MULTICULTURALISM IN CANADA

Evidence and Anecdote

ANDREW GRIFFITH
Purpose

• Provide integrated view of multiculturalism
  • Demographic, economic, social, political
  • Latest data available
  • Set out issues and implications
• Data sources
  • 2011 National Household Survey, Citizenship & Immigration operational stats, employment equity reports, political representation
Diversity within Diversity
A Country of Immigrants

Percentage Foreign-Born

Year

1871
1881
1891
1901
1911
1921
1931
1941
1951
1961
1971
1981
1991
2001
2006
2011

Percentage

18%
23%
23%
20%
18%
17%
16%
11%
10%
9%
7%
5%
4%
3%
2%
1%
Dominant European Ancestry

- British
- North American
- French
- Western European
- Eastern European
- Southern European
- East and Southeast Asian
- NA Aboriginal
- South Asian
- Northern European
- West Central Asian & Mid-East
- Caribbean
- Latin American
- Other European
- North African
- Other African
- Central and West African
- Oceania
- Other Asian

Number of People:
- 2,875,000
- 5,750,000
- 8,625,000
- 11,500,000

Single Ethnic Origin
Multiple Ethnic Origin
Immigration Trends
Last 25 years — Country of Birth

East and Southeast Asia
South Asia
West Asian and Mid-East
East Europe
Latin America
Southern and East Africa
North Africa
Caribbean
South Europe
North America
Central and West Africa
Britain
West Europe
France
Oceania
North Europe

Average 2006-13
Average 1988-2005
Canadian Ancestry
Those with Canadian and other ethnic origins

- French
- British
- Aboriginal
- Oceania
- Western European
- Northern European
- Eastern European
- Other African
- Southern European
- Other European
- Caribbean
- Latin American
- North African
- West Central Asian & Mid-East
- Southern & East African
- Central & West African
- East & Southeast Asian
- South Asian

Percentages:
- 40%
- 30%
- 20%
- 10%
Provinces differ

Single and Multiple Origins

ON
BC
AB
QC
Prairies
Atlantic
North

25%
50%
75%
100%

NA Aboriginal
French
East European
South European
North African
East and Southeast Asian
South Asian
Caribbean
North American
British
North European
Latin American
Central and West African

West European
East European
South Asian
Caribbean
North African
Other African
North African
North European
Latin American
Central and West African
As do cities
British Columbia Cities

- Vancouver
- Surrey
- Burnaby
- Richmond
- Abbotsford

Population segments:
- Aboriginal
- Canadian
- Caribbean
- West Central Asian & Mid-East
- African
- Latin American
- European
- East & Southeast Asian
- South Asian
- Oceania
Quebec Cities

Montreal | Laval | Longueuil | Gatineau | Sherbrooke | Québec

Aboriginal | Canadian | European | East & Southeast Asian | South Asian | Oceania
Caribbean | West Central Asian & Mid-East | African | Latin American
Religions

Christian 67%
Muslim 3.2%
Sikh 1.4%
Jewish 1.0%
Aboriginal 0.2%

None 24%
Hindu 1.5%
Buddhist 1.1%
Jewish 1.0%
Other 0.4%

Aboriginal 0.2%
Buddhist 1.1%
Hindu 1.5%
Jewish 1.0%
Muslim 3.2%
Sikh 1.4%

Catholics 58%
Presbyterian
Lutheran
Pentecostal
Orthodox
Baptist
Anglican
United Church
Other

All 67%
Immigration by Religions
2001 - 2011

Christians: 900,000
No religion: 675,000
Muslim: 450,000
Hindu: 225,000
Sikh: 90,000
Buddhist: 45,000
Jewish: 20,000
Religious Minorities

- Toronto: 25%
- Vancouver: 19%
- Calgary: 13%
- Montreal: 13%
- Edmonton: 13%
- Ottawa-G: 13%
- Winnipeg: 6%
- Halifax: 6%

- Muslim
- Hindu
- Sikh
- Buddhist
- Jewish
- Aboriginal
- Other
## Mainly First Generation

But Growing Second Generation 25-64

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>First generation</th>
<th>Second generation</th>
<th>Third generation +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Asian</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not VisMin</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 25%, 50%, 75%, 100% represent different generations.
Persistence of Economic Difference

But Second Generation Making Progress
Unemployment
Compared to Non-Visible Minorities 25-64

West Asian
Black
Latin American
Southeast Asian
South Asian
Arab
Korean
Filipino
Chinese
Japanese
Aboriginal

-2% 0% 2% 4% 6% 8%

First generation
Second generation
Unemployment
Compared to Christian Men and Women 25-64

- Muslim: Men -4.5%, Women 0%
- Hindu: Men 4.5%, Women 9%
- Sikh: Men 9%, Women 13.5%
- Buddhist: Men 13.5%, Women 18%
- Jewish: Men 18%, Women 21%
## Religion and Unemployment

Religious and Visible Minorities Second Generation 25-34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Christian</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Muslim</th>
<th>Buddhist</th>
<th>Hindu</th>
<th>Sikh</th>
<th>Jewish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Asian</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not VisMin</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Low Income
Pre-tax LICO Prevalence Individuals 25-64

Custom

12%

Korean: 12%
West Asian: 12%
Arab: 12%
Black: 12%
Latin American: 12%
Chinese: 12%
SE Asian: 12%
South Asian: 12%
Japanese: 12%
Filipino: 12%
Not VisMin: 12%
Aboriginal: 12%
Median Income
Full-Time Employed All Generations 25-64

Korean
West Asian
Latin American
Filipino
Black
Arab
Southeast Asian
South Asian
Chinese
Japanese
Not VisMin
Aboriginal

$30,000 $37,500 $45,000 $52,500 $60,000

Men
Women

Custom
$44,307
$54,886
Median Income

Full-Time Employed, Second Generation 25-34 University Educated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Median Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>$58,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.American</td>
<td>$48,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>$48,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Asian</td>
<td>$48,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>$52,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Asian</td>
<td>$52,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab</td>
<td>$52,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>$52,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>$52,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Asian</td>
<td>$52,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not VisMin</td>
<td>$48,629</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graph shows the median income for different ethnic groups, with separate bars for men and women.
Varied Social Picture
Hate Crimes
Annual Average 2008-12

**Ethnic Origin per Thousand**

- Black
- Arab or West Asian
- South Asian
- East and SE Asian
- Aboriginal
- White

**Religion per Thousand**

- Jewish
- Muslim
- Catholic
Feelings Towards Religious Groups
Angus-Reid 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Group</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholics</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhists</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Christians</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheists</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mormons</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikhs</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bias and Discrimination

Blind CV Test

• Having a foreign sounding name means 40% fewer interviews (Oreopoulos 2009, 2011)

• Assumed to be immigrants, not second generation

  • “I personally am guilty of gravitating toward Anglo names on résumés, and I believe that it’s a very human condition – [a result of] resistance to change.” (HR Staffing Officer)

• RBC/EY Report — Outsmarting our brains: Overcoming hidden biases to harness diversity’s true potential

• Implicit Association Test - Sobering realization of bias
Serving Citizens

Age 15 or Greater, All Generations

Healthcare

- Multiple VisMin
- VisMin, n.i.e.
- Japanese
- Korean
- West Asian
- Southeast Asian
- Arab
- Latin American
- Filipino
- Black
- South Asian

- Green
- Light Green
- Dark Green
- Purple
- Orange
- Pink
- Yellow

Social Services

- Multiple VisMin
- VisMin, n.i.e.
- Japanese
- Korean
- West Asian
- Southeast Asian
- Arab
- Latin American
- Filipino
- Black
- South Asian

- Green
- Light Green
- Dark Green
- Purple
- Orange
- Pink
- Yellow

Percentage breakdown:

20%
15%
10%
5%

- 3.7%
- 3.8%
- 3.1%
- 3.5%
- 2.7%
- 4%
- 2.4%
- 3.4%
Education Sector Employees
Age 15 or Greater, All Generations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>19%</th>
<th>13%</th>
<th>6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Multiple VisMin
- VisMin, n.i.e.
- Japanese
- Korean
- West Asian
- Southeast Asian
- Filipino
- Arab
- Latin American
- Black
- Chinese
- South Asian
- VisMin, n.i.e.
## Provincial Public Services

Visible Minority Representation, Age 15 or Greater, All Generations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>LMA</th>
<th>Other Healthcare</th>
<th>Other Services</th>
<th>Education Schools</th>
<th>Education Colleges</th>
<th>Education Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concentration vs Dispersion
2015 Electoral Ridings View of Ethnic Enclaves

- Ethnic Origin: 27 < 5%, 65 5-20%, 67 20-50%, 35 50-70%, 67 70% plus
- Visible Minorities: 135 < 5%, 93 5-20%, 77 20-50%, 15 50-70%, 2 70% plus
- Religious Minorities: 182 < 5%, 112 5-20%, 42 20-50%, 2 50-70%, 0 70% plus
Declining Citizenship and Plateauing Political Representation
Citizenship Take-up
Foreign-born by Place of Birth, Eligible

- Europe: 2,500,000
- Southern Asia: 1,875,000
- Latin America: 1,250,000
- Africa: 625,000
- East and SE Asia: 625,000
- West Central Asia, Mid-East: 625,000
- Caribbean: 625,000
- United States: 625,000
- Oceania: 625,000

Canadian Only: Yellow
Dual Nationals: Orange
Non-Citizens: Green

39
Citizenship
Visible Minorities, Eligible or Not

- Total VisMin: 22%
- Southeast Asian: 14%
- Black: 18%
- Chinese: 19%
- South Asian: 20%
- Japanese: 24%
- West Asian: 25%
- Arab: 28%
- Latin American: 30%
- Filipino: 32%
- Korean: 37%
- Not VisMin: 2%

Canadian only, Dual nationals, Non-Citizens
PRs, Applications, Citizens
2004 to 2014

Permanent Residents
Applications
New Citizens
Citizenship Take-Up
6 Years Since Landing vs All Years Since Landing 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>6 Years Since Landing</th>
<th>All Years Since Landing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact 2010 Changes

Percentage Decline by Country of Birth
2010-13 and 2014 Compared to 2005-9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Birth</th>
<th>Percent Change 2010-13</th>
<th>Percent Change 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern &amp; East African</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Asian &amp; Mid-East</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central &amp; West African</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North African</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East &amp; SE Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South European</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East European</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West European</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North European</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Pass Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-9</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-13</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Growth in Candidates
Visible Minority 2004 - 2015 Elections

Citizens
Lib
CPC
NDP
BQ

2011 Elections

Citizens
Overall
CPC
Cabinet
NDP
Liberals
Other

Visible Minorities
Women
2015 Elections

Citizens
Overall
Liberal
Cabinet
CPC
NDP
Other

Visible Minorities
Women
Provincial Representation

Visible Minority Representation Compared to Citizens 2014
(Alberta and PEI 2015)

[Bar chart showing the comparison of Visible Minority representation among different provinces in Canada, with BC, AB, SK, MB, ON, QC, NB, NS, PEI, and NL.]
Employment Equity
Large Provinces, Age 15 or Greater, All Generations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION VISIBLE MINORITY REPRESENTATION 2011</th>
<th>LMA</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>Provincial</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employment Equity

Government Religious Minority Employees 2011
Age 15 or Greater, All Generations
PS Salary Levels
2012-13 Compared to Men — TBS Data

- $100,000 and over
- $85,000 to 99,999
- $70,000 to 84,999
- $60,000 to 69,999
- $50,000 to 59,999
- $40,000 to 49,999
- Under $40,000

Visible Minority  Aboriginal Peoples  Women
Military, RCMP, CSIS
Employment Equity Visible Minority 2012-13

- VisMin Citizens: 15.0%
- CF Future Goal: 8.2%
- CF Officers: 6.0%
- CF Members: 4.0%
- RCMP LMA: 6.0%
- RCMP Officers: 3.3%
- RCMP Members: 8.8%
- CSIS: 14.3%
# Provincial Comparisons

## Visible Minorities compared to non VisMin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>AB</th>
<th>SK</th>
<th>MB</th>
<th>ON</th>
<th>QC</th>
<th>ATL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below pre-tax LICO 25-64</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation Rate 2nd Generation 25-34</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
<td>-3.0%</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment 25-64</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment 2nd Generation 25-34</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
<td>-4.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>-2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income 25-64</td>
<td>83.4%</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income 2nd Generation 25-64</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
<td>101.5%</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>101.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income 2nd Generation 25-34 University Diploma</td>
<td>101.1%</td>
<td>104.2%</td>
<td>99.7%</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Graduation 25-64</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Representation compared to LMA</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Representation compared to LMA</td>
<td>-7.6%</td>
<td>-7.1%</td>
<td>-4.4%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
<td>-7.3%</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naturalization Rate</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Representation compared to citizens</td>
<td>-5.6%</td>
<td>-8.4%</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
<td>-4.9%</td>
<td>-3.2%</td>
<td>-4.4%</td>
<td>-4.6%</td>
<td>-2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Representation compared to LMA</td>
<td>-3.7%</td>
<td>-10.6%</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td>-4.6%</td>
<td>-4.0%</td>
<td>-3.8%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### International Comparisons
2008 OECD Integration Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>AUS</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>NL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social - Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PISA G2 compared to native born</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>-26%</td>
<td>-23%</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Secondary 15-64 foreign-born</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household poverty rates</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment 15-34 G2 compared to native born</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS Employment 15-34 G2 compared to native born</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>-3.8%</td>
<td>-3.9%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>-5.7%</td>
<td>-12.2%</td>
<td>-5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Ownership</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born all ages</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalization 15 or older</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observations, Implications and Risks
Demographic

- More complex, varied diversity — ethnic and religious
- Toronto, Vancouver and Calgary, not MTV
- Dispersion to smaller centres

Implications and Risks

- More debate and discussion regarding “reasonable” accommodation
- More communities and institutions affected
Economic

- Strong participation rates
- Persistence of economic differences
  - But university-educated 25-34 second generation largely comparable
- Quebec outcomes significantly poorer

Implications and Risks

- Weaker inclusion of second-generation non-university educated
- Poorer outcomes for some groups (Black, Latin American)
  - Communities to focus both on external and internal barriers
- Ongoing discrimination in hiring
Social

• Strong education outcomes
• Hate crimes and discrimination persist
• Healthcare and education reasonably representative
• More mixed ‘ethnic enclaves’ than majority ones

Implications and Risks

• Gap between education and economic outcomes
• Challenge in overcoming implicit bias
• Greater prevalence of some groups in support positions
Political

• Immigrant to citizen model at risk
• Under-representation in elected officials and judges
  • But all parties compete for ethnic votes
• Federal public Service largely representative, provincial and municipal less so

Implications and Risks

• Weakened social fabric
  • Increased number of marginalized long-term non-citizens
  • Judicial decisions may not reflect Canada’s diversity
  • DND and RCMP need to address weak representation
Overall

- Fundamental policy framework — recognition and equality — remains valid
- Getting it right critical to Canada’s overall success
- Canada doing well compared to other countries
- But overall model of integration — from immigrant to citizen — at risk for some groups
- Need to address emerging fault lines
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