Immigration and multi-level governance in Canada and Europe: The role of municipalities as integration "policy innovators"

Alexander Gunn[*]
Doctoral Candidate, University of Victoria

Introduction

Cities are increasingly identified in Canadian academic and policy literature as being an integral support structure for the settlement and integration of immigrants to Canada – often serving as the "first point of contact" between newcomers and government due to the day-to-day dependence of immigrants on various local public services. The ability of municipal governments to assist in the immigrant settlement process, however, is continually challenged by their weak fiscal capacities and their limited (or non-existent) role in the development of immigration policy – a field that has traditionally been dominated by the federal and provincial levels of government. This paper will examine how various Canadian cities are overcoming these challenges in order to become "policy innovators" in the fields of immigrant settlement and

---

[*] Alexander Gunn is a PhD candidate in the Department of Political Science at the University of Victoria, working under the supervision of Dr. Oliver Schmidtke, a lead researcher of the Canada-Europe Transatlantic Dialogue project and Jean Monnet Chair in European History and Politics. Alexander's research focuses on immigration, minority nationalism and identity politics, with a particular focus on Catalonia and Quebec. He can be reached by email at adgunn@uvic.ca.

integration, often working in collaboration with their federal and provincial counterparts as well as with local businesses and civil society organizations.

The increasingly complex role played by municipalities in regard to immigration is also reflective of a wider challenge facing the municipal level of government in Canada: specifically, how local communities can effectively respond to the demands of their evolving and increasingly diverse populations while at the same time operating under a structure of multi-level governance in which jurisdictional power and fiscal resources are concentrated at the federal and provincial levels. It is a challenge that European cities have also increasingly faced in the wake of rising immigration levels, coupled with the need to develop effective policy responses that coordinate with the objectives of both national and European levels of government. The paper will therefore conclude with an analysis of some of the major commonalities and differences between Canadian and European cities in their policy innovation efforts in the immigration field.

Immigrant settlement patterns in Canada

Over the course of the 20th century immigrant settlement in Canada became a predominantly urban phenomenon. In recent decades, the majority of immigrants have settled in and around Canada's three largest cities – Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver – with the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) (2011) reporting that "(i)n 2010, two-thirds of all newcomers, both permanent and temporary residents, landed in one of the three largest metropolitan areas" in the country (6). The FCM (2011) also notes that in the past decade the proportion of recent immigrants settling in some of the country's smaller cities has risen substantially, with Winnipeg, Saskatoon, Halifax and Charlottetown all experiencing a sharp increase (7). Newcomers in each of these cities often rely on family members and/or ethno-cultural community groups to serve as support networks as they transition into the Canadian economy and wider society. These familial and community support structures, however, can only do so much in facilitating the integration process, often leaving local government services to address any immediate shortcomings (usually surrounding housing and transportation). Consequently, as Canadian municipalities become increasingly diverse, their governments "face the real challenge of building welcoming communities, including designing and delivering culturally appropriate plans, programs and services, and addressing discrimination and racism" (FCM 2011, -5).

Immigration policy within Canada's system of multi-level governance

Immigration policy has posed a particular challenge from a multi-level governance perspective in Canada since Confederation, with article 95 of the *Constitution Act, 1867*

declaring immigration to be an area of "concurrent" jurisdictional concern between the federal and provincial orders of government. By dividing responsibility between these two levels of government, "the Constitution signalled the importance of immigration to the new federation as a policy domain so central that it would not be entrusted to just one level of government" (Tolley, Biles, Vineberg, Burstein & Frideres 2011, 3). While historically the federal government predominated over immigration matters, since the 1970s, provincial governments have become increasingly active in this policy area. The Quebec government has been particularly assertive in this regard, and through repeated intergovernmental negotiations and agreements with Ottawa during the past four decades, has secured substantial authority for itself over both the selection and settlement/integration of immigrants to the province. Quebec's efforts in turn spurred demands from the other provinces for similar agreements with the federal government, leading to the establishment of Provincial/Territorial Nomination Programs during the late-1990s and early 2000s, programs which allow the provinces and territories to nominate specific immigrant applicants whom they believe possess the necessary skills and training to provide an immediate "contribution" to their economies and societies (Vineberg 2011, 36-37).

The rationale behind Canadian immigration policy has also changed over time due to the shifting policy concerns of both the federal and provincial levels of government. Christian Poirier (2006) notes that historically immigration was regarded "as a matter related to the workforce" and that policy tended to be "situated in terms of international relations and economic development" (204). During the 1960s and 1970s, however, immigration matters became increasingly influenced by shifts in federal and provincial "social and cultural policies", including the institutionalization of official bilingualism and multiculturalism at the federal level and of French-language public unilingualism and interculturalism within Quebec (Poirier 2006, 204). These policy changes represented both a shift towards greater accommodation and openness on the part of the federal and provincial governments towards the ethnocultural diversity of recent immigrants, as well as a heightened emphasis on the ability of immigrants to function in one or both of the country's two official languages – with the Quebec government emphasizing the recruitment of newcomers who demonstrate an ability or a willingness to successfully integrate into French-speaking Québécois society. Finally, in recent decades, immigration has frequently been framed by the federal and provincial governments as a solution to Canada's near- and long-term demographic and economic challenges. Tolley et al. (2011) note that "(a)s Canada's population ages and its fertility rate continues to drop, immigration has become increasingly important as a potential mechanism to facilitate economic development adjustment", as well as a means of "responding to labour market gaps and out-migration from Canada's regions, smaller centres, and official language minority communities" (2). Consequently, the federal government and several of its provincial counterparts have placed a priority on immigration matters in recent years, often linking it to a multitude of other prominent policy areas including public health, education, housing, regional economic development, labour mobility, and national security (Tolley et al. 2011, 3).

Canadian municipalities as immigration "policy innovators"

Integration and settlement services are provided to recent immigrants for the first three years after their arrival in Canada.[1] A variety of government agencies, community groups and immigrant organizations act as the major service providers, with the federal department of Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC)[2] serving as the main source of program funding. The means by which CIC funding is managed and allocated varies from province to province based on specific policy regimes negotiated between CIC and its provincial counterparts. In several provinces, CIC continues to be actively involved in settlement service provision, whereas in Quebec, British Columbia and Manitoba the provincial governments exercise exclusive responsibility over "the design, delivery and administration of settlement services" (CIC 2010) – although their programs are still dependent on federal contributions and are "expected to achieve (settlement) outcomes comparable to those of CIC programs" (FCM 2011, 9). The effectiveness of these CIC and provincial programs has however come under criticism in recent years. The Federation of Canadian Municipalities (2011) contends that the current integration process is failing to address some of the significant socio-economic gaps that exist between recent immigrants and the wider Canadian population. They further note that "(i)mmigrants face their greatest challenges integrating into Canadian life in their first five years" of settling in Canada, and emphasize that existing federal and provincial settlement services are currently insufficient and fail to adequately integrate immigrants into the wider Canadian population (or help them achieve the average Canadian standard of living) in the three years they are offered (FCM 2011, 9).

While immigration services and programs have increasingly been shaped by intergovernmental negotiation and collaboration between the federal and provincial levels of government, the municipal level of government in Canada until very recently has remained outside of these policy development processes. The FCM (2011) notes that even though municipal "front-line service providers are key players in the successful settlement, attraction

---

[1] This is in spite of the fact that the integration process for immigrants is officially regarded as lasting a decade – indeed, Statistics Canada, Citizenship and Immigration Canada, and Human Resource and Skills Development Canada all regard the official term "recent immigrant" as "refer(ring) to immigrants arriving in Canada in the past five to 10 years" (FCM, 2011, p. 6).

[2] Citizenship and Immigration Canada's (2011) stated mission is to "build a stronger Canada" through policies and services that: 1) "facilitate the arrival of people and their integration into Canada in a way that maximizes their contribution to the country while protecting the health, safety and security of Canadians"; 2) "maintain Canada's humanitarian tradition by protecting refugees and people in need of protection"; 3) "enhance the values and promote the rights and responsibilities of Canadian citizenship"; and 4) "reach out to all Canadians and foster increased intercultural understanding and an integrated society with equal opportunity for all, regardless of race, ethnicity and religion", with the additional goal of "(a)dvancing global migration policies in a way that supports Canada's immigration and humanitarian objectives".

and retention of immigrants, municipalities have been left on the sidelines of immigrant policy and funding decisions" (2). In recent years, however, a variety of circumstances have combined to encourage municipalities to assume a more active role in immigration policy formation, with or without official recognition by the other levels of government. Christian Poirier (2006) attributes this increased activity to a combination of individual initiative on the part of municipal political leaders, political pressure on municipalities from local immigrant and ethnocultural minority organizations, lobbying by groups like the FCM, and perhaps most significantly the "downloading" of various social policy responsibilities from the federal and provincial governments to the local level (206).[3] In this respect, Poirier (2006) regards municipal activity in the immigration field as being reminiscent of John Kingdon's concept of "opening a policy window" whereby "local authorities take up an issue because they perceive that there are advantages to be gained and because other levels of government are not really involved" (204). Canadian municipalities are therefore increasingly becoming what can be characterized as "policy innovators" in terms of both developing and delivering new settlement and integration policy initiatives within their own communities; initiatives that are often derived through consultation with local community groups and immigrant organizations, as well as through collaboration with both the provincial and federal levels of government. John Biles (2008) notes that "(d)espite the fact that cities do not possess the political or financial authority over many of the services important to the successful integration of newcomers, many cities have been extremely creative and innovative in their response to integration issues" (163). Kristin Good (2005) similarly asserts that recent municipal activity in the field of immigrant settlement and integration undermines the traditional conception of local government in Canada as being a "subordinate" actor relative to the other levels of government, and instead re-casts cities as dynamic agents who are able to effectively respond to the demands of their changing and increasingly diverse populations (262).

Certain Canadian municipalities have even developed formalized intergovernmental partnerships in which the municipal level of government assumes an equal status to its federal and provincial counterparts regarding settlement/integration policy formation and service delivery. The paper will now examine some of the formalized bipartite and tripartite initiatives that have been developed for the cities of Toronto, Montreal and Winnipeg, respectively. These three cases have been chosen to demonstrate some of the similar policy concerns that characterize these new multi-level government agreements, as well as to demonstrate some of the major differences between them and how the contextual/demographic realities of each individual

---

[3] The FCM (2011) notes that Canadian municipalities have increasingly been called on to shoulder the burden of growing immigrant service demands – in such areas as "affordable housing, public transit, child care and library services" – at the same time as they have been required to support a host of other fiscal demands brought about by growing "infrastructure deficits" and the "downloading" of services that had previously been funded by the federal and provincial governments (2).

city (immigration rates; existing provincial immigration policy regimes; cultural/linguistic factors) invariably influences each city's approach to settlement and integration policy.

Toronto

The Greater Toronto Area represents one of the most culturally diverse urban regions in both Ontario and the entire country, and for decades has acted as a major settlement destination point for recent immigrants to Canada. The City of Toronto itself actively promotes its social/cultural diversity,[4] and in recent years has developed a variety of working-groups with local immigrant and refugee organizations to allow for public consultation on diversity-related issues (Biles 2008, 164). It is only in the past few years, however, that Toronto's role in the integration of newcomers has been officially recognized by the other levels of government. Until recently, the federal government predominated over immigration matters in Ontario, while the provincial government in contrast often "displayed little interest in active immigration management" (Biles et al. 2011, 211). This dynamic changed however in 2005 with the negotiation of the Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement (COIA) between the federal and provincial governments. COIA was significant in that it both established a greater role for the Ontario government in "the integration of newcomers to the province" (Biles et al. 2011, 205), as well as emphasized "partnership with municipal governments in Ontario on immigration matters," with a particular focus on the issues of "access to employment; access to education and training; access to services; and citizenship and civic engagement" (FCM 2011, 24).

COIA therefore "provide(d) a much more explicit role for (Ontario) municipalities" in immigration matters compared to similar immigration agreements between Ottawa and the other provinces, and in turn served as the foundation for the Canada-Ontario-Toronto Memorandum of Understanding on Immigration and Settlement, signed by all three levels of government in September 2006 (225). The Memorandum of Understanding created a "framework" for tripartite consultation on "matters related to immigration and settlement in the City of Toronto" with an emphasis 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" (CIC 2006). The agreement recognizes the various levels of government as equal partners and is meant to be guided by the "principles of horizontality and co-operation, with an emphasis on results" (Biles 2008, 164). Indeed, the wording of the Memorandum emphasizes both the "vital role" that the City of Toronto already plays in "the development of settlement programs and services" for recent immigrants, as well as highlights the city's extensive "expertise" and "community infrastructure" in regard to immigration policy (CIC 2006). John Biles (2008) further notes that "(g)iven the complex array

---

[4] Indeed, the City of Toronto's official motto is "Diversity Our Strength" (City of Toronto 2012).

of actors in the Toronto area," the Memorandum's horizontal framework has the potential to be quite effective in both the development and delivery of immigrant settlement services, in that it "may facilitate a new level of co-ordination and avoid overlapping of policies and programs" among the various government and non-government actors (164).

Montreal

The City of Montreal similarly acts as the main destination point for recent immigrants settling in Quebec; becoming home to around 73 per cent of new immigrants to the province each year (Ville de Montréal 2012a). The municipal government therefore promotes itself as an "important actor" in the integration process of new immigrants, as well as the level of government that is best positioned to coordinate and work effectively with the city's growing immigrant communities (Ville de Montréal 2012a). Montreal's efforts, however, are heavily influenced by the Quebec government's policies of interculturalism and "francization", which emphasize both respect for the cultural diversity of immigrants but also actively encourage the linguistic integration of newcomers into Québécois society. The city accordingly defines itself as an "intercultural" community (Ville de Montréal 2012b) and closely coordinates many of its integration efforts with those of Quebec's Ministère de l'Immigration et des Communautés culturelles (MICC), a provincial department that oversees various programs designed to "facilitate the reception and integration of immigrants" to Quebec, including settlement services and French-language training (Germain & Trinh 2011, 261). In recent years, the MICC has emphasized greater consultation with local communities regarding integration and settlement policy, and consequently has launched a series of bipartite initiatives with various Quebec municipal and regional governments. In 2006, the City of Montreal signed a three-year funding agreement with the MICC worth $4.5 million and designed to "support services to facilitate the reception and settlement of newcomers" to the city (Germain & Trinh 2011, 265). Similarly, in 2011, the city and the MICC reached another three-year agreement oriented towards improving intercultural relations and immigrant living conditions in Montreal, as well as towards combating racism and discrimination (Ville de Montréal 2012). The city has also undertaken several settlement/integration policy initiatives on its own or in cooperation with local community groups. A prominent example is the Habiter la mixité (Living Diversity) housing initiative run through the Office municipal d'habitation de Montréal, which encourages intercultural communication between immigrant social housing tenants and their local neighbourhoods as a way of combating "social isolation" as well as fostering connections between newcomers and the wider Montreal community (Office municipal d'habitation de Montréal 2012).

Winnipeg

The City of Winnipeg also serves as the main destination point for immigrants to Manitoba, but unlike the Toronto and Montreal cases, Winnipeg has experienced relatively low immigration rates and low population growth in recent decades; demographic challenges that have been exacerbated by the out-migration of residents to other parts of Canada (Carter & Amoyaw, 2011, p. 171). To counteract these low growth rates, the Manitoba government has pursued an aggressive immigration strategy designed to attract and retain more newcomers to the province. Manitoba's Provincial Nominee Program (PNP) has been a major component of this strategy and has been utilized both "as a way to deal with existing and impending skill shortages" in the provincial economy, and "as a vehicle to increase population growth – in both Winnipeg and rural areas" (Carter & Amoyaw 2011, 172). Indeed, Manitoba's PNP has been the most active in the country, and has subsequently accounted for a significant increase in the number of immigrants to the province in the past decade (Vineberg 2011, 38).

The City of Winnipeg itself has also taken the lead in developing innovative policy solutions regarding immigrant settlement and integration, often in close collaboration with local community groups and immigrant organizations. A prominent example is the Winnipeg Private Refugee Sponsorship Assurance Program, an initiative that arose following public pressure by groups like the Manitoba Interfaith Immigration Council for greater municipal leadership and support regarding the settlement and integration of refugees to the city. The program began in 2002 following a tripartite agreement between the City of Winnipeg and its provincial and federal counterparts, and is designed to provide financial support for individual refugees in circumstances "when a private sponsor is no longer able to meet its commitment" to a particular refugee claimant (Biles 2008, 163). The Winnipeg Private Refugee Sponsorship Assurance Program was significant in that it "represent(ed) the first time a city government has been recognized as a partner in immigration and population growth strategy" by its provincial and federal counterparts (Biles 2008, 163). Since its introduction, the program has increased the number of newcomers settling in Winnipeg, with the FCM (2011) reporting that in the first four years of its operation the program "registered an average of nearly 650 cases per year" from "more than 20 countries", ultimately "affecting about 1,200 individuals" (21). Indeed, the initiative may be proving too popular, with the FCM noting that "(c)oncerns are mounting that the program is generating a larger-than-anticipated number of refugees" that in turn is increasing demand on scarce municipal services as well as on the supply of affordable housing in Winnipeg (FCM 2011, 21).

Policy prescriptions relating to multi-level governance

The recent initiatives by Canadian cities in the realm of immigrant settlement and integration have led to a number of recommendations regarding how municipal programs – as

well as coordination with the other levels of government – can be improved. Tolley et al. (2011) note that policy-makers increasingly recognize that settlement and integration are not "stand-alone issues" and that therefore developing effective policy responses "requires a whole-of-government approach as well as the collaboration of communities, non-governmental organizations, the education sector, and other key stakeholders" (3). Building on this concept of multi-faceted collaboration, the FCM (2011) contends that Toronto's Memorandum of Understanding should serve as a model for similar agreements across the country, in which the federal and provincial governments would negotiate formal roles for municipalities in the immigrant settlement process as a way of orienting policies to the specific needs of each community (4). Christian Poirier (2006) similarly insists that any "greater empowerment of municipalities" by the other levels of government "must be flexible" in that it must acknowledge that "all cities do not face the same problems and therefore do not need the same powers and the same level of political and fiscal autonomy" (216). Specifically, he contends that "(i)n the field of immigration and settlement, there must be national standards (especially regarding discrimination)", but also emphasizes that as "immigration issues are closely linked to questions of identity and local matters" and therefore "the task of building models and defining mechanisms must be left to the different local communities" (Poirier 2006, 217). Rimok and Rouzier (2008), referring to the experiences of Quebec municipalities, also emphasize the importance of locally-oriented settlement/integration policies that are properly funded by the other levels of government. They note that "(i)t is probably desirable that local solutions come from a variety of stakeholders" including municipal officials, ethnocultural and immigrant community groups, local employers, and local non-government organizations, but caution that "(w)hile these actors can set priorities at the local level" they must also "develop partnerships with other levels of government, notably the federal and provincial governments or other jurisdictions" in order for their initiatives to remain fiscally viable (Rimok & Rouzier 2008, 191).

Comparing the experiences of Canadian cities with those of Europe

The recent initiatives undertaken by Canadian municipalities provide several important points of comparison to similar efforts by European cities at providing policy leadership in regard to migrant settlement and integration. As with Canadian cities, there is no one standard "policy model" to immigration and integration at the urban level in Europe, and instead a diverse array of approaches and strategies exist that vary from city to city. In spite of these variations, there has nonetheless been a recent emphasis among European cities on promoting and sharing "best practices" regarding migrant settlement and integration policy. A major forum for policy sharing is the European Network of Cities for Local Integration Policies for Migrants (or the CLIP Network). The CLIP Network includes thirty European cities (from both inside and outside the European Union) "working together to support the social and economic integration of

migrants", efforts that are supported by various European organizations and research centres (Eurofound 2011b). Their policy literature centres on the experiences of the thirty cities in relation to four "research modules": 1) housing, 2) equality and diversity, 3) intercultural policies and intergroup relations, and 4) ethnic entrepreneurship. The Network's analysis of each of these issues also provides important points of comparison with the experiences of Canadian municipalities and reveals some of the major commonalities and differences between Canadian and European cities in their respective approaches to immigration.

As in the Canadian literature cited above, the CLIP Network emphasizes that many of the "challenges" associated with the "economic and cultural integration of migrants" are best "dealt with at the local level", as European local governments serve as a major point of day-to-day contact and support for migrant populations (Eurofound 2011a).[5] European cities accordingly "have a vital role to play, not only in the implementation of integration policies, but also in the development of innovative policies on housing, education and cultural diversity"; a role that the CLIP Network contends must be facilitated through active cooperation and financial support from both the national and European levels of government (Eurofound 2011a). This emphasis on the supportive role of European institutions is significant as it demonstrates how European cities can now look beyond their own national governments in securing funding for new policy initiatives and can now also increasingly rely on organizations like the European Union and the Council of Europe. The literature similarly emphasizes the reciprocally useful role that cities can play in the implementation of European policy objectives surrounding migrant integration, and how local governments are well positioned to adapt European programs and initiatives to the contextual realities of their respective urban communities (Bosswick et al. 2007, 78). Lastly, the CLIP Network literature also demonstrates that many of the major policy concerns surrounding immigration in Canada are also present in Europe. European cities have devoted considerable attention to such policy issues as: migrant access to affordable and quality housing (Bosswick et al. 2007); migrant access to employment and public services (Spencer 2008); encouraging "ethnic entrepreneurship" as a way of fostering greater economic development (and economic integration) within migrant communities (Rath, Swagerman, Krieger, Ludwinek & Pickering 2011); and, capitalizing on the opportunities for "cultural innovativeness and international competitiveness" that accompanies immigration and growing cultural diversity (Lüken-Klaßen & Heckmann 2010, 1).

This body of literature also, however, highlights important differences in both the policy concerns and approaches of European cities compared to their Canadian counterparts. Firstly,

---

[5] The CLIP Network's 2007 study *Housing and integration of migrants in Europe* notes that "cities and municipalities have a genuine interest in successful local integration practices in order to avoid unnecessary costs and to mobilise the potential of their population with a migratory background", an interest that has encouraged them to become "centres of competence in developing and implementing strategies for the integration and improved participation of immigrants and ethnic minorities in the local community" (Bosswick et al., 2007, p. 1).

migration in the CLIP Network literature is regarded as a multi-generational phenomenon, and consequently is treated as a long-term policy challenge for European cities. In this respect, the target population for integration policy initiatives in Europe is not simply individuals who have arrived in recent years, as it is in Canada, but instead is oriented towards people of a "migrant-background" a category that can include second-generation and third-generation individuals of migrant descent.[6] European cities are therefore encouraged to collect "reliable and up-to-date information" on their urban populations so that, as Bosswick et al. (2007) note, integration policies are not simply targeting "foreign persons, but also consider individuals with a 'migratory background' as second- and third-generation migrants" (86-87). Secondly, the CLIP Network literature emphasizes a more active policy role for European cities than is often envisioned in the Canadian literature, a difference that partly reflects the greater jurisdictional scope that European cities possess regarding education, housing and health care policy, which in Canada all officially fall under the purview of provincial governments. Accordingly, some of the policy prescriptions in the CLIP literature for European cities are much more "interventionist" than those proposed in the Canadian literature, and include proposals for significant new investment in public housing by European local governments (Bosswick et al. 2007), or recommendations that local governments act as major sources of employment for recent immigrants (Spencer 2008, 120).

Lastly, European cities have demonstrated a greater concern with alleviating some of the inter-group tensions that can occasionally arise from large-scale immigration. Bosswick et al. (2007) note that residential "segregation" of migrant populations has become a major policy concern in many of the CLIP Network cities and has prompted various anti-segregation strategies to be adopted. These strategies include "quota" systems in cities like Antwerp, Copenhagen, Frankfurt, and Stuttgart that mandate a specific proportion of migrant and low-income inhabitants within specific residential neighbourhoods (17), or housing developments in Amsterdam and Vienna that "explicitly pursue a strategy of diversification" in terms of the ethnic and socio-economic background of their residents (18). This type of active intervention on the part of local government in promoting a certain proportion of "ethnic diversity" within residential neighbourhoods is largely absent from the policy experiences of Canadian cities. The CLIP Network literature similarly highlights a greater concern among European policy-makers towards the political and religious "radicalization" that can stem from immigration. Lüken-Klaßen & Heckmann (2010) note that in many European cities "the topic of immigration has become politicised" and that "radical ideological groups have developed around the issue" both among the "majority and minority populations" (139). Amongst majority populations, "xenophobic" and "nativist" sentiments have been perpetuated, often by far-right political movements, while among minority populations the issue of religious radicalization has become

---

[6] Doris Lüken-Klaßen & Friedrich Heckmann's (2010), for instance, define "migrant" as "those people who have immigrated themselves and their children who form the second generation", as well as includes "asylum seekers and refugees" (1).

an issue of concern, particularly in regards to Muslim migrant communities (Lüken-Klaßen & Heckmann 2010, 139). In response to these challenges, European cities have adopted a series of policy strategies aimed at stemming radicalization which again are largely absent from the Canadian context. A prominent example is Amsterdam's "comprehensive anti-radicalization strategy" that arose following the assassination of Dutch film director Theo Van Gogh. This initiative targets "both the majority and minority population" in Amsterdam, but has a particular emphasis on preventing the perpetuation of radical Islamism in the city by attempting to "strengthen the resilience of (its) Muslim communities against *jihadi* ideology" (Lüken-Klaßen & Heckmann 2010, 156).

Conclusion

In both Canada and Europe, cities have become increasingly responsible for facilitating the successful social and economic integration of immigrants. In the Canadian context, however, the ability of cities to fulfill this important demographic and economic function is constrained by their limited jurisdictional and fiscal powers. As a consequence, immigration policy development in Canada has become even more complex as municipalities (and their local community partners) increasingly attempt to enter into negotiations with their federal and provincial counterparts in securing financing for new settlement and integration programs. Multi-level governance strategies are an important consequence of these recent initiatives, in which certain municipalities are now being formally recognized as partners in the immigration policy formation process, and settlement and integration programs are increasingly being oriented to suit the specific conditions of different urban settings. These trends are still piecemeal, however, and ultimately run against decades of top-down direction by federal (and more recently provincial) officials regarding immigration matters. Ultimately, the success of many of these initiatives will depend on the willingness of the federal and provincial levels of government to continue to recognize the important role of municipal governments in immigration matters, as well as depend on their willingness to continue funding locally developed settlement and integration programs. In this respect, the experiences of European cities potentially provide important lessons for Canada in terms of fostering greater intergovernmental cooperation on immigration policy matters. While many of the policy concerns of European cities surrounding immigration – such as residential segregation or political/religious radicalization – may not be as relevant in the Canadian context, the European cases do nonetheless demonstrate how cities can be proactive in fostering innovative policy solutions (and in securing intergovernmental financial support) on the issues of housing, employment, and intercultural dialogue, all of which are top priorities for both Canadian cities and their growing immigrant populations.

REFERENCES

Biles, J. 2008. Integration Policies in English-Speaking Canada. In *Immigration and Integration in Canada in the Twenty-first Century*, J. Biles, M. Burstein, & J. Frideres (Eds.). Kingston: School of Policy Studies, Queen's University. 139-186.

Biles, J., Tolley, E., Andrew, C., Esses, V., & Burstein, M. 2011. Integration and Inclusion in Ontario: The sleeping giant stirs. In *Integration and Inclusion of Newcomers and Minorities across Canada*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press. 195-246.

Bosswick, W., Lüken-Klaßen, D., & Heckmann, F. 2007. *Housing and integration of migrants in Europe*. Dublin: European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. Retrieved from http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/pubdocs/2007/94/en/1/ef0794en.pdf.

Carter, T. & Amoyaw, B. 2011. Manitoba: the struggle to attract and retain immigrants. In *Integration and Inclusion of Newcomers and Minorities across Canada*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press. 165-193.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. 2006. *Canada-Ontario-Toronto Memorandum of Understanding on Immigration and Settlement*. Retrieved from http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/department/laws-policy/agreements/ontario/can-ont-toronto-mou.asp.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. 2012. *Provincial nominees*. Retrieved from http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/immigrate/provincial/index.asp.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. 2010. *Welcome to Canada: What you should know*. Retrieved from http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/resources/publications/welcome/wel-17e.asp.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. 2011. *Who we are*. Retrieved from http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/department/mission.asp.

City of Toronto. 2012. *Immigration Portal*. Retrieved from http://www1.toronto.ca/wps/portal/toronto/content?vgnextoid=35b51b3cf98d1310VgnVCM1000003dd60f89RCRD.

Eurofound. 2011a. *About CLIP*. Retrieved from http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/areas/populationandsociety/clipabout.htm.

Eurofound. 2011b. *European network of cities for local integration policies for migrants (CLIP)*. Retrieved from http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/areas/populationandsociety/clip.htm.

Federation of Canadian Municipalities. 2011. *Starting on Solid Ground: The Municipal Role in Immigrant Settlement*. Retrieved from http://www.fcm.ca/Documents/reports/Starting_on_Solid_Ground_Municipalities_and_Immigration_EN.pdf.

Germain, A. & Trinh, T. 2011. Immigration in Quebec: Profile and players. In *Integration and Inclusion of Newcomers and Minorities across Canada*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press. 247-275.

Good, K. 2005. Patterns of Politics in Canada's Immigrant-Receiving Cities and Suburbs. *Policy Studies* 26.3/4, 261-289.

Lüken-Klaßen, D., & Heckmann, F. 2010. *Intercultural policies in European cities*. Dublin: European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. Retrieved from http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/pubdocs/2010/32/en/1/EF1032EN.pdf.

Office municipal d'habitation de Montréal. 2012. *Living Diversity*. Retrieved from http://www.omhm.qc.ca/en/living-diversity.

Poirier, C. 2006. Ethnocultural Diversity, Democracy, and Intergovernmental Relations in Canadian Cities. In *Canada: The State of the Federation 2004: Municipal-Federal-Provincial Relations in Canada*, R. Young & C. Leuprecht (Eds.). Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press. 201-220.

Rath, J., Swagerman, A., Krieger, H., Ludwinek, A., & Pickering, L. 2011. *Promoting ethnic entrepreneurship in European cities*. Dublin: European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. Retrieved from http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/pubdocs/2011/38/en/2/EF1138EN.pdf.

Rimok, P. & Rouzier, R, Conseil des relations interculturelles. 2008. Integration Policies in Quebec: A Need to Expand the Structures? In *Immigration and Integration in Canada in the Twenty-first Century*, J. Biles, M. Burstein, & J. Frideres (Eds.). Kingston: School of Policy Studies, Queen's University. 187-209.

Spencer, S. 2008. *Equality and diversity in jobs and services: City policies for migrants in Europe*. Dublin: European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. Retrieved from http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/pubdocs/2008/71/en/3/EF0871EN.pdf.

Vineberg, R. 2011. History of Federal-Provincial Relations in Canadian Immigration and Integration. In *Integration and Inclusion of Newcomers and Minorities across Canada*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press. 17-43.

Ville de Montréal. 2012a. *Intégration des personnes immigrants*. Retrieved from
http://ville.montreal.qc.ca/portal/page?_pageid=8258,90415578&_dad=portal&_schema=
PORTAL.

Ville de Montréal. 2012b. *Relations interculturelles*. Retrieved from
http://ville.montreal.qc.ca/portal/page?_pageid=8258,90415663&_dad=portal&_schema=
PORTAL.