government of Canada pay particular attention to the role of the tax system in reducing income inequality, improving the circumstances of low-income Canadians, and stimulating job creation.
APPENDIX A – LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION 1

That the Government of Canada initiate research that will lead to the development of a set of indicators to measure levels of social inclusion and social cohesion in Canada:

a) That the Government of Canada, using these indicators, establish goals for social inclusion and social cohesion in those areas which fall within its responsibilities as set forth under the Canadian Constitution;

b) That the Government of Canada use these indicators, when appropriate, in the design and evaluation of its policies, programs and activities; and

c) That the Government of Canada measure, at regular intervals, the extent to which its policies, programs, and activities are achieving the social inclusion and social cohesion goals it has established, and report the results to the Parliament of Canada.

RECOMMENDATION 2

That the Government of Canada work in partnership with other levels of government to provide support over the long term for initiatives that have, as their objective, enhanced social inclusion and social cohesion; and

That the Government of Canada support efforts by provincial and territorial ministers of education to implement and integrate the importance of social inclusion and acceptance into their educational systems.

RECOMMENDATION 3

That the Government of Canada enhance the availability of the full suite of pre-arrival services provided to immigrants prior to their departure for Canada.

RECOMMENDATION 4

That permanent residents and their dependents between the ages of eighteen and fifty-four, and members of the family class of permanent residents within the same age range be assessed for their skills in one of the two official languages following arrival in Canada;

a) That based on this assessment, those tested be directed to an appropriate level of language training under the Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada (LINC) Program;

b) That enrolment in the Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada (LINC) Program be strongly encouraged for all those falling below a predetermined level of linguistic ability; and

c) That the Government of Canada continue to make improvements to the Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada (LINC) Program. In particular, such improvements should take into consideration those language skills that are work-specific and that
enhance the ability of newcomers to interact with Canadians in ways that facilitate community involvement.

RECOMMENDATION 5
That the Government of Canada employ campaigns explaining the importance of community engagement and to promote volunteerism among immigrant communities.

RECOMMENDATION 6
Where warranted, such as for immigrant women who stay at home to care for young children, that immigrants be granted admission to the Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada program up to five years following arrival regardless of acquisition of Canadian citizenship.

RECOMMENDATION 7
That Citizenship and Immigration Canada expand the number of Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada (LINC) Program sites equipped with child care facilities for pre-school children.

RECOMMENDATION 8
That the Government of Canada initiate efforts to expand the Local Immigration Partnership model beyond the province of Ontario.

RECOMMENDATION 9
That the Government of Canada work with the provincial and territorial governments and municipalities to support programs that identify neighbourhoods at risk and to help provide services and infrastructure to overcome negative effects of enclaves arising from poverty.

RECOMMENDATION 10
That the Government of Canada work in partnership with provincial, territorial and municipal levels of government to promote civic awareness among new Canadians. Such programs should emphasize both the rights and responsibilities of citizens vis-à-vis their communities.

RECOMMENDATION 11
That, as part of the pre-departure services, prospective immigrants be advised when their academic or other credentials do not meet the standards required by Canadian employers.

RECOMMENDATION 12
That the Government of Canada support initiatives that empower members of minority communities to become better represented in federal boards, commissions, and in public office.

RECOMMENDATION 13
That the Government of Canada encourage the provinces and territories to develop a national comprehensive educational policy to challenge and address underlying structural issues such as racism, religious and sexual intolerance, and bullying in schools and society.
RECOMMENDATION 14
That the Government of Canada continue actions to combat racism and discrimination as set forth in Canada’s Action Plan against Racism.

RECOMMENDATION 15
That the Government of Canada accelerate equitable hiring and staffing processes for visible minorities and other designated groups as called for under the federal Public Service Employment Act, and

That the Government of Canada invite employers in federally regulated industries to hire and retain members of the four groups designated under the Employment Equity Act in proportion to their workforce availability.

RECOMMENDATION 16
That the Government of Canada enhance efforts to communicate information regarding the Youth Gang Prevention Fund to national Aboriginal organizations and consult with those organizations regarding the design and opportunities available under the program, with a view to enhancing its overall effectiveness.

RECOMMENDATION 17
That in developing and delivering the Cultural Connections for Aboriginal Youth (CCAY) Program, Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada and the National Association of Friendship Centres work together to ensure that local Aboriginal communities are given a prominent role in shaping the Program to respond to community needs.

RECOMMENDATION 18
That the Government of Canada, in partnership with national Aboriginal organizations and other levels of government, expand the Urban Aboriginal Strategy beyond the thirteen municipalities where it is already in operation.

RECOMMENDATION 19
That the Government of Canada work with national Aboriginal organizations and other levels of government to bring about better coordination and distributional fairness within community steering committees established under the Urban Aboriginal Strategy.

RECOMMENDATION 20
That the Government of Canada continue to work in partnership with Aboriginal Friendship Centres to support transition services for Aboriginal peoples moving to Canadian cities.
RECOMMENDATION 21
That the Government of Canada continue to place an emphasis, in all federal government employment programs or initiatives, on making sure that there are skills training and employment opportunities for Aboriginal youth.

RECOMMENDATION 22
That the Government of Canada continue to work with private sector partners to stimulate efforts to open up employment and skills training opportunities for Aboriginal youth in all sectors of the Canadian economy.

RECOMMENDATION 23
That the Government of Canada, along with provincial/territorial governments, place additional emphasis on working with national Aboriginal organizations to support the development of Aboriginal entrepreneurs, with a focus on new and existing Aboriginal businesses through such activities as business assessments, business and marketing plans, and mentoring for business owners; and

That the Government of Canada, in partnership with national Aboriginal organizations, place additional emphasis on developing Aboriginal human capital, through such measures as arranging full access for Aboriginal peoples for skills development and training specific to their businesses, and the provision of business skills training that would assist Aboriginal entrepreneurs to own and manage a successful business.

RECOMMENDATION 24
That the Government of Canada explore, with provincial and territorial governments, its involvement in the Aboriginal Affairs Working Group.

RECOMMENDATION 25
That the Government of Canada review core funding under the Aboriginal Friendship Centre Program and, where warranted, adjust funding to appropriate levels.

RECOMMENDATION 26
That Human Resources and Skills Development Canada provide information on the resources allocated to, and the outcomes achieved by, the Opportunities Fund for Persons with Disabilities in its annual Departmental Performance Reports tabled in Parliament.

RECOMMENDATION 27
That the Government of Canada, with provincial and territorial partners, monitor implementation of UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Monitoring should include the active involvement of Canadians with disabilities and organizations that represent them, as specified in Article 33.3 of the Convention.
RECOMMENDATION 28
That the Government of Canada, in partnership with provincial and territorial governments, continue to identify and implement measures designed to assist Canadians with disabilities to enter the labour market.

RECOMMENDATION 29
That the Government of Canada use youth-friendly language in materials intended to inform the public and enhance the use of social media for that purpose.

RECOMMENDATION 30
That the Government of Canada work with the provinces and territories to support school-to-work transition programs that increase opportunities in training, co-op, apprenticeship and education programs, and that increase labour mobility to enter the workforce, and also consider tax incentives for companies that hire and invest in young Canadians.

RECOMMENDATION 31
That as part of its efforts to raise public awareness about elder abuse, the Government of Canada devote particular attention to reaching seniors who are living independently or in isolation.

RECOMMENDATION 32
That the Government of Canada recognize sexual minorities as distinct minority groups like other cultural, linguistic, religious, and ethnic communities in all federal programs and policies designed to support minorities; and

That the Government of Canada include identity and gender expression in the hate crime provisions of the Criminal Code of Canada as aggravating circumstances to be taken into consideration at the time of sentencing.

RECOMMENDATION 33
That the Government of Canada support awareness and education programs to combat sexual assault and harassment, including cyber-bullying.

RECOMMENDATION 34
That the Government of Canada support efforts by Canadian police forces to enhance the recruitment and retention of women and members of Canadian minority communities in proportion to their labour market availability.

RECOMMENDATION 35
That the Government of Canada increase the share of its current criminal justice budget that is devoted to crime prevention.
RECOMMENDATION 36
That the Government of Canada increase supports for offenders to decrease recidivism and victimization by offering small incentives for offenders to receive further education and training while incarcerated in order to increase employment options upon release into the community;

That the Government of Canada make mandatory alcohol and substance abuse programs for addicted inmates while incarcerated in federal institutions and then follow up in the community with drug enforcement testing during reintegration; and

That the Government of Canada facilitate and increase access to mental health counseling and programs for offenders to increase successful reintegration in the community.

RECOMMENDATION 37
That the Government of Canada encourage the provinces and territories to identify and develop urban transit strategies;

That the Government of Canada give tax-exempt status for employer-provided transit benefits. This would complement the current federal tax credit for transit pass purchases and encourage employers to support transit commuters financially; and

That the Government of Canada consider additional allocations from the Gas Tax Fund specifically to transit capital investment.

RECOMMENDATION 38
That the Government of Canada consider increasing the value of the Working Income Tax Benefit (WITB) and move toward widening eligibility for the WITB to include all households with earned income below the after-tax low income cut-off (LICO).

RECOMMENDATION 39
That the Government of Canada initiate a review of the Income Tax Act and its application to ensure progressivity and fairness.

That in conducting this review, the Government of Canada pay particular attention to the role of the tax system in reducing income inequality, improving the circumstances of low-income Canadians, and stimulating job creation.
APPENDIX B – RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PREVIOUS REPORTS

I. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM IN FROM THE MARGINS: A CALL TO ACTION ON POVERTY, HOUSING AND HOMELESSNESS

RECOMMENDATION 1

The committee recommends that the federal government adopt as a core social policy poverty eradication goal that all programs dealing with poverty and homelessness are to lift Canadians out of poverty rather than make living within poverty more manageable and that the federal government work with the provinces and territories to adopt a similar goal.

RECOMMENDATION 2

The committee recommends that provincial governments increase current limits on assets for qualifying applicants for the first six to 12 months, to allow those relying on social assistance for short periods of time to retain the assets they need to re-engage in the labour force and regain their economic footing.

RECOMMENDATION 3

The committee recommends that federal government modify all federal income security programs, e.g., Employment Insurance, to better protect Canadians in low-income households who experience short-term gaps in income.

RECOMMENDATION 4

The committee recommends that the federal government establish with the provinces a goal that individuals and families, regardless of the reasons for their need, receive incomes totaling at least after-tax LICOs.

RECOMMENDATION 5

The committee recommends that the federal government publish a Green Paper by 31 December 2010, to include the costs and benefits of current practices with respect to income supports and of options to reduce and eliminate poverty, including a basic annual income based on a negative income tax, and to include a detailed assessment of completed pilot projects on a basic income in New Brunswick and Manitoba.

RECOMMENDATION 6

To demonstrate a federal commitment to adequate minimum wages, the committee recommends that the federal government reinstate a federal minimum wage at $10/hour, indexed to the Consumer Price Index, and that suppliers of goods and services to the federal government be required to pay its employees at least that amount.

RECOMMENDATION 7

The committee recommends that the federal government develop a new program to insure against income losses due to long-term employment interruption that covers those who are not included under the Employment Insurance Act.
RECOMMENDATION 8
The committee recommends that the federal government amend the Employment Insurance Act to provide benefits for a longer period to workers who become unemployed after a long attachment to the workforce, and that the longer benefit period not be based solely on regional unemployment rates.

RECOMMENDATION 9
The committee recommends that the two-week waiting period for Employment Insurance benefits be removed for people who are taking compassionate or parental leave funded through the EI program.

RECOMMENDATION 10
The committee recommends that the federal government re-engineer the Employment Insurance program to allow adjustments to anticipated economic downturns, rather than be based solely on recent but past experience.

RECOMMENDATION 11
The committee recommends that the federal government amend the EI program to extend its parental insurance benefits to self-employed individuals, with premiums assessed similar to those being paid by employees who access this benefit.

RECOMMENDATION 12
The committee recommends that the federal government expand EI sickness benefits over time to 50 weeks, to provide appropriate support for eligible beneficiaries experiencing medium-term illnesses or disabilities.

RECOMMENDATION 13
The committee recommends that the federal government include reinstatement of experience rating for consideration in any redesign or substantial modification to the EI program.

RECOMMENDATION 14
The committee recommends that the federal government make EI-funded training available to those who have contributed to the EI fund over time, but are not eligible for benefits.

RECOMMENDATION 15
The committee recommends that the federal government permit the inclusion of advanced language training and training that could equip those with credentials from other countries to qualify for Canadian recognition be permitted within training funded through the EI program.

RECOMMENDATION 16
The committee recommends that the federal government coordinate a nationwide federal/provincial initiative on early childhood learning.
RECOMMENDATION 17
The committee recommends that federal funding programs and allocations emphasize and support initiatives that keep disadvantaged youth enrolled and engaged in schools, including effective counselling, after-school programs, homework clubs, and youth centres.

RECOMMENDATION 18
The committee recommends that the federal government, in conjunction with the Council of Ministers of Education, encourage and support actions to reduce the drop-out rate, including the establishment of targets and time-lines, with regular reporting on progress.

RECOMMENDATION 19
The committee recommends that federal government, in conjunction with the Council of Ministers of Education, encourage and support actions to reduce the drop-out rates among Aboriginal students, on-reserve or off-reserve, including the establishment of targets and time-lines, with regular reporting on progress.

RECOMMENDATION 20
The committee recommends that the federal government monitor and report on new post-secondary student aid programs, including comparisons with affordability and debt load results of the programs that have been replaced.

RECOMMENDATION 21
To redress the under-representation of low-income people from some groups, e.g., Aboriginal people and people with disabilities, among students in post-secondary education, the committee recommends that the federal government offer additional tax support for post-secondary education targeted to these students and their families.

RECOMMENDATION 22
The committee recommends that the federal government sustain strong financial support for adult and family literacy programs, with a special priority given to groups over-represented among high-school non-completers.

RECOMMENDATION 23
The committee recommends that federal and provincial governments collectively amend existing income security programs to provide secure funding to training participants for long enough periods to ensure opportunities for secure employment at adequate incomes.

RECOMMENDATION 24
The committee recommends that the federal government set aside a fixed percentage of training positions (to match the percentage established for federal employment equity targets) for persons with disabilities in all renewing and new labour market agreements.
RECOMMENDATION 25
The committee recommends that the federal government explicitly identify immigrants as a population to be targeted in training programs, including training to reduce language and other barriers to the labour market in all renewing and new labour market agreements.

RECOMMENDATION 26
In recognition of poverty’s effect on health, the committee recommends that the federal government instruct its central agencies to allocate resources to prevent and address negative health outcomes associated with poverty and unemployment.

RECOMMENDATION 27
The committee recommends that the federal government work with provincial and territorial governments and appropriate other stakeholders to develop a national pharmacare program, building on progress underway in some provinces.

RECOMMENDATION 28
Recognizing the importance of local contexts with respect to identifying and implementing programs to reduce poverty, the committee recommends that federal policy initiatives seek and support local voluntary sector and municipal agencies as active partners in design and delivery of federal government initiatives at the community level.

RECOMMENDATION 29
To facilitate support for local approaches and solutions to complex social and economic problems, the committee recommends that the federal government explore and implement additional Urban Development Agreements among federal, provincial and municipal governments, in concert with community-identified leaders and priorities.

RECOMMENDATION 30
The committee recommends that the federal government establish a fund to allow groups over-represented among the persistently low-income to have legal representation in law reform cases with respect to their human rights.

RECOMMENDATION 31
In recognition of both Canadian obligations under international human rights law, and their importance in claiming access to appropriate programs and services, the committee recommends that the federal government explicitly cite international obligations ratified by Canada in any new federal legislation or legislative amendments relevant to poverty, housing and homelessness.

RECOMMENDATION 32
The committee recommends that the federal government analyze gender-based differences in benefits to men and women when designing and implementing new tax measures.
RECOMMENDATION 33
The committee recommends that the federal government increase the Guaranteed Income Supplement for seniors to ensure that economic households are not below the poverty line as defined by the low income cut-off levels, and that intergovernmental collaboration ensure that such increases do not result in the loss of eligibility for provincial/territorial subsidies or services for seniors.

RECOMMENDATION 34
Recognizing the important contribution the National Child Benefit (NCB) can make to reducing child poverty, the committee recommends that the NCB be raised, incrementally and predictably, to reach $5,000 (in 2009 dollars) by 2012.

RECOMMENDATION 35
The committee recommends that the federal government commit to a schedule of longer term planned increases to the Working Income Tax Benefit to bring recipients at least to the LICO line.

RECOMMENDATION 36
The committee recommends that just as the federal government invests in "shovel-ready" physical infrastructure to combat recession with their provincial counterparts, so too should "shovel-ready" social infrastructure be targeted for investment, specifically housing, income security, and social agencies, whose ability to serve can be quickly enhanced through increased and accelerated investment in the Canada Social Transfer.

RECOMMENDATION 37
The committee recommends that the federal government provide sustained and adequate funding through the Affordable Housing Initiative to increase the supply of affordable housing.

RECOMMENDATION 38
The committee recommends that the federal government issue a White Paper on tax measures to support construction of rental housing in general and affordable rental housing in particular, including the donation of funds, lands or buildings for low-income housing provision.

RECOMMENDATION 39
The committee recommends that the federal government clarify the mandate of Canada Lands Corporation to favour use of surplus federal lands for development of affordable housing and to expedite planning processes to facilitate this use.

RECOMMENDATION 40
The committee recommends that the federal government support the work of local and provincial non-profit housing developers by making housing programs longer term to accommodate five-year development cycles and ten-year planning cycles, and to permit more effective planning at the local and provincial levels.
RECOMMENDATION 41
To assist tenants facing discrimination in housing, the committee recommends the explicit identification of civil legal aid as an element to be supported by the Canada Social Transfer.

RECOMMENDATION 42
The committee recommends that the federal government extend the Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program as a permanent program, increase the budget allocations for this program, and amend eligibility requirements to take into account differential costs for repairs in different communities across Canada, and projects converting housing units for affordable rental accommodation.

RECOMMENDATION 43
The committee supports the use of rent supplements to provide faster access to affordable housing and recommends that the federal government, with provincial housing authorities, private landlords’ associations and non-profit housing providers, assess the impact of portable housing allowances on rents.

RECOMMENDATION 44
The committee recommends that the federal government, in collaboration with provincial governments, representatives of municipal governments, First Nation organizations, and other housing providers, develop a national housing and homelessness strategy to include:

- priorities established by and for each provincial and territory with respect to meeting existing needs for affordable and secure housing;
- a 10-year commitment of funds from the federal government, to include similar commitments from provincial and territorial governments that will receive these funds;
- annual reporting on how the money is being spent, with particular attention to the number of people housed who could not afford to secure housing in the private market;
- a specific focus, with targets and funding commitments, with respect to meeting the needs for affordable housing for urban Aboriginal peoples;
- a simpler, more integrated application process for funds, cutting across programs related to housing funded at the federal level;
- the integration of the Homelessness Partnering Initiative, with an expanded mandate and budget to support combined local housing and homelessness plans and the initiatives identified in them; and
- a thorough evaluation at the end of the 10-year period to assess achievements and continuing gaps.

RECOMMENDATION 45
The committee recommends that federal funding focussed on homelessness be sustained until a combined strategy on housing and homelessness is developed to guide federal investment.
RECOMMENDATION 46
The committee recommends that the federal government, with provincial and territorial governments and health researchers across Canada, provide funding for physical health services for people who are homeless.

RECOMMENDATION 47
The committee recommends that the Homelessness Partnering Strategy be expanded to play a greater coordinating role within the federal government, engaging all departments and agencies with a mandate that includes housing and homelessness, especially for those groups over-represented among those in need.

RECOMMENDATION 48
The committee recommends that the federal government provide financial incentives to encourage communities already supported through the Homelessness Partnering Strategy to use a 10-year time horizon in adjusting and renewing their community plans.

RECOMMENDATION 49
The committee recommends that the federal government continue to provide direct funding for and continued support of related research and knowledge dissemination about a “housing first” approach to eliminating homelessness.

RECOMMENDATION 50
The committee recommends that the federal government, at the next meeting of the Federal-Provincial-Territorial Ministers of Labour, take a leadership role in encouraging a harmonization of provincial and territorial workers’ compensation programs.

RECOMMENDATION 51
The committee recognizes the importance of support services for persons with disabilities entering jobs, and that these supports are often lost when employment earnings begin. Therefore, the committee recommends that provincial and territorial governments extend these supports for up to 12 months following employment to persons with disabilities leaving social assistance, and that these governments negotiate with employers to provide these supports indefinitely for those earning low incomes.

RECOMMENDATION 52
The committee recommends that the Government make the Disability Tax Credit refundable.

RECOMMENDATION 53
The committee recommends that the federal government develop and implement a basic income guarantee at or above LICO for people with severe disabilities.

RECOMMENDATION 54
The committee recommends that provincial and territorial governments use the savings realized in social assistance spending with the introduction of the basic income guarantee for people with severe disabilities
to redesign and enhance delivery of disability supports to all persons with disabilities, regardless of the source of their incomes.

**RECOMMENDATION 55**

The committee recommends that the federal government sustain and increase the funding for the Opportunities Fund for persons with disabilities, with a clear mission to address barriers to the labour force.

**RECOMMENDATION 56**

The committee recommends that all provincial and territorial governments amend their social assistance legislation to exempt savings under the Disability Savings Plan from any asset depletion requirements with respect to qualifications for or benefits from social assistance and social services programs.

**RECOMMENDATION 57**

Until mainstream training programs provide training opportunities for persons with disabilities proportionate to their representation in the population, the committee recommends that the federal government extend and expand funding for such training through the Labour Market Agreements for Persons with Disabilities.

**RECOMMENDATION 58**

The committee recommends that federal government work with provincial governments and social housing providers to take the necessary steps to provide larger housing units to larger families.

**RECOMMENDATION 59**

The committee recommends that the federal government develop a tax credit for employers who hire newcomers for their first job in their field or area of expertise.

**RECOMMENDATION 60**

The committee recommends that the federal government reduce the immigration sponsorship period from 10 years to three years similar to the regulations pertaining to conjugal sponsorship, and make a commensurate reduction in the residency requirement for entitlement to a monthly pension under the *Old Age Security Act*.

**RECOMMENDATION 61**

The committee recommends that the federal government extend eligibility for the resettlement assistance program for refugees to two years for regular cases and to four years for joint assistance sponsorships.

**RECOMMENDATION 62**

The committee recommends that the federal government establish a repayment schedule and loan forgiveness program for travel loan repayment by government-sponsored refugees, that takes into account the time needed to integrate and the household income upon employment.
RECOMMENDATION 63
The committee recommends that the federal government accelerate its work with provincial governments and other relevant agencies to complete and implement a framework leading to the recognition of qualifications from other countries, and report annually to Parliament on its progress.

RECOMMENDATION 64
The committee recommends that the federal government support bridging programs, especially for immigrants with professional qualifications from their countries of origin, through immigrant settlement funds and agreements.

RECOMMENDATION 65
The committee recommends that the federal government provide on-going subsidies to off-reserve, non-profit Aboriginal housing providers for new and existing units to ensure increased supply of affordable housing.

RECOMMENDATION 66
The committee recommends that the Urban Aboriginal Strategy be used as a platform for greater investment and collaboration in addressing the poverty and housing problems facing urban Aboriginal peoples.

RECOMMENDATION 67
The committee recommends that the federal government continue and expand targeted funding and programming for training and employment supports for urban Aboriginal peoples, and their organizations, where appropriate.

RECOMMENDATION 68
The committee recommends that the federal government require an Aboriginal working group to identify priorities for urban Aboriginal people and designated funding for this purpose within all federal funding to communities to address housing and homelessness.

RECOMMENDATION 69
The committee recommends that the federal government review and revise grants and contributions reporting requirements among federal departments and agencies to enhance horizontal and vertical coordination of reporting and encourage multi-year funding among federal granting agencies, where problems that programs are addressing are persistent and longer term.

RECOMMENDATION 70
The committee recommends that the federal government recognize and stabilize the contribution of voluntary sector organizations with respect to poverty, housing and homelessness, by budgeting adequate support for these organizations to accomplish not only the delivery of government-funded services, but also the community-building activities that only this sector can provide.
RECOMMENDATION 71
The committee recommends that federal government use grants and contributions to fund community-based organizations to provide innovative solutions, to share innovation, and where appropriate to replicate successful community-based initiatives involved in poverty reduction, housing affordability, and supporting homeless people.

RECOMMENDATION 72
The committee recommends that federal and provincial governments, acting internally, bilaterally and/or multilaterally, review current policies and programs and new initiatives in the context of eliminating and avoiding both gaps and duplication, through a whole-of-government approach to poverty, housing and homelessness issues.

RECOMMENDATION 73
The committee recommends that the federal government continue and expand support to Statistics Canada for the collection, analysis and more affordable dissemination of data important to the evaluation and improvement of social programs with respect to poverty, housing and homelessness.

RECOMMENDATION 74
The committee recommends that the federal government continue to support knowledge exchange with respect to poverty, housing and homelessness.
II. SELECT RECOMMENDATIONS FROM *OPENING THE DOOR: REDUCING BARRIERS TO POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION IN CANADA*

RECOMMENDATION 3

The committee recommends that the federal government work with the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada, to improve the information about post-secondary education to Canadians, including primary and secondary school students and their parents, and that the information provided include the following:

- The costs and benefits of obtaining a post-secondary diploma or degree;
- The information about financial assistance, including eligibility criteria as well as the terms of loan repayment and repayment; and
- An overview of the complete range of educational programs available, including trade schools, apprenticeships, and college and university programs.

RECOMMENDATION 7

The committee recommends that the Government of Canada work with First Nations to improve educational outcomes for students on reserve, by building on actions that have proven successful such as concluding tripartite agreements, to ensure that supports for First Nations students, including on reserve school funding, focuses on the shared goal of improved educational outcomes.

RECOMMENDATION 8

The committee recommends that the federal government evaluate its aid to Aboriginal post-secondary programs and institutions, including skills training, and consult with organizations that represent Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal post-secondary institutions in order to determine whether or not the allocation to ISSP is adequate to develop a funding method for the Program that is based on the genuine financial needs of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal post-secondary institutions.

RECOMMENDATION 9

The committee recommends that the 2% cap on funding increases for post-secondary education programs administered by Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada in effect since 1996 be reviewed immediately such that the funds allocated to the Post-Secondary Student Support Program reflect the real needs of Aboriginal Students and are administered through an open, transparent and fully accountable distribution mechanism.
RECOMMENDATION 10

The committee recommends that the federal government invite national Aboriginal organizations, Aboriginal student groups, and Aboriginal students to formally participate in an evaluation of the Post-Secondary Student Support Program through an advisory committee.

RECOMMENDATION 11

The committee recommends that the federal government consider ways to ensure Métis and non-status First Nations have access to post-secondary training, and include consideration of the creation of a national scholarship and bursary fund for Métis and for non-status First Nations.
II. SELECT RECOMMENDATION FROM TIME FOR TRANSFORMATIVE CHANGE: A REVIEW OF THE 2004 CANADA HEALTH ACCORD

RECOMMENDATION 19

That the federal, provincial, and territorial governments develop and implement a strategy for continuing care in Canada, which would integrate home-, facility-based long-term, respite and palliative-care services fully within health-care systems. The strategy would establish clear targets and indicators in relation to access, quality and integration of these services and would require governments to report regularly to Canadians on results.
## APPENDIX C – WITNESSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wednesday, February 2, 2011</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As an individual</td>
<td>Fran Klodawsky, Associate Professor, Carleton University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maytree Foundation</td>
<td>Ratna Omidvar, President</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thursday, February 3, 2011</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada West Foundation</td>
<td>Robert Vineberg, Senior Fellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Immigration Policy Reform</td>
<td>Martin Collacott, Spokesperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship and Immigration Canada</td>
<td>Deborah Tunis, Director General, Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation of Canadian Municipalities</td>
<td>Ben Henderson, Chair, Standing Committee on Social-Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSIGNIS Strategic Research Inc.</td>
<td>David Harris, Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics Canada</td>
<td>Garnett Picot, Senior Analyst, Social Analysis Division</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wednesday, February 9, 2011</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| As Individual              | Zheng Wu, Professor of Sociology, University of Victoria  
                             | Stephanie Gaudet, Associate Professor, Dept. of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Ottawa |
| City of Edmonton           | John Reilly, Office of Diversity and Inclusion |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thursday, February 10, 2011</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As an individual</td>
<td>Lori Wilkinson, Associate Professor, Dept. of Sociology, University of Manitoba</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| BC Construction Association | Manley McLachlan, President  
<pre><code>                         | Randy Garon, Provincial Manager, Skilled Trades Employment Program |
</code></pre>
<p>| Center for Immigration Policy Reform | James Bissett, Member of the Advisory Board |
| Citizenship and Immigration Canada | Corinne Prince-St-Amant, Director General, Foreign Credential Referrals Office |
| Human Resources and Skills Development Canada | Jean-François LaRue, Director General, Labour Market Integration |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Thursday, February 17, 2011</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| As an individual              | Paul Bramadat, Director, Centre for Studies in Religion and Society, University of Victoria  
Kristopher Wells, Researcher, Institute for Sexual Minority Studies and Services, University of Alberta |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Wednesday, March 2, 2011</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assembly of First Nations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Congress of Aboriginal Peoples| Betty Ann Lavallée, National Chief  
Randy Martin, National Bilateral Director |
| Indian and Northern Affairs Canada | Allan MacDonald, Director General, Office of the Federal Interlocutor  
Denis Carignan, Director, Office of the Federal Interlocutor, Saskatchewan |
| Metis National Council        | David Chartrand, Vice-President |
| Statistics Canada             | Jane Badets, Director General, Census Subject Matter, Social and Demographic Statistics Branch  
Cathy Connors, Assistant Director, Social & Aboriginal Statistics |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Wednesday, February 8, 2012</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Congress of Aboriginal Peoples| Jerry Peltier, National Advisor  
Dwight Dorey, National Vice Chief  
Angela Mojak, National ASETS Advisor |
| City of Edmonton              | Leona Carter, Director, Aboriginal Relations Office, Community Services |
| National Association of Friendship Centres | Jeffrey Cyr, Executive Director |
| Saskatoon Tribal Council      | Larry Cachene, Chief,  
Yellow Quill First Nation |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Wednesday, February 15, 2012</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| As individuals                | Caroline Andrew, Director, Centre on Governance, University of Ottawa  
Dr. Sandeep Kumar Agrawal, Graduate Program Director, School of Urban and Regional Planning, Ryerson University |
| Canadian Council on Social Development | Peggy Taillon, President & CEO  
Katherine Scott, Vice-President, Research |
<p>| Canadian Urban Transit Association | Alain Mercier, Board Member |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wednesday, March 7, 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Council of Canadians with Disabilities | Tony Dolan, Chairperson  
Vangelis, Nikias, Project Manager |
| International Institute for Child Rights and Development | Natasha Blanchet-Cohen,  
Assistant Professor,  
Applied Human Sciences |
| Metro Toronto Chinese & Southeast Asian Legal Clinic | Avvy Go, Director |
| Seniors For Seniors | Peter Cook, President |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thursday, March 8, 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Canada</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Statistics Canada | Julie McAuley, Director, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics  
John Turner, Chief of Analysis, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics  
Mia Dauvergne, Senior Analyst, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics |
| Canadian Resource Centre for Victims of Crime | Heidi Illingworth, Executive Director |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wednesday, March 14, 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| As individuals | David Hulchanski, Professor and Associate Director, Cities Centre, University of Toronto  
Irvin Waller, Full Professor, Department of Criminology, University of Ottawa  
Ross Hastings, Professor, Department of Criminology, University of Ottawa |
| Federation of Canadian Municipalities | Karen Leibovici, First Vice-President |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wednesday, May 2, 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| As individuals | Charles Beach, Professor of Economics, Department of Economics, Queen's University  
Miles Corak, Professor of Economics, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Ottawa |
APPENDIX D – PROMISING PRACTICES

Over the course of this study, the committee asked witnesses to identify practices that show the promise of advancing social inclusion and cohesion. These practices demonstrate some common characteristics, among them, collaboration among stakeholders, initiative and innovation, and a focus on local efforts that involve the participation of those who are themselves at risk of social exclusion. The following are among the practices reported by witnesses:

*The City of Edmonton’s Diversity Reviews*

A major inclusion challenge involves the non-participation of excluded groups in decision-making bodies such as boards of directors and institutions. To counteract this form of exclusion, some municipalities conduct diversity audits of their voluntary bodies. This is done, for example, by the City of Edmonton which reviews its voluntary boards and commissions to evaluate the extent to which members of excluded groups are involved in membership. John Reilly of the City of Edmonton’s office of Diversity and Inclusion testified that Edmonton “recognized that we want to do a better job of connecting with groups that are not necessarily represented on those boards and commission groups.”

*Centretown Citizens’ Ottawa Corporation (CCOC), Ottawa*

Professors Fran Klodawsky and Caroline Andrew identified the Centretown Citizens’ Ottawa Corporation (CCOC) as a promising practice. The CCOC is a non-profit housing corporation that was formed in 1975 with $500 in the bank. It now owns approximately 1,800 units located in more than 50 properties. The Corporation has a broad-based governance structure and encourages its tenants (who have mixed incomes, cultural backgrounds, and come from all age groups) to participate in its community structures. Its core principle is that everyone should have control over their housing.

The CCOC represents an illustration of the achievements that can result from an inclusive decision-making and planning process. It also serves as an example of one of the means that can be used in order to build bonding and bridging social capital, helping its residents and volunteers develop skills that are useful in numerous other arenas.

*Social and Economic Immigrant Integration*

During its hearings devoted to the social and economic inclusion of immigrants, the committee’s witnesses identified many promising practices. The following sections present these examples arranged according to those that encourage social inclusion, social inclusion specific to immigrant women, and economic inclusion. The final section provides examples of initiatives that seek to accomplish both social and economic inclusion.

---

Social Inclusion

The Thorncliffe Neighbourhood Office, Toronto (TNO)

TNO is a community based, multicultural centre. TNO provides a wide variety of programs and services including information and referral, a family violence program, women’s counselling, settlement services and language training for newcomers, employment assistance, youth services and community information workshops and seminars. Professor Sandeep Kumar Agrawal told the committee that the “TNO has been very active in deciphering the needs and wants of the community. It has been able to deliver a number of programs geared towards women whose husbands may work elsewhere [---] or kids who need help with the English language...”\(^{515}\)

The Coalition of Community Health and Resource Centres, Ottawa (CCHRC)

The CCHRC is a coalition of 14 multi-service health and resource community centres in Ottawa. Coalition members recognize the importance of responding to diverse needs and of focusing attention on those in their communities who are most vulnerable and at risk. This promising practice was identified by Caroline Andrew, who told the committee that the Coalition has been “flexible about changing demographics and changing programs.”\(^{516}\)

Multicultural Liaison Officer (MLO) Program, Ottawa

The MLO Program was pioneered by the Ottawa Community Immigrant Services Organization (OCISO) in 1991. The Program’s objective is to address the settlement and integration needs of immigrant and refugee children and their families in local schools. Liaison Officers work with teachers, school administrators, children and parents to help them take the needs of immigrant and refugee children into account. The Program has now spread to all major Ontario cities and has won awards from Citizenship and Immigration Canada and the Canadian Council on Race Relations. Caroline Andrew testified that the MLO Program “was an Ottawa innovation saying we needed to couple specific workers who knew about immigration with the school system. It is now a very successful program going into both libraries and schools.”\(^{517}\)

Immigrant Women

City for All Women, Ottawa

Professors Klodawsky and Andrew pointed to City for All Women, Ottawa as a promising practice. Professor Klodawsky indicated that City for All Women is a community-based group whose “aim is to strengthen the capacity of the full diversity of women and the City of Ottawa to


\(^{517}\) Evidence, 8 March 2012, Caroline Andrew, p. 30.
work in partnership to create a more inclusive city and promote gender equality. In one of this organization’s projects, women from a wide variety of backgrounds received training as focus group facilitators. One of their assignments was to lead group discussions about recreation programs within the city. As a result, city staff who was working to prepare a new recreation master plan were able to draw on insights from residents who had not previously been heard from on these matters.”

Provision of Child Support Services

Stéphanie Gaudet gave the example of the Mile-End neighbourhood in Montréal where a school at which child-care services are offered have been opened to immigrant women with children on Saturdays. She told the committee that:

“The decision was made to open the neighbourhood school on Saturday mornings, and the social stakeholders, social workers groups take care of the children. That enables the children to play, while the women cope with incredible obligations. The ones who work often have jobs with unusual schedules and very heavy family responsibilities. First, they have to be freed of their children and, second, offered a place where they can receive services, and they also have to be helped to understand the organizations in which they could get involved. That has to be done in their daily lives. It has to be much more informal in the sense that they will not necessarily go and get involved in political organizations or in the municipalities and so on; they do not necessarily have the time to do that. But I think this has to be done in actual life; opportunities have to be created where they can be helped, but with their children. Ultimately, child care is the barrier to engagement.”

Professor Gaudet identified schools as ideal locales for fostering greater social inclusion for immigrant women with children, an observation in which Mr. Reilly of the City of Edmonton concurred, particularly if childcare services are provided.

Economic Inclusion of Recent Immigrants

Witnesses identified the following examples of promising practices that promote the appropriate inclusion of immigrants in the Canadian economy at the municipal level:

Edmonton Region Immigrant Employment Council (ERIEC), Edmonton

John Reilly identified the Edmonton Region Immigrant Employment Council (ERIEC) as a promising practice. The Council, created by the City of Edmonton in cooperation with the

---

518 Evidence, 2 February 2011, Fran Klodawsky; Evidence, 8 March 2012, Caroline Andrew, p. 19.
519 Evidence, 9 February 2011, Stéphanie Gaudet
Edmonton Economic Development Corporation) works to ensure that immigrants are able to find jobs that match their education and work experience.520

**City of Edmonton – Recruitment of Immigrants for City Jobs**

Edmonton’s Human Resources Department operates immigrant internship and mentorship programs that have helped increase the number of recent immigrants working for the City and have helped newcomers find employment commensurate with their education and work experience.521

**The Association of Canadian Community Colleges (ACCC) – Canadian Immigrant Integration Program**

The Association of Canadian Community Colleges (ACCC), with funding from the Government of Canada, has developed the Canadian Immigration Integration Program (CIIP). The CIPP prepares newcomers for economic integration in Canada prior to departure from their countries of origin. The Program began as a pilot project in 2007, and is now a three-year initiative being delivered during 2010. Deborah Tunis informed the committee that the “ACCC is working on attempts to do individual needs assessments and to be straight with newcomers overseas about some of the challenges they will face.”522

**Assisting Local Leaders with Immigrant Employment Strategies (ALLIES)**

Funded by the Maytree and J.W. McConnell Family Foundations, Assisting Local Leaders with Immigrant Employment Strategies, or ALLIES, supports local efforts in Canada to adapt and establish programs that advance appropriate employment for skilled immigrants. ALLIES brings together stakeholders to develop these programs and gives funding and other resources to immigrant employment councils that are led by local employers. The councils also include community organizations, post-secondary institutions, assessment service providers, labour, immigrant professional associations and representation from all three levels of government.523

Deborah Tunis, of Citizenship and Immigration Canada, identified ALLIES as a promising practice, stating that “Ms. Omidvar's work with ALLIES [...] with Immigrant Employment Strategies, to secure representation on boards is terrific work.”524

**S.U.C.C.E.S.S. - Active Engagement and Integration Project, Vancouver**

The Active Engagement and Integration Project is the first overseas project from S.U.C.C.E.S.S. With funding from Citizenship and Immigration Canada, the project supports the

---

524 Evidence, 3 February 2011, Deborah Tunis
settlement, adaptation and integration of skilled workers, members of the family class, and live-in caregivers from South Korea and Taiwan into Canadian Society. The project includes pre-departure services such as group orientation, workshops, and active engagement case management. Client resources include: a support line, referrals, a resource centre, and a virtual resource centre. After clients have attended orientation sessions prior to their departure for Canada, they are given links to workshops on topics such as labour market employment, foreign credential recognition, health and medical services, and education and training they may need to bring their employment skills up to Canadian requirements.

Debora Tunis indicated that Citizenship and Immigration Canada has “funded SUCCESS for the last three years and have committed to funding for 2011-12. The preliminary things I have been seeing are very promising in terms of getting the settlement service providers in Canada connected and understanding the needs of newcomers before they arrive.”

The Toronto Region Immigrant Employment Council (TRIEC), Toronto

John Reilly identified the Toronto Regional Immigrant Employment Council as a promising practice. TRIEC helps develop relationships amongst major corporate leaders and public institutions where there is a need for highly educated and highly skilled workers. Then it begins to develop intelligence and research work on the kinds of labour force opportunities we have, in terms of the people living in the city.

Toronto Regional Immigrant Employment Council – Mentoring Partnership

Mr. Reilly identified the Mentoring Partnership, a program delivered by the Toronto Region Immigrant Employment Council, as an example of a promising practice. The Mentoring Partnership brings together recent skilled immigrants and established professionals in occupation-specific mentoring relationships.

Now operating for over five years in the Greater Toronto Region, the Mentoring Partnership has facilitated over 5,000 mentoring relationships between skilled immigrants and established Canadian professionals. Since the launch of the program, over 50 organizations have offered The Mentoring Partnership to their staff as an opportunity to enhance their leadership and coaching competencies, and develop their cross-cultural skills.

The Skilled Trades Employment Program (STEP), British Columbia

Mr. Randy Garon, Provincial Manger of the Skilled Trades Employment Program, and Mr. Manley McLachlan, President of the British Columbia Construction Association, provided the committee with details of the STEP (the Program) initiative. In 2006, the Canadian Construction Sector Council (CSC) and the British Columbia Construction Association (BCCA) created the Immigrant Skills Training Employment Program (ISTEP) as a pilot with funding from the federal government’s Foreign Credential Recognition (FCR) Program. ISTEP was aimed at skilled immigrants who were seen as an underutilized and underrepresented labour pool that

would help resolve the labour shortages that existed in the B.C. construction industry in 2006. ISTEP used job coaches, or Trade Employment Specialists, with experience in construction trades and who knew what employers were looking for. The coaches would then locate, screen, and perform trades assessments on potential employees, whom they would either place in jobs or refer to other agencies for additional training. Once an immigrant was placed in a job, the coach would continue to act as a liaison between employee and employer. The Program operated between 2006 and 2010, achieving 4,962 points of contact with employers and finding construction employment for 1,051 immigrants. ISTEP has since become the Skilled Trades Employment Program which operates under a provincial Labour Market Agreement. Mr. McLachlan testified that the Program is a “fully expandable model that can be expanded incrementally into existing infrastructure, without duplicating overhead costs for expansion.”

**Social and Economic Inclusion of Immigrants**

Frequently, measures to facilitate the inclusion of recent immigrants accomplish both goals of achieving better social and economic integration. The City of Edmonton is one of the leaders in this respect.

**Multicultural Health Brokers Co-operative Ltd., Edmonton**

The Multicultural Health Brokers Cooperative Ltd is a group of 54 health brokers that represent 22 cultural and linguistic communities in Edmonton and serves 2,000 families in Edmonton yearly. The brokers own the Cooperative and assist their clients in making connections with Canada’s health, social services, education, justice, immigration and employment support systems.

Mr. Reilly told the committee that the Co-operative “was originally designed to help support immigrant access to the health sector, but they now provide supportive access to all kinds of different projects and programs.” Mr. Reilly indicated, in addition, that this co-operative as the kind of non-profit organization that could provide specialized support to immigrant women with children.

**Initiatives by the City Edmonton**

The City of Edmonton determined that immigration and settlement was a strategic priority in 2005. In 2007, the city adopted an Immigration and Settlement Policy to provide guidance to its departments and to serve as the basis for collaborative work with community organizations. The city has established an Office of Diversity and Inclusion and tasked it with creating programs to attract and retain immigrants. The Office has as its goals to:

a) Have a workforce broadly reflective of the community;

---

526 Evidence, 10 February 2011, Manley McLachlan; The Skilled Trades and Employment Program (STEP), [http://www.stepbc.ca/](http://www.stepbc.ca/)


b) Identify and address barriers within organizational systems;

c) Attract and retain a talented workforce skilled at working in an inclusive and respectful manner with one another and the community; and

d) Create processes, policies plans, practices programs and services that meet the diverse needs of those [the City] serves.529

Programs implemented by the City include:

a) a grants and space rental subsidy to support groups for newly arrived immigrants;
b) an Immigrant Internship Program530;
c) the publication of a newcomer guide to services; and
d) a recognition program that honours immigrant contributions to the economic, social and cultural life of the city.531

The City has worked with the Edmonton Economic Development Corporation (EEDC), local employers and others in the community to create the Edmonton Region Immigrant Employment Council (ERIEC) in 2008.532

Edmonton has also added municipal staff to support capacity-building with immigrant and refugee groups and engage in policy and program planning.533 In addition, the City has developed a detailed Diversity and Inclusion Framework and Implementation Plan to guide the development of a diverse and inclusive workforce in its own departments. Besides drawing upon the talent and experience of recent immigrants, the goal of the plan is to create a workplace that is representative and reflective of the communities served by the City.

John Reilly identified several initiatives taken by Edmonton to “support the social, economic and political integration of immigrants.” He indicated that these efforts are paying off: “The number of immigrants choosing Edmonton as their destination city is increasing, and feedback from our immigrant communities shows that these communities have a deep appreciation for the engagement that [the City is] providing at the community level.”534. Initiatives mentioned by Mr. Reilly included:

530 John Reilly indicates that the human resource consultant hired by the City to create a workforce more reflective of the population has hosted eight interns in Edmonton’s Human Resources Branch and Transportation Department. Several interns now have permanent positions with the City. Reilly, 2009, p. 157.
531 Federation of Canadian Municipalities, 2009, p. 15.
533 Federation of Canadian Municipalities, 2009, p. 15.
534 Evidence, 9 February 2011, John Reilly
Immigration and Settlement Policy

The first of its kind in Canada, the City of Edmonton’s Immigration and Settlement Policy draws on best practices already in place in Toronto and has influenced the creation of a similar policy in Calgary (Welcoming Community Policy). 535

Move to Edmonton Website

Edmonton Economic Development Corporation’s “Move to Edmonton” website has attracted over one hundred thousand visitors in its first year of operation.536 The site provides information on educational and employment opportunities in Edmonton and first hand accounts by people who have moved to the city. Maps of the city, videos, and contact information are also included.

City of Edmonton – Immigrant and Settlement Community Gatherings

Every two years, the City of Edmonton hosts an Immigration and Settlement Community Gathering which brings together more than 150 participants. Mr. Reilly told the committee that the Gatherings are a consistent forum where immigrants become familiar with City services and provide feedback on how to improve and make City services more available and accessible. He labeled this initiative as the “most successful” of all of the measures taken by Edmonton. According to Mr. Reilly, the City

“made a clear commitment in the ethno-cultural and immigrant groups we engaged with in the early going who asked for some kind of ongoing way to connect with the city's administration and with our political leaders. That is why we developed our Immigration and Settlement Community Gatherings.”537

The Newcomers’ Guide

The City of Edmonton publishes a 32-page Newcomers Guide in nine languages with information relevant to recent immigrants, and operates the Citizen and New Arrival Information Centre at City Hall. The Centre and the City’s 3-1-1 information service provide a telephone based language interpretation line that can provide service in more than 170 languages and our libraries are emerging as important hubs where newcomers seek information on their new homes.538

536 City of Edmonton, Move to Edmonton, website: http://www.edmonton.com/moving-to-edmonton.aspx
**Visible Minorities**

John Reilly identified a practice that helps combat and reduce discrimination and racism directed towards members of Canada’s visible minority communities.

**Canadian Coalition of Municipalities against Racism and Discrimination/Racism Free Edmonton**

As Jean-Claude Icart, Micheline Labelle, and Rachad Antonius observe, cities and metropolises in Canada and other countries “have clearly sensed a need to develop their own policies” to combat the inequalities, racism, and discrimination that can often accompany growing diversity.539

The City of Edmonton is a member of the Canadian Coalition of Municipalities against Racism and Discrimination and implemented the Racism Free Edmonton initiative, a partnership of 14 institutions and organizations working toward the elimination of racism and creation of a more culturally inclusive city. The City receives federal support for this initiative through Citizenship and Immigration Canada. Mr. Reilly told the committee that

“[t]he Racism Free Edmonton partners’ commitment to creating full inclusion of all of the city’s multicultural communities has helped stimulate an important dialogue among immigrants and First Nations, Métis, Inuit and other non-status Aboriginal people about the impacts of racism on their respective communities.”540

The Canadian Coalition of Municipalities against Racism and Discrimination (CMARD) has over 42 member cities and municipalities. The Coalition is an initiative launched in 2007 by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and is part of an international commission, also formed by UNESCO. The Canadian Coalition receives support from the Federation of Canadian Municipalities as well as the Canadian Race Relations Foundation, the National Association of Friendship Centres, and several provincial human rights commissions.541

**Religious Minorities**

**Teaching Ethics and Religious Culture in Quebec Schools**

Following several years of consultation with teachers, academic experts, and parents, and field testing in five elementary and three secondary schools, Québec’s Ministère de l’Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport introduced a mandatory Ethics and Religious Culture Program into all elementary and secondary schools in the province. Under the Course, students are encouraged to

---


understand the phenomenon of religion by practicing, in a spirit of openness, dialogue that is oriented toward contributing to community life.”

Dr. Bramadat identified this Course as a promising practice, telling the committee that it:

“is an illustration of open secularism because Quebec has many concerns about religious diversity in the public arena, especially in the official context of the public arena; yet it is the province, the culture, the nation, if you will, that has adopted the most interesting, rigorous, experimental approach to dealing with what I would call the real problem of religious illiteracy, and it is a real problem.”

Aboriginal Canadians

Economic Inclusion and Business Development

The Canadian Council for Aboriginal Business (CCAB)

Dwight Dorey told the committee that the CCAB has “a large membership of successful Aboriginal businesses [...] they provide a role model to young entrepreneurs for all the Aboriginal communities, and it is one that they are having [...] some success with.” The CCAB brings together businesspeople from the Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal communities to share and enhance mutual knowledge of effective business practices.

Service Delivery

The Yellow Quill First Nation

The Yellow Quill First Nation, part of the Saskatoon Tribal Council, has opened offices in Regina where it is dealing with a range of issues. Larry Cachene, Chief of the Yellow Quill First Nation, stated that “[W]e need to start engaging our Aboriginal people in the city to take part in learning and training that is available....” He added that Yellow Quill is “fortunate with social workers that are coming from our community that are helping in our urban office development.” The committee believes that this is an excellent example of Aboriginal Canadians relying on their own initiative and resources to develop community reliance and is therefore identifying it as a promising practice that warrants emulation.

Municipal Governments

“Assimilation is not something we try to do. We try to integrate.”

544 Evidence, 2 February 2012, Dwight Dorey
545 Evidence, 2 February 2012, Larry Cachene.
546 Evidence, 9 February 2012, Leona Carter
City of Edmonton Initiatives

The City of Edmonton is engaged in a number of promising practices that have, as their goal, better social and economic inclusion for its Aboriginal citizens. Prior to the mid-1990s there was limited municipal engagement with Edmonton’s Aboriginal peoples. In the mid-1990s, Edmonton City Council appointed the first Edmonton urban Aboriginal affairs committee. Leona Carter testified that

“[t]his strong commitment from our elected officials continues through our mayor and council today. This commitment led to a collaborative initiative to engage the Aboriginal community in a meaningful dialogue process and subsequent groundbreaking relationship building and new ways of working together.” 547

The City of Edmonton’s commitment to working with the Aboriginal community is embodied in a declaration by the City Council, Strengthening Relationships between the City of Edmonton and the Urban Aboriginal Peoples Agreement issued in 2006, which was used as the basis for the City’s Urban Aboriginal Accord. 548 Subsequently, the City has established a human resources Aboriginal outreach consultant position, a tripartite Aboriginal workforce participation initiative, and an Aboriginal Relations Office, the first municipality in Canada to have such an office. Edmonton has included indigenous concepts in the city’s strategic plans, The Way Ahead of 2009, 549 and The Way We Live, the City’s 10-year strategic plan that focuses on the municipal government’s role in creating and fostering a diverse and inclusive city. 550 According to testimony from Leona Carter

“The city’s administration priorities include improved relationships with the Aboriginal community, improved hiring and retention of Aboriginal people in the city workforce, improved delivery of city mandated services to Aboriginal people and supportive community development initiatives, supportive council-appointed Edmonton Aboriginal Affairs Committee and supportive councils of Aboriginal initiatives.” 551

Ms. Carter emphasized the importance of collaborative and cooperative efforts between the City, Aboriginal groups and other levels of government in bringing about successful social and economic inclusion for Edmonton’s Aboriginal citizens. She told the committee that the City has “worked closely, and we think well, with administration counterparts in both Alberta Aboriginal

547 Evidence, 9 February 2012, Leona Carter.
551 Evidence, 9 February 2012, Leona Carter.
relations and the Office of the Federal Interlocutor.” She also pointed to the UAS as an important element in the work the City is doing with Aboriginal people living there, stating that “The Urban Aboriginal Strategy on community consultations, joint planning, collaborations with the Aboriginal community and collaborations with governments with the Aboriginal community and collaborations of governments with the community on issues of the magnitude experienced by the Aboriginal community is fundamental to making progress.”

Relationships between the City of Edmonton and Aboriginal peoples continue to grow. In 2007 and in 2011, Edmonton hosted the National Aboriginal Achievement Awards. And on 6 July 2012, the City entered into a formal agreement with the Confederacy of Treaty No. 6 First Nations under a Memorandum of Cooperation and Dialogue designed to strengthen the City’s working relations with First Nations within, and in proximity to, its municipal boundaries.

**Flying Eagle Program**

The Flying Eagle Program is provided free of charge by the City of Edmonton to children aged 6-12 at the city’s parks and recreation facilities. The Program teaches children about Aboriginal culture and heritage. Karen Leibovici, Edmonton City Counselor and former Vice-President of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities told the committee that the Flying Eagle Program “focuses on leadership, recreation and communities’ service.”

**Canadian Youth**

“...engagement sustains promising practices. [...] engagement is a shift and a different way of working with youth because we often see youth as being a problem that you need to fix, especially marginalized youth, as being victims. However, when you take the view that youth have views – they have gone through these experiences; they have been on the streets; adults cannot speak on their behalf – you are taking on more of an engagement approach. It is a paradigm shift because we are not used to working with youth that way.”

Professor Blanchet-Cohen identified several promising practices for promoting greater youth inclusion and involvement. These included:

---
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City of Victoria Youth Council, Legal Literacy Project

In 2007, following consultations with local youth, the City of Victoria Youth Council (CVYC) found that many young people did not understand their rights and the youth justice system and that the relationship between youth and the city’s police were suffering as a result. In response, the CVYC worked with the University of Victoria to create a participatory research project, the Youth Legal Literacy Team. Professor Blanchet-Cohen told the committee that the youth “work with police to create practical guidelines for homeless youth to understand their rights and responsibilities when stopped by the police. The pocket-sized pamphlets produced by the project have been largely distributed. It is small but helpful.”

YouthScape Project, Béluga, Rivière-des-Prairies

Béluga is a project in which adults and young people work together to create a shared vision for their neighborhood. It aims to support young people in “developing their capacity as significant contributors to building a more resilient community.” The project brings together “...several mainstream institutions connected to YouthScape, including schools, a library and a local cultural center, have experimented with forms of youth decision making to be more inclusive of the cultural diversity among youth. The trust developed through successful youth-led projects has reduced racial and intergenerational tensions in the neighborhood.”

Environmental Youth Alliance, Vancouver

The Environmental Youth Alliance (EYA) seeks to engage youth in positive change to improve community and environmental health. The EYA involves children and youth in five programs, multiple community projects and a volunteer program. In 1991 EYA received non-profit status and in 1993 began to engage youth in issues involving urban living. By 2011, EYA had reached over 300,000 young people through workshops, training, and community voluntersim.

Apathy is Boring

Apathy is Boring was conceived in 2004 by three young adults – a dance choreographer, a filmmaker, and a photographer/graphic designer --who were concerned that Canadian youth were becoming disengaged from the democratic process. Apathy is Boring, a non-partisan initiative, began with a ‘Get out the Youth Vote’ project for the 2004 federal General Election. It has since used art and technology to educate youth about democracy, increase youth voting rates, and increase youth engagement in their communities. Apathy is Boring has received support from Heritage Canada and Telefilm Canada.

557 Ibid., p. 46; City of Victoria Youth Council Campaign for Legal Literacy, http://youthcoreprogram.ca/?action=spark_projects&spark_id=48
559 Evidence, 8 March 2012, Natasha Blanchet-Cohen; Environmental Youth Alliance, http://www.eya.ca/splash.php
560 Ibid; Apathy is Boring, http://www.apathyisboring.com/en
Canadian Seniors

“In our Toronto office alone, we get 100 to 150 people a week, aged 50 plus, calling looking for work.”

Two initiatives, both developed by Peter Cook, impressed the committee as being promising practices with regard to bringing seniors in from the margins and engaging them in useful and productive ways that benefit not only seniors, but the communities in which they live.

Seniors for Business

Seniors for Business, founded by Mr. Cook in 1989, finds white collar jobs for seniors over 50. Mr. Cook told the committee that as of March 2012, Seniors for Business has “eight offices, and we are a multimillion dollar business.” In further testimony, Mr. Cook added that Seniors for Business employs

“about 1,000 junior seniors [...] There are engineers and chartered accountants...They are from different walks of life. They are at home. They are bored to tears. They want something to do. [...] I want to expand and employ more people. It is a win-win-win. Junior seniors have something to do, the senior seniors are looked after and in the middle is our business.”

Seniors for Seniors

Seniors for Seniors was established by Peter Cook in 1985 to engage younger seniors (50 years of age and older) in providing a variety of services for older seniors (60 years of age and older), many of whom experience mobility problems. Services offered include home cleaning, companionship, drivers, yard work and lawn care, house sitting, and overnight care. Since 1985, Seniors-for-Seniors has branched out from its original Toronto location and now has branches in nine centres, including Halifax and Truro, Nova Scotia. Each office is independently owned and operated.

Sexual Minorities

Edmonton Police Services’ Outreach Activities Community Liaison Committees

Kristopher Wells, a current member of the City of Edmonton’s Police Chief’s Community Advisory Council, identified a number of initiatives undertaken by the Edmonton Police Services to reach out and build relationships with the city’s minority communities, including the LGBT community.

Mr. Wells pointed to the Edmonton Police Services’ Community Liaison Committees as a means of facilitating the social inclusion of diverse groups. The Sexual Minorities Liaison Committee (SMLC) is one of such committees, and has worked with the Edmonton Police

---
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Service since 1992 to promote public safety and security needs of Edmonton’s LGBT community. The SMLC treats all inquiries with confidentiality and has created a Facebook page to facilitate communication. The committee assists members of that community to report crimes against them, and to get police support and service.65

**Edmonton Police Service Hate Crimes Unit**

Mr. Wells told the committee that the Edmonton Police Service “has established a hate crimes unit, one of the few specialized units in Canada, and the police service has targeted working with minority communities.”66 The Hate Crime Unit promotes human rights, safety, security and inclusiveness and works to build sustainable partnerships with communities to build trust and prevent hate crimes from occurring. The Unit produces hate crimes brochures in Chinese, French, Hindi and Punjabi. It also works closely with the Police Service’s Sexual Minorities Liaison Committee (see above).

**Edmonton Police Service’s Unit on Diversity, Equity and Human Rights**

The Edmonton Police Service has created a specialized unit on diversity, equity and human rights. The Edmonton Police Service’s Chief’s Committee has given the Unit the task of assisting the Edmonton Police Service in achieving its vision of a safe and vibrant city, created in partnership with the community through innovative and responsive policing. The Unit focuses on education and professional development for the Edmonton Police Service, community development, and fair, equitable and inclusive workplace practices.57

**Alberta Teachers’ Association Diversity, Equity and Human Rights Committee**

The Alberta Teachers’ Association’ Diversity, Equity and Human Rights Committee promotes diversity, equity and human rights in Alberta’s schools. The Diversity, Equity and Human Rights Committee has subcommittees on sexual orientation and gender identity, as well as on Aboriginal education, intercultural education, and gender equity.

Mr. Wells told the committee that “[i]f people know other gays or lesbians chances are those people will become more accepting and inclusive of them.”58 The Alberta Teachers’ Association supports the establishment of gay/straight alliance groups in schools to create awareness, and offers workshops on a range of diversity issues, including bullying and cyber bullying, and sexual orientation and gender identity.

---


567 Edmonton Police Service, Equity, Diversity and Human Rights, [http://www.edmontonpolice.ca/edhr](http://www.edmontonpolice.ca/edhr)

568 *Evidence*, 17 February 2011, Kristopher Wells.
Engaging partners from other sectors is a key to fostering successful efforts to bring marginalized groups into the mainstream. As Mr. Wells indicated about initiatives taken in Edmonton to include sexual minority youth, “[w]e have created those programs largely with the success of community partners. This partnership has been important to us.”569 Mr. Wells pointed to the Diversity, Equity and Human Rights Committee as an example of working with those directly affected apart from teachers, school boards, students and parents and bringing about the participation of corporate citizens in its activities.570

**Camp FYrefly**

“Instead of looking at these youth, our big focus is being ‘at risk,’ such as what would happen if we looked at them as fundamentally being ‘at promise.’ How would the questions change if we changed the foundation or lens? Recognizing that every young person out there has inherent talents and gifts to give to a community, our job is to help find ways for them to bring those gifts forward.”571

Camp FYrefly is a four-day summer leadership camp and resiliency-building program in Edmonton Alberta for approximately 50 sexual minority youth from across Canada. Youth attending the camp return to their communities with capacity-building skills. The upper-case ‘Y’ represents an acronym – fostering Youth, resiliency, energy, fun, and leadership.572 The camp is in its 9th year and has expanded to Saskatchewan with plans to expand to Southern Alberta and Ontario in the future. Kristopher Wells explained that following attendance at the camp, youth know that they are not alone when they go back to their communities and that there is a “network of support out there that they could always reach back into.”573

**City of Edmonton Sexual Minority Youth Intervention and Outreach Project**

In 2008, the City of Edmonton, the United Way and the Edmonton Community Foundation jointly funded the Institute for Sexual Minority Studies and Services to develop a multi-year, sexual minority youth intervention and community outreach project. The project has three major goals: to engage an outreach worker, to support Edmonton’s Youth Understanding Youth (a volunteer grassroots community organization that provides social and support services to LGBT

570 The Alberta Teachers’ Association, Diversity, Equity and Human Rights Committee, [http://www.teachers.ab.ca/For%20Members/Professional%20Development/Diversity%20and%20Human%20Rights/Pages/Index.aspx](http://www.teachers.ab.ca/For%20Members/Professional%20Development/Diversity%20and%20Human%20Rights/Pages/Index.aspx)
571 *Evidence*, 17 February 2011, Kristopher Wells.
youth), and to develop a sexual-minority youth needs assessment and mentorship project in partnership with Big Brothers and Big Sisters Society of Edmonton.  

Safer Communities

During the committee’s hearings on building safer communities, witnesses offered the following examples of promising practices:

**Programme de suivi intensif de Montréal – Gangs de rue**

The Programme de suivi intensif de Montréal – Gangs de rue is supported by the National Crime Prevention Centre with total funding of $7.4 million over five years. The program is a multidisciplinary effort that involves the coordination of various service providers with the goal of reducing gang delinquency among 15 – 25 year olds. It integrates prevention, crime suppression and intervention approaches and is delivered by the Centre jeunesse de Montréal – Institut universitaire in partnership with the Québec Ministry of Public Safety, the City of Montréal, the Direction of Public Prosecution Service of Québec, the City of Montréal Police Service, and Québec Correctional Services. Family involvement is integral to the program and the youth, family, and project staff meets three to four times weekly. Program participants spend 20 to 40 hours per week in activities related to the program, including school, professional training, employment skills development, job searching, volunteer work and recreational activities.

Mr. Sansfaçon indicated that, working together, various service providers involved in the Program had managed to overcome privacy concerns using memoranda of understanding and protocols in order to share information with one another. He told the committee that “…because they work together, they are capable of being effective and efficient in delivering the interventions that are needed to the right people and at the right time.” He added that under initiatives such as this “[y]ou wrap the services around these vulnerable populations and provide the right intervention at the right time [thereby] increasing the chances of being successful.”

**Prince Albert Regional Intersectoral Committee (Hub Program)**, Prince Albert, Saskatchewan

The Hub Program is a partnership between service providers including representation from federal and provincial agencies, local police service, First Nations, and schools with the goal of providing social service delivery through collaboration.

---
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Stop Now and Plan (SNAP), Toronto, Ontario

Toronto. SNAP is a strategy that was initially developed in Toronto in 1970 as a means of curbing aggressive and disruptive classroom behaviour that could eventually lead to future contact with the police. The strategy works with parents and children 12 years old and younger to help them regulate and channel angry feelings. SNAP is now being used by over 90 organizations in Canada, the United States, and Australia.578

REACH Program, Edmonton, Alberta

REACH Edmonton Council of Safe Communities is a community-based initiative made up of 83 organizations and 126 citizens with the goal of making Edmonton safer within one generation. Dr. Waller testified that REACH “involves leadership, so someone saying we are going to reduce crime and not just react to crime. It involves bringing police and social agencies and schools and housing people together to look at what needs to be done. It involves using data. It involves investing.” Similar efforts are being undertaken in: Winnipeg, Thunder Bay, Regina, and the Peel Region. Dr. Waller stated that “[w]e need to see this coast to coast. [...] this needs to go along with things like Housing First and other general programs that will somehow reduce the gaps in advantage and disadvantage.”579

Violence Reduction Action Plan, City of Edmonton, 2011

The Violence Reduction Action Plan was developed by REACH Edmonton (above). Initiatives in the Plan target high risk populations and focus on prevention, intervention, suppression, and information/engagement. Each focus area has been given a goal along with the action or actions intended to achieve it and the name of the entity responsible for spearheading the effort.580

Community Mobilization Project, Prince Albert, Saskatchewan

The Community Mobilization Project in Prince Albert began in 2011, and brings together police, health and social services agencies to reduce crime. In the year since the Project has been active, crime in St. Albert has fallen by 12%, there have been fewer social services intakes, and fewer emergency room visits.581 The idea to initiate the Project came after a visit to Glasgow, Scotland. Chief Dale McFee told the committee that “[w]hen we took our multi-agency team of 11 to Glasgow, Scotland, with our business plan, we found an area that had 15 key indicators that were the same as ours and at five years of success.”582

582 Evidence, 8 March 2012, Dale McFee.
Project Prevention and Intervention Toronto (PIT) Program, Toronto, Ontario

The Project Prevention and Intervention Toronto Program is supported by Public Safety Canada’s National Crime Prevention Centre’s Youth Gang Prevention Fund (YGPF) and is delivered by the City of Toronto’s Social Development, Finance and Administration Division with support from the University of Toronto’s Centre for Criminology. The project began in September 2008 and

“...has developed and implemented an integrated, targeted, evidence-based community program to prevent and reduce the proliferation of gangs in certain neighborhoods in Toronto, particularly vulnerable neighborhoods. This includes such initiatives as proper risk assessment of these youth, intensive group-based training opportunities that will support the development of pro-social skills, practical supports for the family of participating youth to assist them in reducing risk factors, and building protective factors that will eventually contribute to their positive social inclusion.” 583

Algonquin College, Ottawa, Victimology Program, Ottawa, Ontario

Heidi Illingworth identified the Victimology Program as a promising practice. She told the committee that the program is “a graduate certificate program for people who intend to work with victims of crime. It is a one-year certificate program that teaches about trauma, what people go through and how they should be dealt with in the community setting.” 584

The Fourth R Program

Irvin Waller told the committee that the Fourth R Program is “the only one identified by the WHO as effective in reducing violence against women. This is the sort of thing you should be recommending from coast to coast.” 585 Primary funding for the Program has been provided by the Royal LePage Shelter Foundation and the Crooks family, and is an example of how stakeholders outside government can contribute to reducing community violence.

LiveSAFE in Winnipeg

LiveSAFE in Winnipeg, under the leadership and coordination of the City of Winnipeg, seeks to strike a balance between enforcement and crime prevention by bringing together partners in the areas of housing, urban planning, education, citizen engagement, business and

584 Evidence, 8 March 2012, Heidi Illingworth; Algonquin College, Victimology, http://www2.algonquincollege.com/ppsi/program/victimology/
other levels of government.\textsuperscript{586} Dr. Waller pointed to LiveSAFE in Winnipeg, telling the committee that “[W]e know that we can reduce violence and property crime upwards of 50 per cent within a three- to five-year period. Winnipeg reduced car theft by over 85 per cent within a three-year period.”\textsuperscript{587}

**Neighborhood Empowerment Teams**, Edmonton, Alberta

The Edmonton Police Service, the Family Centre and the United Way work in partnership to reduce and prevent crime. According to its website a typical N.E.T. team is made up of a City of Edmonton Community Capacity Builder, an Edmonton Police Service Constable and a Youth Capacity Builder from The Family Centre, offering a diverse mix of social, policing and youth services to the community.\textsuperscript{588} Karen Leibovici told the committee that NETs

“go into neighborhoods that have issues with regard to capacity and that are high crime areas, and they work with those neighborhoods, and then they move on to other neighborhoods. They are getting individuals within those neighborhoods to understand what their strengths are, to work on their weaknesses, and to build towards the future.”\textsuperscript{589}

**Community Action Team (C.A.T.)**, Edmonton, Alberta

The C.A.T. is a dedicated police unit that is dispatched to neighborhoods that are experiencing persistent levels of crime. The Team’s role is to disrupt and prevent crime, and to provide the affected community with assurance that it has the support of the Edmonton Police Service. The Team works in cooperation with other agencies in education and enforcement (Edmonton Transit, Edmonton Rangers, and Community Shelters & Outreach Services.)\textsuperscript{590} Speaking about C.A.T., Karen Leibovici indicated that “[t]hat is part of smart policing because we work together as the police and social service partners. They engage neighborhoods that are experiencing enduring levels of violence.”\textsuperscript{591}

**24/7 Initiatives**, Edmonton, Alberta

Karen Leibovici spoke to Chief Dale’s McFee’s observation that police are often asked to intervene in situations that they are not trained for when she told the committee that “[p]olice are engaging in activities that are probably not the most appropriate activities. Police officers spend a lot of time with individuals with mental illnesses to the detriment of other policing activities.” She indicated that to address this challenge, Edmonton is “looking at a 24/7 initiative so there are

\textsuperscript{586} Institute for the Prevention of Crime, University of Ottawa, “A Profile of Crime Prevention Initiatives in the City of Winnipeg” \url{http://www.sciencessociales.uottawa.ca/ipc/eng/documents/Winnipeg-.pdf}

\textsuperscript{587} Evidence, 15 March 2012, Irvin Waller.

\textsuperscript{588} Edmonton Police Services, \url{http://www.edmontonpolice.ca/crimeprevention/neighbourhoodempowermentteams.aspx} .

\textsuperscript{589} Evidence, 15 March 2012, Karen Leibovici.


\textsuperscript{591} Evidence, 15 March 2012, Karen Leibovici.
the right kinds of services available 24/7 to help those vulnerable individuals find a home and find the services they need to help them get off the streets and allow time for police officers to deal with crime as opposed to helping those individuals that other types of issues that they might not have the skills to deal with." She told the committee that the Initiative, which is still waiting funding, is “a new strategy that is looking at bringing together the different resources required when there is a call at two o’clock in the morning. Traditionally, that call at two o’clock in the morning has been to the officer or sometimes to the ambulance worker. [...] we have firefighters as well.” This traditional approach is one that is costly and inefficient. Ms. Liebovici testified that “[t]he police and/or the firefighter and/or the ambulance and the emergency worker come, which means there is a lot of money being spent and it is not for the right kind of service.” She stated that “[W]e are hoping that it can be something that other municipalities across the country can look at and implement.”

**Injera Initiative, Edmonton, Alberta**

The Injera Initiative is a joint effort involving the Edmonton Police Service, the City of Edmonton, the Multicultural Coalition for Equity in Health and Wellbeing, and REACH Edmonton. The goal of the Initiative is to build the capacity of the police force to work with cultural communities so that they can prevent crime together, and to gain a better mutual understanding of other cultures, including the police culture. The Initiative is “working on enhancing relationships between police and youth.”

**Women as Victims of Crime**

Caroline Andrew identified several promising practices that hold the potential to effectively address criminal acts that target women. Dr. Andrew pointed to two groups that focus on “gender-sensitive perspectives on the creation of inclusive and security communities for the full diversity of women and girls and, therefore for the whole population.”

**Women in Cities International / Femmes et villes internationales**

Dr. Andrew told the committee that Women in Cities International is “[A] very small Montreal-based group that does work both in Canada and internationally, and in an area where Canada has really been a world leader, starting from METRAC in Toronto – on the work of safety audits and on the work of public safety for women and for everyone.”

---

595 Edmonton Multicultural Coalition, Injera Initiative, [http://www.emcoalition.ca/injeera/](http://www.emcoalition.ca/injeera/)
Together for Women’s Safety: Creating Safer Communities for Marginalized Women and Everyone.

Together for Women’s Safety: Creating Safer Communities for Marginalized Women and Everyone is a project carried out in four communities across Canada (Regina, Peel, Gatineau and Montréal) by Women in Cities International, with funding from Status of Women Canada. Together for Women’s Safety worked with Aboriginal women in Regina, immigrant women in Peel, elderly women in Gatineau, and handicapped women in Montréal. The challenge was “making sure that the real voices of individual women are being heard, and also that those real voices are [presented in] ways that can be understood by the governments taking decisions.”598