Title: Why there is no Detroit in Canada[1]

Abstract:

Despite significant structural similarities, Canadian and American Rust Belt cities have very different levels of inner core land abandonment. Cities like Detroit and Cleveland are filled with thousands of vacant lots. No abandonment of this magnitude exists in the Canadian Rust Belt, despite significant deindustrialization, suburbanization, wealth and localist politics—all factors theorized to be central causes for American Rust Belt abandonment. This paper considers why such a vast difference in land abandonment exists between the two contexts. It centers on the role of race, but in a way that challenges Canadian exceptionalist narratives about the ostensible lack of racialization. Racialization took place on both sides of the border, I argue, but only the American form contributed to land abandonment.

Author information:

Jason Hackworth
Professor of Geography and Planning
University of Toronto
100 St. George Street, Rm 5047
Toronto, ON M5S 3G3
+1-416-946-8764
jason.hackworth@utoronto.ca

Keywords: land abandonment; comparative urbanization; race; urban decline

Text word count: 8,859

Acknowledgments

Title: Why there is no Detroit in Canada

Abstract:

Despite significant structural similarities, Canadian and American Rust Belt cities have very different levels of inner core land abandonment. Cities like Detroit and Cleveland are filled with thousands of vacant lots. No abandonment of this magnitude exists in the Canadian Rust Belt, despite significant deindustrialization, suburbanization, wealth and localist politics—all factors theorized to be central causes for American Rust Belt abandonment. This paper considers why such a vast difference in land abandonment exists between the two contexts. It centers on the role of racialization, but in a way that challenges Canadian exceptionalist narratives about the ostensible lack of racialization. Racialization took place on both sides of the border, I argue, but only the American form contributed to land abandonment.

1

Land abandonment in the North American Manufacturing Belt

Every major world regional geography textbook has a section on the North American Manufacturing Belt. The discussion, and usually map, often focuses on the centripetal physical, transportation, and social features of the region. By the late nineteenth century, the American and Canadian governments had opened waterways and railroads that brought the formerly small towns of the Midwest and Central Canada into closer contact with port cities of the East. Significant iron ore deposits, ingenuity amongst automobile industrialists, and capital investment transformed the region within a generation. Places like Detroit, Cleveland, and Pittsburgh morphed from small outposts in the mid-nineteenth century into large industrial cities by the mid-twentieth. Almost all cities in the region, even those that did not grow as rapidly, became oriented around an industrial, warehousing, or steel-producing base. Small cities in southern Ontario transformed from a largely agricultural orientation to an industrial one, often replete with an American-owned factory that made them part of a bilateral supply chain. These links have been reinforced over the years by trade deals and infrastructure that streamline the movement of goods, capital, and people over the border in both directions.

Like their American counterparts, southern Ontario cities have seen their share of plant closures over the past half century as firms seek lower cost labor in other parts of the world. And yet despite the common experience of deindustrialization, most cities in the Southern Ontario Rust (née Manufacturing) Belt look nothing like their American counterparts. In particular, the extreme land abandonment of places like Buffalo, Cleveland and Detroit is nowhere to be found in Canadian cities even though they share some features that are widely thought to contribute to the problem in American cities. Why is inner city land abandonment so much less acute on the Canadian side of the Rust Belt? Why, in short, is there no Detroit in Canada? This article

attempts to answer that question. The larger conceptual goal is to calibrate existing theories of land abandonment. The piece centers on the importance of race as a key factor distinguishing the two urban experiences. Unlike other research which reinforces exceptionalist narratives about Canada however, this piece argues that both countries have profoundly racist pasts, particularly toward Black North Americans. In the United States, these sentiments were codified into housing policies and lending practices that directly contributed to the extreme levels of eventual land abandonment. In Canada, these sentiments were channeled primarily into an immigration policy that deliberately prohibited Blacks (and other non-Whites) from settling in the country.

This argument will be drawn out in several steps. First, I review the literature on American Rust Belt land abandonment to derive three major factors that are widely seen as causes: deindustrialization, unchecked suburban growth, and racialization. Second, through a correlation analysis of 151 American Rust Belt cities, I attempt to assign relative weights to these factors. From both the literature and correlation analysis, racialization emerges as a highly significant factor in land abandonment in U.S. cities. Third, I use this three-factor framework to explore the absence of dramatic land abandonment in the Canadian Rust Belt. Canadian Rust Belt cities are marginally different on the first two factors, but possess very different ethno-racial geographies. I conclude from this, not only that racialization is an underappreciated factor in land abandonment studies, but that Canada's absence of land abandonment is more attributable to an absence (until recently) of non-White minorities, than it is to an absence of racialization.

Understanding American land abandonment

The level of land abandonment in many American Rust Belt cities is often staggering for first-time visitors to see. Hundreds of thousands of housing units in cities like Detroit, Cleveland, and Buffalo have been vacated and demolished in the past half century (Hackworth, 2015b). In

general, scholars have focused on three inter-related forces to understand this phenomenon. First, land abandonment theory highlights the nature of the underlying industry and differential success in shifting to a post-industrial economy. Unlike the smaller, primarily textile-based economies of the Eastern Seaboard, Great Lakes urbanization centered around heavier, more sprawling industries—steel, chemicals, and automobiles in particular. These large sprawling industrial complexes grew around port, rail and expressway depots, first in classic urban cores (like Detroit), then next to them (e.g. Dearborn's River Rouge Plant), and then eventually in rural areas (e.g. the I-75 auto corridor). This encouraged the outward migration of firms in search of larger (and less unionized) factory sites. The exodus of plants from Rust Belt cities promoted an exodus of workers, that in turn suppressed demand for older, smaller inner core housing. Hundreds of thousands of residents eventually abandoned their properties as the surrounding market collapsed. The desperation to retain industry also provoked cities to pursue counterproductive and politically-toxic measures like demolishing whole neighborhoods (e.g. Poletown in Detroit) to accommodate factory expansions (and largely in vain) (Binelli, 2012). These measures accelerated rather than mitigated land abandonment. Cities that were particularly dependent on one industry (e.g. Detroit), or one firm (e.g. Highland Park, MI), were more vulnerable to this process than diversified ones like Chicago and Columbus. Cities that have been able to adapt from this industrial past by reorienting themselves around the globalized economy have generally fared better (Cowell, 2013; Martinez-Fernandez, et al, 2012; Reckien and Martinez-Fernandez, 2011).

Second, researchers have emphasized the pernicious combination of sprawl and jurisdictional fragmentation in American metropolitan areas (Gordon, 2008; Teaford, 1979). As previously-small Midwest cities transformed into industrial or shipping behemoths in the late

nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, they were quickly surrounded by bedroom communities that incorporated and separated themselves from the taxing authority and expensive social problems of the inner core (Teaford, 1979). As regions continued to grow, inner core cities began clamoring for some form of regional government, particularly in light of the fact that surrounding municipalities were sending thousands of workers to inner core factories and office buildings without adequately paying for the infrastructure they used (Thomas, 2013). Even business groups argued that the emerging crazy-quilt of cities and towns that formed most American metropolitan areas was administratively inefficient for the entire region (particularly for infrastructure provision), but courts and state legislatures increasingly took the side of balkanized suburbs and strengthened their efforts to have separate taxing, service, and school systems from the inner core (Gordon, 2008; Teaford, 1979). Many inner core locations entered a fiscal spiral that continues to this day, as residents increasingly moved to the suburbs undermining their tax base. Inner core property taxes rose, while service quality fell, promoting a migration of residents to the suburbs.

Complicating the basic inability to provide adequate services was the emergence a "housing disassembly line" (Galster, 2012). The housing disassembly line consists of the multiple political and economic processes that facilitate fringe housing growth, while encouraging inner core property abandonment. Perhaps the simplest dimension of this is the authority and incentive of suburban municipalities to approve, without any apparent limits, new housing in their jurisdiction. Fringe municipalities were permitted to grow so rapidly because of subsidized infrastructure, the most impactful form being large expressways that allow residents to live in far-flung communities but still remain within reasonable commute times of the inner core city. The federal government, prompted by the building lobby, has been subsidizing this

infrastructure since World War II (Checkoway, 1980). The saturation of regional housing markets with accessible, new, larger, relatively-inexpensive housing made it difficult to sell older, smaller housing in the core (Breger, 1967). Wide-open, quickly-built Midwestern cities that were surrounded by overly (building) permissive suburbs suffered greater abandonment than others with less acute versions of this mix (Ryan, 2012).

A final prominent factor in the land abandonment literature is race, though there are major differences in how it is positioned causally. In some instances, it is not mentioned at all, or framed as merely contextual—i.e. something happening in parallel with other more important processes. In these narratives, land abandonment is primarily an economic process of restless consumers seeking better housing on larger lots in the suburbs, and segmentation is just an innocuous expression of the American ethic of local control (see Checkoway, 1980 for critique). As Teaford (1979) points out, for example, municipal fragmentation predates the Great Migration of African Americans to the Midwest, so it cannot be crudely reduced to a simple reaction by Whites. According to this narrative, American suburbanization was poised to take a particularly fragmented form once wealth became more widespread and incomes rose after World War II. As an expanded middle class began to search for larger homes, they were increasingly finding them in suburbs that were formally separated from the inner core. Within this narrative, the fact that inner core cities became predominantly Black and their suburbs predominantly White is a separate question.

In other theories, race is a more significant factor but it is still framed as a consumer choice of White people fleeing Blacks. The common version of this story is that Whites spontaneously fled the growing concentration of Blacks in inner cities, particularly after the uprisings of the 1960s (Glaeser, 2011). In extreme versions of this narrative, Black leaders are

said to have engineered this movement to enhance their own electoral prospects (Glaeser and Shleifer, 2005). These narratives have a superficial quality to them that fails to fully explain the patterns of racialization and abandonment that emerged. If, for example, urban geographies were so dominated by true consumer sovereignty, Black families would have moved to suburbs too. Lost in these narratives are the answers to many important questions including how housing policies explicitly disallowed Blacks from migrating to the suburbs, and how banks and governments functioned to isolated impoverished African-American communities, undermine their equity, and encourage disinvestment.

To rectify these weaknesses, other scholars have developed a richer explanation rooted in explaining how policy, institutions, and simple prejudice facilitated land abandonment in Rust Belt Cities. This view holds race to be a socially-constructed, but deeply influential, source of policies that facilitated land abandonment in the American Rust Belt. This notion also derives from the thought that public policy is not merely, or even mostly, a dispassionate effort to meet the public interest. It is, rather, a reflection of the worldview and preferences of socially dominant groups (Bacchi, 2009). How this materializes depends on the context, but within twentieth century American urban policy, race was a dominant factor. Unlike previous groups who were initially constructed as "non-White" but were, within a generation, assimilated into the White power structure (e.g. Irish, Italian), Blacks were framed as a threat and actively reproduced as one (Massey & Denton, 1993). Whites vigorously, and often violently, resisted the growth of African-American neighborhoods. With the help of racist unions and firms they made sure that Blacks were not offered lucrative factory jobs (Sugrue, 2005). With the help of real estate agents, neighborhood groups, and City Hall, they made sure that segregation was rigid and persistent (Darden et. al., 1987; Sugrue, 2005; Thomas, 2013). Public and private redlining

7

denied Black neighborhoods the capital needed to purchase and maintain properties. Whites, middle class African Americans, and real estate investors abandoned such properties en masse, further isolating the existing residents who did not possess the resources to move. Relics of this process exist today. Using the aforementioned definition, 73.8% of the people living in extreme housing loss neighborhoods (explained below) are Black, compared to 34.1% for the aggregated remainder of those cities (Hackworth, 2015b).

These pressures did not stay entirely focused at the neighborhood scale, particularly after the 1968 Fair Housing Act outlawed some of the most egregious practices.[1] As African Americans came to dominate City Hall, these forces metastasized to the state legislature level. The extant American cultural preference for local control became infected and animated by a tribalistic politics that saw state legislatures in the Midwest support and reinforce a variety of measures (e.g. anti-school busing, anti-transfer payments, anti-annexation) that sought to protect the interests and property of White suburbs, while limiting the power of increasingly Black cities like Detroit, Cleveland, and Saint Louis (Gordon, 2008; Massey & Denton, 1993). Whites fled those cities at an increasing pace and the growing proportion of African Americans living in them became even more isolated. With time, and the assistance of right-wing think-tanks, the details of these injustices disappeared into the background, and the narrative switched to blaming in isolated Black cities and people for the problems "they caused" (e.g. Tanner, 2013). Black-majority cities were (and are) framed as profligate socialists, rather than victims of a sustained campaign to isolate and contain (Bukowski, 2012; Hackworth, 2015a). Such places served as symbolic and actual centers of Black political power, and of the White backlash that followed. The openly racist language of the past has been replaced by a discourse that blames the challenges of cities like Detroit on local fiscal malfeasance and corruption (Peck, 2015). The

discourse functions to divert funds away, and limit the administrative power of large, predominantly Black cities (Greenblatt, 2014; Hackworth, 2014).

In short, White racialization and isolation is heavily associated with land abandonment. Midwestern metro areas became more hyper-segregated, and entered fiscal crisis points which made it more difficult to maintain conditions attractive to new and existing residents. African Americans, in short, were framed as a threat by the dominant White society, which then sought to limit their living spaces, capital access, and political power. The means of those limitations directly facilitated an abandonment-friendly environment.

Assigning weight to land abandonment causes

Three factors have been positioned as significant causal forces in the production of extreme land abandonment in the American Rust Belt: deindustrialization, unchecked fringe growth, and racialization. A basic correlation analysis of patterns in Rust Belt cities and their association with different levels of land abandonment was performed to assign relative weights to each factor. Table 1 lists the catchment area of the study and the cities considered. All cities whose 1950 population exceeded 25,000 persons in New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, and Wisconsin were evaluated. New York City was eliminated because of its functional differences with the region in question, and Louisville and Saint Louis were added both because their MSAs spill into the region and because of their functional similarities with the cities in it (see Schilling and Mallach, 2012). Land abandonment is measured by calculating the percentage of each city's land area that is composed of extreme housing loss neighborhoods (EHLN). EHLNs are defined as all census tracts (within the aforementioned catchment) that lost more than 50% of their housing between 1970 and 2010. Tracts with fewer than 500 housing units in 1970 were eliminated to reduce the number of commercial spaces. Tracts that lost more

Table 1: Selected Cities in the American Rust Belt.[a]

State	EHLN Cities[b] (n = 49)	Other Cities (n = 102)
Illinois	Chicago*, Chicago Heights, Danville*, Decatur*, E. St. Louis, Joliet, Peoria*, Rockford*, Springfield*	Alton, Aurora, Belleville, Berwyn, Bloomington*, Champaign*, Cicero, Elgin, Evanston, Granite City, Kankakee*, Maywood Village, Moline, Oak Park, Rock Island, Waukegan
Indiana	Bloomington*, E. Chicago, Evansville*, Ft. Wayne*, Gary, Indianapolis*, So. Bend*	Anderson, Elkhart*, Hammond, Kokomo*, Lafayette*, Michigan City*, Mishawaka, Muncie*, New Albany, Terre Haute*
Kentucky	Louisville*	-
Michigan	Battle Creek, Detroit*, Flint*, Highland Park, Kalamazoo*, Muskegon*, Pontiac, Saginaw*	Ann Arbor*, Bay City*, Dearborn, Ferndale, Grand Rapids*, Hamtramck, Jackson*, Lansing*, Lincoln Park, Port Huron, Royal Oak, Wyandotte
Missouri	St. Louis	-
New York	Albany*, Brockport, Buffalo*, Rochester*, Syracuse*	Binghampton*, Elmira*, Ithaca*, Kingston*, Lackawanna, Lockport, Niagara Falls, Rome, Schenectady, Troy, Utica*, Watertown*
Ohio	Akron*, Canton*, Cincinnati*, Cleveland*, Dayton*, Hamilton, Lima*, Mansfield*, Steubenville, Toledo*, Youngstown*	Alliance, Barberton, Cleveland Heights, Columbus*, Cuyahoga Falls, E. Cleveland, Elyria, Euclid, Lakewood, Lorain, Massillon, Middletown, Newark, Norwood, Parma, Shaker Heights, Springfield*, Warren
Pennsylvania	Chester, Harrisburg*, Johnstown*, McKeesport, Philadelphia*, Pittsburgh*	Aliquippa, Allentown*, Altoona*, Bethlehem, Easton, Erie*, Hazleton, Lancaster*, Lebanon*, New Kensington, Norristown Borough, Reading*, Scranton*, Sharon, Washington, Wilkes-Barre, Wilkinsburg, Williamsport*, York*
Wisconsin	Milwaukee*	Appleton*, Beloit, Eau Claire*, Fond Du Lac*, Green Bay*, Kenosha, La Crosse*, Madison*, Oshkosh*, Racine*, Sheboygan*, Superior, Wausau*, Wauwatosa, W. Allis

* Principal core city of the MSA[c]

NOTES

[a] Includes all cities whose 1950 population exceeded 25,000 people in New York, Pennyslvania, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois and Wisconsin. New York City was subtracted, and St. Louis and Louisville were added.

[b] Cities that include at least one extreme housing loss neighborhood (EHLN). EHLNs are census tracts that lost more than 50% of their housing between 1970 and 2010 (not including tracts that contained fewer than 500 housing units in 1970, or those that lost more than 80% of their housing in a single decade).

[c] Principal core city is defined as the first city listed in the title of the MSA as of 2013 (according to U.S. Executive Office of the President, 2013).

than 80% of their housing in a single decade were also eliminated because it is often a signal of a large scale redevelopment (e.g. a hospital and city demolish an adjacent neighborhood to expand their facilities), which is different conceptually than the physical erosion of neighborhoods that takes places when abandonment progresses. This is a deliberately conservative way to measure land abandonment. It does not, for example, account for vacancy which is often the first step in the abandonment process, and it uses a very high threshold (half or more of the housing has been demolished). The intent is to identify only the most *extreme* and visible housing loss neighborhoods (EHLN)—those where the housing stock has significantly and persistently eroded over the past four decades. In total, there are 268 census tracts in 49 cities that meet this criteria. The percentage of land area in each city that has been classified as EHLN was then calculated for the correlation analysis. The 49 cities range from EHLNs being 1.1% of land area in Louisville, Kentucky, to 57.1% of land area in Highland Park, Michigan. Cities in the region are divided into three categories to illustrate the relationship between and among samples: all cities (n = 151); principal core cities (n = 78); and EHLN cities (n = 49).

The three aforementioned factors— deindustrialization, unchecked suburban growth, and racialization—were then operationalized using city level data, and a basic Spearman's correlation was performed. Table 2 displays the results with the most substantially-weighted factor for each sample bolded. Deindustrialization was measured by calculating the ratio of 1972 manufacturing jobs to 2012 manufacturing jobs located in each city. Ratios ranged from 0.7 in Lafayette (IN) to 46.9 in East Cleveland (OH). Moderate and statistically significant correlations with this variable and extreme abandonment were observed, but it was never the strongest relative to the other factors. The degree of fringe growth was calculated by determining what percentage of the housing unit growth occurred outside of the MSA core principal city between

Table 2: Spearman's rho correlations between land abandonment and socio-economic changes in the American Rust Belt.

Independent Variables	Degree of Land Abandonment[a]		
	All Cities[b]	Principal Cities[c]	EHLN Cities[d]
Manufacturing Job Loss, 1972-2012[e]	0.257**	0.347**	0.511***
Degree of Fringe Growth in MSA, 1970-2010[f]	0.111	0.437***	**0.606***
Percent Black in 1970[g]	**0.660***	0.703***	0.506***
Percent Black in 2010[h]	0.567***	**0.710***	0.471***
Percent Change in Black, 1970-2010[i]	0.423***	0.525***	0.435**

*Significance levels: *** ≤ 0.001, ** ≤ 0.010, * ≤ 0.050*

NOTES

[a] Defined as the percentage of the city land area that is composed of extreme housing loss neighborhoods (EHLN). EHLNs are census tracts that lost more than 50% of their housing between 1970 and 2010 (not including tracts that contained fewer than 500 housing units in 1970, or those that lost more than 80% of their housing in a single decade).

[b] All cities of greater than 25,000 people in 1950 in the following states: New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin. New York City was eliminated. Louisville and St. Louis were added (see Table 1).

[c] Using the Rust Belt (defined above), the "principal city" from each MSA featuring ate least one of the cities was selected. Principal city is defined as the first city listed in the 2013 MSA titles (U.S. Executive Office of the President, 2013). In total, there are 78 cities that meet this criteria.

[d] EHLN cities are those within the Rust Belt (defined above) that contain an "extreme housing loss neighborhood" (EHLN) (for definition, see above).

[e] Ratio of total manufacturing Jobs in 1972 (Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, 1972) to total manufacturing jobs in 2012 (NAICS Codes 31-33, from U.S. Department of Commerce, 2012).

[f] The percent of housing unit growth in each MSA that occurred outside of the principal (core) city for that region between 1970 and 2010 (Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce 1970 and 2010).

[g] Percentage of total population who is Black in 1970. Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, 1970

[h] Percentage of total population who is Black in 2010. Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, 2010

[i] Percentage Black in 2010 minus percentage Black in 1970.

1970 and 2010. Figures ranged from 16.3% of housing unit growth occurring outside of the principal city in the Muncie (IN) MSA, to 158.1% occurring outside of Dayton (OH) in its MSA.[2] When focusing only on EHLN cities, this variable emerges as a strong and significant relative to the others. But when other cities (i.e. those without an EHLN) are considered the relationship between unchecked fringe growth and inner core abandonment largely evaporates (see also Downs, 1999, for similar findings). Similar to deindustrialization, fringe growth was ubiquitous in the region (thus undermining the correlation coefficient strength when all cities are considered) but had a particularly pernicious effect on core cities already experiencing decline.

Racialization, by contrast, emerges as not only highly significant, but in all but one run, the *most* substantially-weighted variable. In particular, there are strong and consistent associations between the percentage of Black people and land abandonment, lending weight to the importance of the aforementioned racialization theories. In practice, it is impossible to fully isolate and disentangle these forces. The most extreme cases like Detroit experienced heavy doses of deindustrialization, suburbanization, *and* racialization. But it is clear that racialization is a significant part of this picture, arguably the *most* significant. To evaluate the vastly different abandonment experience of Canadian Rust Belt cities, the following analysis will focus on these three variables—unchecked fringe growth, deindustrialization, and racialization—with particular emphasis given to the latter.

Avoiding land abandonment in the Canadian Rust Belt

On the one hand, Canada and the United States possess similar governing frameworks that facilitate local autonomy. They are both spatially-sprawling, federalist systems, with regional differences that generate considerable economic and political competition between cities for investment and resources. Globally speaking, the two countries are more similar than

11

different when it comes to transfer payments to cities (i.e. at the low end of the OECD spectrum),

and in recent years, Canadian federal (and provincial) government spending on cities

(particularly the social economy) has been reduced and "downloaded", thus facilitating more

independence and inter-place competition as cities seek to fill the budgetary gaps with

entrepreneurial measures (Hackworth & Moriah, 2006). But there are relative differences of note

that contribute to different land abandonment outcomes. Above all, the balance of forces in

Canada have produced a less hostile relationship between provincial government and inner core

cities than American states have had with cities (Sancton, 2011; Weir, 1995). Aspects of this

difference have affected the administrative ability to create abandonment-resistant policies, the

most pertinent example being municipal annexation. While suburban fragmentation has

proliferated across the United States, Canadian officials have viewed such fragmentation as

incredibly expensive and inefficient (similar to the view expressed by business groups in the

United States). Provincial governments of various political stripes have actually *forced*

municipalities to consolidate their functions repeatedly during the twentieth century, including

most recently in 1997 when Ontario forced several regions to amalgamate, citing the redundancy

costs associated with governing a fragmented region (Sancton, 2011).[3] The Greater Toronto Area

(GTA) cities involved all sued the province in an attempt to block the change, and the resulting

political geography is not always cooperative—illustrating that the spirit of localism is not a

uniquely American one. But the fact remains that the amalgamation (like earlier ones) was

completed, and the City of Toronto (and Windsor, and Hamilton, among others) emerged with a

wider property tax base on which to draw revenue. Regional restructuring of this sort was not

possible in the United States, writes Darden (2004, p. 23) because of "the greater emphasis on

local control", and "the more racially diverse composition of American metropolitan areas".

12

These repeated amalgamations have created very different urban and regional geographies in the two countries. Many of the largest American Rust Belt cities have been hemmed in by suburbs for decades and their populations have fallen dramatically (Table 3).[4] Canadian Rust Belt cities, by contrast, have all experienced significant growth that has masked similar issues of inner city population loss. Windsor and Hamilton have, for example, lost 31.4% and 9.4% respectively from their populations since 1951 if one focuses on the original (1951) boundaries of the city. But because of repeated amalgamations, the 1951 boundaries are a mere thought experiment as both cities now encapsulate several former suburbs. These amalgamations have allowed for Southern Ontario cities to retain a larger proportion of their metropolitan area property tax base. In 2006, for example, Toronto encapsulated 49%, Windsor 67%, and Hamilton 73% of their metropolitan area populations.[5] By contrast, Detroit represented 19%, Cleveland 17%, and Buffalo 23% of their metropolitan area populations in 2010.[6] Ontario cities have a property tax base that has been consistently denied their American counterparts, making regional governance more tenable, and the funding of infrastructure, education, and social services more possible.

The political geography of governance in Ontario also slows the housing disassembly line somewhat to discourage inner core abandonment. Like the United States, Ontario has a substantial building construction lobby that has been successful at loosening regulations on the type and volume of new housing permitted—as it did during the mid- and late 1990s (Eidelman, 2010). But by the same token, meaningful suburban growth restrictions have emerged from the same political context. Additionally while much infrastructure is paid for by provincial and federal governments, locally levied development fees also pay for a significant portion (Hodge & Gordon, 2014), which brings the actual costs of growth marginally closer to the developer and

13

Table 3: Population change in the largest American and Canadian Rust Belt Cities (Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce, 1950 and 2010; Canada Census 1951 and 2006).

Rank in 1950/1	American Rust Belt[a] Cities				Canadian Rust Belt[b] Cities			
	City Name	1950 Population[c]	2010 Population[d]	% Change	City Name	1951 Population[e]	2006 Population[f]	% Change
1	Chicago	3,620,962	2,695,598	-25.6%	Toronto	675,754	2,503,281	270.4%
2	Philadelphia	2,071,605	1,526,006	-26.3%	Hamilton	208,321	504,559	142.2%
3	Detroit	1,849,568	713,777	-61.4%	Ottawa	202,045	812,129	302.0%
4	Cleveland	914,808	396,815	-56.6%	Windsor	120,049	216,704	80.5%
5	Saint Louis	856,796	319,294	-62.7%	London	95,343	352,395	269.6%
6	Pittsburgh	676,806	305,704	-54.8%	Thunder Bay[g]	66,108	109,016	64.9%
7	Milwaukee	637,392	594,833	-6.7%	Kitchener	44,867	204,668	356.2%
8	Buffalo	580,132	261,310	-55.0%	Sudbury	42,410	157,857	272.2%
9	Cincinnati	503,998	296,943	-41.1%	Oshawa	41,545	141,590	240.8%
10	Indianapolis	427,173	820,445	92.1%	Peterborough	38,272	74,898	95.7%
11	Columbus (OH)	375,901	787,033	109.4%	St. Catharines	37,984	131,989	247.5%
12	Louisville	396,129	597,337	61.8%	Brantford	36,727	90,192	145.6%
13	Rochester	332,488	210,565	-57.9%	Sarnia	34,697	71,419	105.8%
14	Toledo	303,616	287,208	-5.4%	Kingston	33,459	117,207	250.3%
15	Akron	274,605	199,110	-27.5%	Sault Ste. Marie	32,452	74,948	131.0%

NOTES:

[a] American Rust Belt is defined as all cities in New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, and Wisconsin. New York City was eliminated. Louisville and Saint Louis were added.

[b] Canadian Rust Belt is defined as all cities in Ontario.

[c] Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, 1950.

[d] Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, 2010.

[e] Source: Canadian Census, 1951.

[f] Source: Canadian Census, 2006.

[g] Thunder Bay was initially composed of to two separate cities—Port Arthur and Fort William—which were amalgamated in 1970. For the purposes of this chart, Fort William and Port Arthur populations are combined in 1951.

the development process than is the case in much of the U.S. The marginal differences in the

housing disassembly line are sufficient to create powerful development centrifuges in places like

Detroit, and a more manageable ones in places like Windsor.

An additional contrast centers on the relative success of Ontario's cities at transitioning to

post-industrial economies vis-à-vis their American counterparts (High, 2003). Part of this is

related to the relative drops in manufacturing employment which were marginally less severe in

Ontario than they were in Midwestern states. Measured as a ratio of 1947 to 2012 manufacturing

employment, Ontario scores 0.7 which means that it slightly gained jobs in the sector (in

absolute terms).[7] This ratio is similar to Wisconsin (0.8) and Indiana (1.0), but lower than Illinois

(1.8), Michigan (1.6), New York (1.8), Ohio (2.3), and Pennsylvania (2.2). As a component of

overall employment, manufacturing losses in Ontario have also been at the lower end of the Rust

Belt. Between 1947 and 2012, manufacturing employment shrank from being 62.5% to 11.4% of

Ontario's economy, a 51.1 point drop. This reduction is lower than the American state figures

which ranged from a 61.1 point drop in Wisconsin to a 75.2 point drop in Ohio. Clearly

manufacturing has become a smaller component of Rust Belt economies, but such figures only

relate to land abandonment if a city was not able to transition from an industrial to a post-

industrial pathway and replace lost employment opportunities. This transition has been a

particular challenge for small industrial cities in the American Midwest (Highland Park, MI;

Gary, IN, East St. Louis, IL), but less so for similarly-sized Ontario cities. Much of this relates to

the relationship that smaller cities in southern Ontario have to one very large city, Toronto.

Unlike the American Rust Belt, which is highly dispersed, deindustrialization in southern

Ontario was significantly offset by the post-industrial fortunes of one city. Almost every city in

southern Ontario is linked directly or indirectly to Toronto. Hamilton and Oshawa, for example,

14

are both industrial cities to the west and east of the city respectively, and both have struggled like their American counterparts with steel and auto industry fluctuations. But both also have commuter rail lines and easy expressway access and now partially function as bedroom communities for Toronto. Other cities in the region like London are too distant to have commuter rail links but have partially reoriented themselves around warehousing activities designed disproportionately to serve the GTA. This pattern contrasts with most of the American Rust Belt that has many more major and small cities that are comparatively isolated from the global post-industrial economy.

Toronto is not only disproportionately influential because of its size. It is also the provincial capital so it has a stable base of government employment, and is home to three large universities, which has made it somewhat resistant to the industrial reliance of some of its American counterparts. Most important, it is Canada's financial hub. Its emergence in this role was somewhat an accident of history, as it occurred in the 1970s when banks grew squeamish about the potential Quebec secession, and relocated their headquarters from Montreal. The transfer of financial firms created tens of thousands of jobs in Toronto, and the city emerged as a global financial hub just as the Rust Belt region (including in Toronto) was being hit with crippling industrial sector job losses. When heavy manufacturing began to falter in a widespread way in the 1970s, many American Rust Belt cities found themselves isolated from a globalizing economy or larger cities, like Toronto, which might serve as a conduit for them to access it.

Ontario cities avoided land abandonment in part by not enacting the policies that caused and exacerbated it in the United States. Metropolitan areas in Ontario are fragmented and there is an ethic of local control, but less so than in the United States. The building industry is an active lobby, and periodically advances deregulation in housing construction, but they have less

influence in the more centralized Ontario system. Southern Ontario experienced significant deindustrialization, but much of its impact has been offset by the fortunes of its large, post-industrial urban nucleus. These subtle differences have been important but they are ultimately incomplete. They are differences of degree and sometimes subtle ones at that. Indianapolis and Louisville have, for example, enacted meaningful annexation schemes in the past 20 years but both still have significant land abandonment. Chicago, Philadelphia, and Pittsburgh all have substantial financial sectors, yet they too have significant land abandonment. The differences, to the extent they exist, are subtle but the land abandonment outcomes are not—they are vast. The more meaningful difference I argue, in why land abandonment outcomes were so different centers on racialization. In the United States, these processes focused on containment of African Americans and directly contributed to land abandonment by undermining the equity of African-American cities, neighborhoods, and people. In Canada, these processes focused on exclusion of Blacks (and other visible minorities) from the country. They were motivated by similar logics but led to policy outcomes that had a very different impact on land abandonment.

Racialization and Canadian urban governance

Canada did not impose the range of racially-inspired, abandonment-producing housing policies that became infamous in the United States. There were no restrictive covenants, or widespread race-based financial redlining in Canadian cities. Some have observed differences of this sort and concluded, following Lipset (1989), that the two countries simply possess different racial sensibilities. In particular, the argument flows from the path breaking Myrdal (1944) argument that the "American Creed" is so stained by the legacy of slavery that racism has affected nearly every meaningful policy matter since abolition. The range of segregating, discriminatory laws enacted in mid-twentieth century urban America make Myrdal's thesis

16

difficult to refute. But the occurrence of a pattern in the United States does not therefore make the opposite true in Canada. Canada has a lengthy history of racialization ranging from slavery into the 1830s (Winks, 1997), to whites-only lunch counters into the 1950s (Ontario Heritage Trust, 2010). The racializing sentiment that produced restrictive covenants and redlining in the United States was (and is) very evident in Canada. The more pertinent difference between the two countries as it relates to land abandonment is the size of the non-White community in Canada and the political threat they (did not) pose to the White status quo. As Massey and Denton (1993, pp. 17-42) argue, Blacks and Whites lived in relatively integrated patterns in American northern (and southern) cities when African Americans were low in number and posed little threat to the White status quo (as is the case in all Canadian cities to this day). But after the Great Migration of the early twentieth century, massive numbers of African Americans moved to northern cities and changed not only the demography but the politics and culture. Eventually, the White establishment created a series of brutal, unjust policies to contain and isolate (Sugrue, 2005). These policies produced eventual land abandonment to a significant extent. In Canada, the policy thrust and application of racialization was simpler: exclusion of visible minorities[8], including but not limited to Blacks, from the country through immigration policy. Blacks and Aboriginals hold a particularly dark place in Canadian history as the two groups who were held as slaves in New France and British North America (Winks, 1997). African Canadians (like Aboriginals and Asians) have been historically racialized as inferior to White in Canada, but because they were denied entry to the country during the twentieth century, their numbers never accumulated (and cohesion never actuated) to the point of being a threat to the political institutions, materiality, or identity of White Canada at the urban scale. In fact, no visible

17

minority group formed a majority-minority city in the way that Detroit became a majority-African American city surrounded by White suburbs (and society).[9]

There are historical and contemporary dimensions to this point. Though Canada has at times been a destination for Black refugees—most famously during the mid-nineteenth century underground railroad—many people of African descent actually found the colony/country to be a hostile place in the eighteenth, nineteenth and early twentieth century (Hill, 2001). Robin Winks' (1997), *The Blacks in Canada*, provides the closest thing to a comprehensive account of this experience. He points out that slaves were brought to the country by the early European settlers—many wealthy families in New France, and British North America owned at least one domestic slave. During the American Revolution, large groups of Black Loyalists were granted passage to Nova Scotia, but so were many slave-owning White Loyalists (with their slaves). Slavery actually endured longer in Upper Canada (Ontario), Lower Canada (Quebec), and Nova Scotia, than in some Northern States (Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, and the Northwest Territory). Slave owners in Upper Canada openly worried that this would undermine the institution, and indeed some Canadian Blacks fled to the United States to escape.

Slavery was abolished throughout North America by the 1860s but this did not translate into Blacks being accepted as equals in either the United States or Canada. In the United States, where Black populations were high, particularly in the South, this sentiment focused on brutal containment and segregation policies. In Canada, from which most earlier Black settlers and refugees had fled (leaving the resident population very small), racialization materialized most prominently in efforts to exclude further Black immigration from the country. In the early twentieth century, for example, African-American farmers began responding en masse to the Canadian Government's offer of free land in the West. Small Black settlements started to emerge

and federal officials worried that this would threaten property values, discourage White

immigration, and create American style racial conflict (Schwinghamer, 2015). As the federally

sponsored commission on the matter reported in 1910, "I would consider it unwise to permit

[African Americans] to come in large numbers to our country, as they would soon assume such

proportions that we might be confronted with the same difficulties, political and social, as the

American Republic is dealing with today" (Canadian Department of Immigration, 1910; quoted

in Schwinghamer, 2015). Federal immigration officials used a variety of means to deny entry to

African Americans and those of African descent from elsewhere in the world. By 1920, African

Canadians numbered a mere 20,000 in a country of 8.4 million (0.2% of the population)

(Vickers, 2002).

These sentiments became further enshrined in Canadian immigration law by the early-

twentieth century and endured until the late 1960s. "Blacks", writes an official federal

government immigration history of the period, "were held to be inadmissible unless they fell in

the preferred classes, or were the spouses or minor children of Canadian residents" (Canadian

Department of Manpower and Immigration, 1974a, p. 21). This was facilitated by a policy that

explicitly ranked countries based on the ethno-racial desirability of their citizens starting in the

early 1950s (Darden, 2004) (see Table 4). At the top of the four category model, were the "most

preferred" countries of the United Kingdom, the United States, Australia, South Africa, and New

Zealand. "More preferred countries" included others in Western and Northern Europe. The

British West Indies was listed in category three, "less preferred", while South Asia along with

"all other Asian countries" and "all other countries" were listed in the "least preferred" category

(Darden, 2004). Black people could gain entry if they were also citizens of the United States, or

other rich White-majority countries, but were actively turned away if they were not. When

19

Table 4: Most and least preferred immigrant country destinations in Canadian immigration policy, 1952-1962 (Source: Government of Canada, 1952).

Category I – Most Preferred	
Rank	*Countries*
1	Great Britain and Northern Ireland; Australia, New Zealand; South Africa, Ireland, The United States, France
Category II – More Preferred	
Rank	*Countries*
2	Belgium, Luxembourg, Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Switzerland
3	Holland
4	Germany, Austria, Greece, Finland
5	Italy
Category III – Less Preferred	
Rank	*Countries/ region*
6	Israel, Turkey, Syria, Lebanon, Iran
7	All other European Countries
8	South America
9	British West Indies
Category IV – Least Preferred	
Rank	*Countries/ region*
10	India, Pakistan, Ceylon
11	All other Asian countries
12	All other countries

minority activist groups in Canada protested the obvious racism of the program, the federal government initially resisted change. In response to calls for the country open more slots to immigrants from the British Caribbean, Canada's Director of Immigration replied in 1955:

> It is from experience, generally speaking, that coloured people in the present state of the White man's thinking are not a tangible asset and as a result are more or less ostracised. They do not assimilate readily and pretty much vegetate to a low standard of living […] many cannot adapt themselves to our climatic conditions. To enter into an agreement [with British Caribbean countries] which would have the effect of increasing coloured immigration to this country would be an act of misguided generosity since it would not have the effect of bringing a worthwhile solution to the problem of coloured people and would quite likely intensify our own social and economic problems. (Canadian Director of Immigration, 1958; quoted in Taylor et. al, 2007)

Before 1962, this sentiment held sway and the ranking system stayed intact. Though Canada was accepting hundreds of thousands of Europeans to fuel its industrializing economy, very few Blacks (or Asians) from any country were permitted entry. Small numbers of Blacks did however gain entry through a small program to recruit nannies and housekeepers from the Caribbean (Calliste, 1991). "The Caribbean Domestic Scheme" was similar in principle to earlier programs which sought to encourage domestic workers of Eastern European origin. Unlike their Eastern European predecessors however, Black Caribbean women were subject to humiliating gynecological exams (on the assumption that they were more promiscuous and thus more likely to bring venereal disease to Canada), and the requirement that they be unmarried without dependents (so that they would be less likely to permanently settle in Canada with their family) (Carty, 1994).

During the 1950s and 1960s, there was much debate about immigration policy and race. The Liberal government of the 1960s openly worried in the influential 1966 Immigration White Paper, that Canada's racist policy was going to deprive it of the high-quality skilled immigrants that it needed for economic development (Canadian Department of Citizenship and Immigration, 1966), so they altered the policy to be less racially discriminatory in 1967. After this point, the country increasingly adopted a point system that rewarded existing training and resources. Larger numbers of visible minorities began, after these seminal acts, to enter the country as immigrants, but Canadian officials continued to worry about their capacity to assimilate and in several important documents gesture openly to the problems then festering between Blacks and Whites in the United States (Darden, 2004; Satzewich, 1989). As the 1974 Federal Government Green Paper on Immigration reported, while some Canadians were supportive of immigration,

> Others are concerned about the consequences for national identity that might follow any significant change in the ethnic composition of the population, citing the unhappy example of countries where the pace at which migration introduced new racial groups into the population outstripped the ability of their societies to adapt to these changes harmoniously, and resulted in serious social difficulties. (Canadian Department of Manpower and Immigration, 1974b, p. 16)

The most prominent "unhappy example" motivating immigration policy was the United States (Canadian Department of Manpower and Immigration, 1974b, p. 6), but Canadian officials increasingly acknowledged how poorly these sentiments represented the country, so they continued with the race-blind immigration policy forged in 1967. Despite this shift in the late 1960s, the preceding century of limiting visible minority immigration left Canadian cities with very White social geographies. By suppressing the entry and concentration of visible minorities

to the country before 1967, no Canadian city acquired a demographically or politically dominant non-White group like Detroit did.

For the small percentages of Black people who made it to, and remained in Canada, discrimination was common, though geographically uneven, throughout the twentieth century. In cities where African Canadians constituted a very small proportion of the population (e.g. Toronto) restrictions were few. But in rural areas of Southwestern Ontario—the destination point for many underground railroad refugees—Blacks were a larger proportion of small farming and industrial towns like Dresden and Harrow. Such towns had Whites-only lunch-counters, churches, theaters, and barber shops, as well as sundown laws for African Canadians until the organizing activity of local Blacks—through the National Unity Association (NUA)—successfully campaigned to have the Ontario Fair Accommodation Practices Act passed in 1954 (Katz, 1949; Ontario Heritage Trust, 2010). Some Whites in Dresden were so incensed at the change that they threatened to kill the leader (and his family) of the NUA, Hugh Burnett (Ontario Heritage Trust, 2010). Though this threat was never carried out, they did boycott Burnett's business and he was driven from town. The first and last prosecution of the Fair Accommodation Practices Act took place in 1956, after White businesses in Dresden refused to comply with the law and were fined nominal sums (Ontario Heritage Trust, 2010). Education patterns too were varied, and related to the proportion of Blacks and other visible minorities. In Southwestern Ontario and Nova Scotia, segregated schools were the norm.[10] The last segregated school in Ontario (School Section 11 of Colchester South District) did not close until 1965, and only then after news reporters from Toronto visited the rat-infested Blacks-only school and embarrassed local officials with a national story about it. The last segregated school in Nova Scotia, astonishingly, did not close until 1983. So, while Ontario and other Canadian provinces did not

adopt the full range of segregating measures that American officials did during the mid-twentieth

century, they were also very slow to change existing local segregating measures, which tended to

be applied specifically in the most non-White areas (Boyko, 1995). Overall during the mid-

twentieth century, African Canadians lived disproportionately in poverty and had little political

power given their small percentages. When Halifax (NS) city officials decided, for example, in

the 1960s that the historical Black Canadian enclave of Africville should be razed, its residents

had little power to stop it (Nelson, 2008). City officials promised to move residents to public

housing respectfully, but instead they forcibly removed residents using City dump trucks to

move their belongings. Because African-Canadian numbers were low, such issues never gained

political prominence. Either unaware or unconcerned about these incidents, many (White)

Canadians began to view the festering race relations across the border as uniquely American.

"Prior to the 1970s", writes Darden (2004; p. 20),

> most Torontonians (overwhelmingly Whites) viewed their city as different from cities in
>
> the United States. Toronto was viewed as different because it did not have the racial
>
> turmoil of U.S. cities. Not mentioned was the fact that Canada's immigration policies had
>
> largely excluded people of color prior to 1967. Thus, few racial minorities meant fewer
>
> incidents of discrimination, fewer grievances and thus less protest, peaceful or violent.

When American racial conflict threatened to spill across the border, the Canadian understanding

of racial tensions in the United States was not appreciably different than that of the White

American mainstream during the mid-twentieth century. When, for example, the Detroit uprising

erupted in July of 1967, Canada's mainstream establishment newspaper, *The Globe and Mail*,

reported the event as such:

Thousands of rampaging Negroes firebombed and looted large sections of the fifth largest

U.S. city last night […] groups of Negroes swilled beer defiantly on main streets. […]

Gangs of Negroes bashed in the fronts of stores and carted off all the goods—lamps,

chairs, golf clubs, beer or whatever was there—with impunity. […] Stores marked with

Soul Brother, meaning Negro-owned or Negro sympathizer, did not escape destruction.

Crowds of angry Negroes surged throughout the embattled area shouting 'Kill whitey',

and hurling bricks, bottles and fruit from looted stores at policemen, fireman and

newsmen. […] (Bavarskis, 1967)

The derisive narrative that framed African Americans as "rampaging" avaricious figures was not

unusual for Canadian press accounts, and captured a fear that Detroit's problems were going to

migrate to Ontario. It also sheds doubt on the notion that Canada's avoidance of such uprisings

was somehow attributable to an enlightened racial sensibility. It was not that Canadian Blacks

(or other visible minority groups) avoided racialization. They were excluded from immigrating

and those who had made it to Canada faced a different set of rules from White people in many

parts of the country. The more meaningful difference was the size, composition, and political

influence of Black populations in the two countries.

Even today, after several decades of a race-blind immigration policy, Black Canadians

are still a very small minority overall and in Canadian cities compared to American Rust Belt

cities like Buffalo, Cleveland and Detroit (see Table 5).[11] Like other visible groups in Canada,

African Canadians never came to dominate an urban political structure, and only exceed a single-

digit population percentage in two cities.[12] Also like other visible minority groups, African

Canadians are more internally divided than African Americans (Mensah, 2010). Almost all of the

Black community in Rust Belt Canada is composed of recent immigrants, whereas the Black

Table 5: Ethno racial characteristics of selected cities in the North American Rust Belt (Sources: Canadian Census, 1961; Canadian Census, 2006; U.S. Department of Commerce, 2002; U.S. Census Bureau, 2015).

	Percent Black		Percent White		Percent Race Other than Black or White	
	1960/1	2006/10	1960/1	2006/10	1960/1	2006/10
United States	10.5%	12.6%	88.6%	72.4%	0.9%	15.0%
US Rust Belt[a]	7.3%	11.9%	92.4%	78.7%	0.3%	9.4%
Buffalo	13.3%	38.6%	86.2%	50.4%	0.5%	11.0%
Cleveland	28.6%	53.3%	71.1%	37.3%	0.3%	9.4%
Detroit	28.9%	82.7%	70.8%	10.6%	0.3%	6.7%
Canada[b]	0.2%	2.4%[c]	96.7%	84.0%	3.1%	13.6%
Canadian Rust Belt[d]	0.2%	3.7%	98.4%	77.8%	1.4%	18.5%
Hamilton	0.1%	2.0%	99.0%	88.5%	0.9%	9.5%
Toronto	0.2%	6.7%	98.4%	58.0%	1.4%	35.3%
Windsor	0.9%	3.9%	97.9%	79.0%	1.2%	17.1%

NOTES

[a] The U.S. Rust Belt is defined here as the aggregated figures for the states of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin.

[b] In Canada, questions used to identify visible minorities were first introduced in the 1996 Census. Prior to this, data was derived from responses to the ethnic origin questions, which included the category "negro" in the 1961 Census. Percent White for Canada (in 1961) is derived from all ethnic origins minus Chinese, Japanese, East Indian, Syrian, Other Asiatic, Eskimo, Native, Negro and Other categories from the Canadian Census (1961).

[c] Source: Canadian Census (2006)

[d] The Canadian Rust Belt is defined here as the province of Ontario.

community in the United States is overwhelmingly native born. Canadian Blacks are less likely to have a sufficiently common experience that might serve as a basis for political identity or mobilization (see Table 6).

In part this undermines the ability of Canadian Blacks to fight evident forms of racialization. African Canadians are, for example, over-represented in prison (Khenti, 2013).[13] They are 17 times more likely than White Canadians to be "randomly" and legally stopped by police in downtown Toronto and forced to show their identification without probable cause (Cole, 2015). They are victims of significant mortgage, job and housing discrimination (Darden, 2004).[14] When race is cross-tabulated with income (see Table 7), African Canadians have a similar distribution as African Americans—overrepresented in the bottom quintile, under-represented in the top. Canadian Blacks and other visible minorities are more likely to be victims of spatialized poverty than Whites (Hanja, 1995; Kazemipur & Halli, 2000).[15] Black Canadian activists have recently argued for reform in several areas related to housing, policing, and schooling, but the community is smaller, more internally varied, and thus less able to activate reform in those area. Though racialized, they are also less of a political and cultural threat to Canadian Whites, and never inspired a backlash that, for example, Detroit did after the 1967 uprising and election of Coleman Young in 1974.

In short, while formal legal prohibition on their entry to the country has ended, Canadian Blacks continue to face significant interpersonal and structural racism. But Canadian Blacks are small in number, more often divided by language, religion, and national origin than American Blacks. There is less political cohesion amongst African Canadians than amongst African Americans, and this pattern is similar to other visible minority groups. These factors have translated into very different social geographies in the North American Rust Belt. Canada did not

Table 6: Language, country of origin, and religion diversity amongst North American Black Populations.

	Percentage of Blacks Who		
	Are Foreign Born	*Speak language other than English[a]*	*Are Non-Christian[b]*
United States[c]	8.1%	0.2%	19.0%[d]
United States Rust Belt[e]	11.7%	0.2%	N/A
Canada[f]	55.7%[g]	24.9%	31.6%
Canadian Rust Belt[h]	56%	19%	35.7%

NOTES

[a] In Canada, this includes those who do primarily not speak French or English (the two official languages). In the U.S., it includes only those who do not speak English.

[b] For the year 2001. Christian includes all unaffiliated Christians, Mormon, Jehovah's Witness, Protestant, and Catholic persons. Non-Christian includes unaffiliated, Jewish, Muslim, Buddhist, and Hindi. Source: 2001 Canadian Census (2001).

[c] Source: IPUMS-US (2006). Cross-tabulations completed by author.

[d] U.S. Data for religion was obtained from the Pew Research Center (2015). Categories included under Christian were: Catholic, Evangelical Protestant, Historically Black Protestant, Jehovah's Witness, Mainline Protestant, Mormon, Orthodox Christian, and Other Christian.

[e] The U.S. Rust Belt is defined here as the aggregated statistics for the states of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin.

[f] Data retrieved from PUMS-Canada (2006). Cross-tabulations completed by author.

[g] Includes both immigrants (citizens and permanent residents) and non-permanent residents (those with a work permit).

[h] Canadian Rust Belt is defined here as the province of Ontario.

Table 7: Race by individual income quintiles in the United States and Canada, 2006.

	Percent of Each Group in Each Income Quintile[a]				
	Poorest Quintile	*Second Quintile*	*Middle Quintile*	*Third Quintile*	*Richest Quintile*
United States[b]					
Black	26.2%	24.5%	20.7%	17.2%	11.4%
White	18.1%	19.4%	20.3%	20.5%	21.7%
Races other than Black or White	28.0%	20.0%	20.3%	16.3%	15.4%
All	19.7%	20.0%	20.0%	20.3%	19.7%
United States Rust Belt[c]					
Black	28.1%	23.2%	19.4%	17.4%	11.9%
White	18.0%	19.7%	21.0%	21.0%	20.4%
Races other than Black or White	30.2%	19.8%	19.3%	15.5%	15.1%
All[d]	19.7%	20.0%	20.8%	20.3%	19.3%
Canada[e]					
Black	28.4%	19.4%	21.5%	18.5%	12.1%
White	19.2%	17.9%	21.4%	20.3%	21.1%
Races other than Black or White	31.1%	20.8%	19.3%	15.4%	13.3%
All	20.9%	18.3%	21.2%	19.7%	20.0%
Canadian Rust Belt[f]					
Black	28.1%	17.6%	19.8%	20.5%	14.0%
White	18.9%	16.0%	19.8%	10.4%	24.8%
Races other than Black or White	31.2%	19.7%	18.4%	16.0%	14.7%
All[g]	21.4%	16.7%	19.6%	19.6%	22.7%

NOTES

[a] National quintiles do not work out to a perfect 20% because of clusters of people with the same income on the break points.

[b] Source: IPUMS-US (2006). Cross-tabulations completed by author.

[c] The U.S. Rust Belt is defined here as the aggregated statistics for the states of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin.

[d] U.S. Rust Belt figures were placed into national quintile break-points. Poorest Quintile ($0-4,399USD), Second Quintile ($4,400-14,299USD), Middle Quintile ($14,299- 27,999USD), Third Quintile ($28,000-49,599USD), Richest Quintile ($49,600+USD).

[e] Source: PUMS-Canada (2006). Cross-tabulations completed by author.

[f] Canadian Rust Belt is defined here as the province of Ontario.

[g] Canadian Rust Belt figures were placed into national quintile break-points. Poorest Quintile ($0-7,999CAD), Second Quintile ($8,000-17,999CAD), Middle Quintile ($18,000-30,999CAD), Third Quintile ($31,000-49,999CAD), Richest Quintile ($50,000+CAD).

avoid the abandonment-producing policies of the American Rust Belt by summarily rejecting racialization. White homogeneity was actively reproduced in Canada during the mid-twentieth century and the still-small numbers of African Canadians continue to experience racialization. Racism against Blacks in Canada simply functioned differently than it did in the U.S. The American version contributed directly to land abandonment, while the Canadian version did not.

Racialization and land abandonment

The role of racialization in land abandonment theories is often inadequate. In the most extreme instances, racialization is excluded as a force altogether—land abandonment is simply a race-blind expression of demand for better housing, or an expression of local control manifesting as newly-incorporated suburbs. In other narratives, it is simply a contextual factor occurring in parallel to this process of demand. A compelling literature on the importance of racialization, statistical evidence from American Rust Belt cities, and the juxtaposition with Canadian cities, suggests that its role is far more significant than it is often framed to be in the literature. Framing land abandonment as a simple expression of free will elides many of the racist institutions and forces that produced it in the United States. Ethno-racial tensions in American cities permeated a variety of policy-making levels during the mid-twentieth century. Black-White racial tensions became central to urban renewal, federal housing law, lending practices, resistance to annexation measures, and schooling issues. These tensions boiled not only into race-based uprisings but into a policy gridlock that has made regional solutions to imminently solvable issues like land abandonment intractable.

If racialization is a significant factor in facilitating land abandonment, the question (given the methodology of this paper) naturally gravitates toward the corollary matter of why such policies did not emerge in Canada and create similar patterns of abandonment. Two logical

possibilities emerge. Either the racialization of African Canadians (and other visible minorities) did not exist or was substantially less severe than the situation in the U.S., or African Canadians (and other visible minorities) were deliberately excluded from the country, leaving their numbers and potential threat to White Canada low. Though it is often framed in exceptionalist terms as a place that avoided American style race tensions, it is doubtful that one can attribute the main policy difference to one of racial sensibility. Blacks and other visible minority groups in Canada experience significant discrimination. Black incomes, job attainment levels, and educational achievement rates are lower than Whites. Their rates of police harassment, mortgage denial, and incarceration are higher. Their post-1967 experience is not substantially different than the post-1968 African-American experience—formal discrimination is illegal, but racialization is still very evident and ongoing. Unlike American Rust Belt cities however, Canadian Blacks are nowhere close to a majority or plurality capable of forcing reform or threatening the status quo. If it is true to say that there is no Detroit in Canada as it relates to land abandonment, it is also true to say that there is no Detroit in Canada when it comes to Black (or any other visible minority group) political mobilization, reform, or cultural identity. African Canadians are marginalized, divided, and small in number. They are not nearly as large, mobilized, or associated with one city as African Americans are in much of the Rust Belt. The toxic politics of "restraining the Black city" never gained traction in the Canadian Rust Belt, because there is no "Black city" (or any other majority-minority inner core city) in Canada. Canada was able to avoid the abandonment-producing policies that tore through Detroit and similar cities, but not because it more successfully integrated people of color into the hegemonic power structure. Its policy-making social cohesion was more built on a deliberate form of exclusion that made

Canadian urban regions more racially homogenous during the industrializing (and

deindustrializing) period of the North American Rust Belt.

References:

Bacchi, Carol. (2009). *Analysing policy: What's the problem represented to be?* Frenchs Forest, NSW: Pearson Australia.

Bavarskis, Justinas. (1967, July 24). Call in tanks, seal border as race riots hit Detroit. *The Globe and Mail*, 1, 9.

Binelli, Mark. (2012). *Detroit city is the place to be: The afterlife of an American metropolis*. New York: Henry Holt Company.

Boyko, John. (1995). *Last steps to freedom: The evolution of Canadian racism*. Winnipeg: Watson and Dwyer.

Breger, G.E. (1967). The concept and causes of urban blight. *Land Economics, 43*(4), 369-376.

Bukowski, Diane. (2012, February). Michigan governor accused of disenfranchising Detroit, other majority Black cities in the state. *The Final Call*. Retrieved from http://www.finalcall.com/artman/publish/National_News_2/article_8621.shtml

Calliste, Agnes. (1991). Canada's immigration policy and domestics from the Caribbean: The second domestic scheme. In Jesse Vorst (Ed.), *Race, class, gender: Bonds and barriers* (pp. 133-65). Toronto: Garamond Press.

Canada, Government of. (1952). Statutes of Canada. An Act Respecting Immigration, 1952. Ottawa: SC 1 Elizabeth II, Chapter 42. Retrieved from http://www.pier21.ca/research/immigration-history/immigration-act-1952

Canada, Government of. (2006). Employment equity data report. Retrieved from http://www.labour.gc.ca/eng/standards_equity/eq/pubs_eq/eedr/2006/profiles/

Canadian Census. (1951). *1951 Census for incorporated cities, towns and villages of 2,500 and over*. Ottawa: Dominion of Bureau Statistics.

Canadian Census. (1961). *1961 Census of Canada population profiles*. Ottawa: Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

Canadian Census. (2001). *2001 Census of population*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.

Canadian Census. (2006). *2006 Census of population*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.

Canadian Department of Citizenship and Immigration. (1966, April). *Immigration white paper: Social and cultural factors in immigration policy*. Ottawa: Government of Canada.

Canadian Department of Immigration. (1910). Immigration of Negroes from the United States to Western Canada. Library and Archives Canada, RG 76, Volumes 192-193, File 72552.

Canadian Department of Manpower and Immigration. (1974a). *The immigration program*. Ottawa: Government of Canada.

Canadian Department of Manpower and Immigration. (1974b). *Immigration policy perspectives*. Ottawa: Government of Canada.

Canadian Department of Trade and Commerce (Canada). (1947). *The employment situation at the beginning of January 1947*. Ottawa: Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

Canadian Director of Immigration. (1958, January 14). *Memo from the Director of Immigration to the Deputy Minister of Immigration, Department of Citizenship and Immigration*. Library and Archives of Canada, RG 26, Volume 124, File 3-33-6, Part 1.

Canadian Ministry of Industry. (2012). *Employment, earnings and hours, January 2012*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.

Canadian Office of Correctional Investigator. (2013, May). The changing face of Canada's prisons: Correctional investigator reports on ethno-cultural diversity in corrections. Press Release. Retrieved from http://www.oci-bec.gc.ca/cnt/comm/press/press20131126-eng.aspx

Carty, Linda. (1994). African Canadian women and the state: 'Labour only, please'. In Peggy Bristow (Ed.), *We're rooted here and they can't pull us up: Essays in African Canadian women's history* (pp. 193-229). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Checkoway, Barry. (1980). Large builders, federal housing programmes, and postwar suburbanization. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *4*(1), 21-45.

Cole, Desmond. (2015, April). Black residents call carding proposal 'terrorism' against community. *The Torontoist*. Retrieved from http://torontoist.com/2015/04/black-residents-call-carding-proposal-terrorism-against-community/

Cowell, Margaret. (2013). Bounce back or move on: Regional resilience and economic development planning. *Cities*, *30*, 212-222.

Darden, Joe. (2004). *The significance of white supremacy in the Canadian metropolis of Toronto*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press.

Darden, Joe, Hill, Richard, Thomas, June, & Thomas, Richard. (1987). *Race and uneven development*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Dauvergne, Mia. (2012). Adult correctional statistics in Canada, 2010/2011. *Statistics Canada Report*. Retrieved from http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2012001/article/11715-eng.htm

Downs, Anthony. (1999). Some realities about sprawl and urban decline. *Housing Policy Debate, 10* (4): 955-974.

Eidelman, Gabriel. (2010). Managing urban sprawl in Ontario: Good policy or good politics? *Politics & Policy, 38* (6): 1211-1236.

Galster, George. (2012). *Driving Detroit: The quest for respect in the motor city*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Glaeser, Edward (2011). *Triumph of the city: How our greatest invention makes us richer, smarter, greener, and happier*. New York: Penguin Press.

Glaeser, Edward, & Shleifer, Andreis. (2005). The Curley Effect: The economics of shaping the electorate. *The Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization, 21*, 1-19.

Gordon, Colin. (2008). *Mapping decline: St. Louis and the fate of the American city*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Greenblatt, Alan. (2014, April). Rural areas lose people but not power. *Governing*. Retrieved from http://www.governing.com/topics/politics/gov-rural-areas-lose-people-not-power.html

Hackworth, Jason. (2014). The limits to market-based strategies for addressing land abandonment in shrinking American cities. *Progress in Planning*, *90*, 1-37.

Hackworth, Jason. (2015a). The normalization of market-fundamentalism in Detroit: The case of land abandonment. In Michael Peter Smith & Lucas Owen Kirkpatrick (Eds.), *Reinventing Detroit*. New Brunswick, N.J. and London: Transaction Publishers, in press.

Hackworth, Jason. (2015b). Demolition as urban policy in the United States. Unpublished working paper. Retrieved from http://individual.utoronto.ca/hackworth/Demolition_WP.pdf

Hackworth, Jason, & Moriah, Abigail. (2006). Neoliberalism, contingency, and urban policy: the case of social housing in Ontario. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *30*(3), 510-527.

Hanja, Zoltan. (1995). The nature of concentrated urban poverty in Canada and the United States. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, *20*(4), 497-528.

High, Steven. (2003). *Industrial sunset: The making of North America's Rust Belt, 1969-1984*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Hill, Laurence. (2001). *Black berry, sweet juice: On being black and white in Canada*. Toronto: Harper Collins.

Hodge, Gerald, & Gordon, David. (2014). *Planning Canadian communities, sixth edition*. Toronto: Nelson Education.

Integrated Public Use Microdata Series, United States (IPUMS-US). (2006). Microdata derived from 2006 American Community Survey 1-year estimates. Custom retrieval from https://usa.ipums.org/usa/

Katz, Sidney. (1949, November 1). Jim Crow lives in Dresden. *Macleans*. 8-9, 51-52.

Kazemipur, Abdolmohammad, & Halli, Shiva. (2000). *The new poverty in Canada: Ethnic groups and ghetto formations*. Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing.

Khenti, Akwatu. (2013). Homicide among young black men in Toronto: An unrecognized public health crisis? *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, *104*(1), 12e-14e.

Lipset, Seymour Martin. (1989). *Continental divide: The values and institutions of the United States and Canada*. New York: Routledge.

Martinez-Fernandez, Cristina, Audirac, Ivonne, Fol, Sylvie, & Cunningham-Sabot, Emmanuele. (2012). Shrinking cities: Urban challenges of globalization. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *36*(2), 213-225.

Massey, Douglass, & Denton, Nancy. (1993). *American apartheid: Segregation and the making of the underclass*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Mensah, Joseph. (2010). *Black Canadians: History, experience, social conditions, second edition*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood Publishing.

Mitchell, Katharyne. (2004). *Crossing the neoliberal line: Pacific Rim migration and the metropolis*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Myrdal, Gunnar. (1944). *An American dilemma: The negro problem and the modern democracy*. New York: Harper.

Nelson, Jennifer. (2008). *Razing Africville*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Ontario Heritage Trust. (2010). Hugh Burnett and the National Unity Association. Press Release. Retrieved from http://www.heritagetrust.on.ca/CorporateSite/media/oht/PDFs/Hugh-Burnett-NUA-ENG.pdf

Peck, Jamie. (2015). Framing Detroit. In Michael Peter Smith & Lucas Owen Kirkpatrick (Eds.), *Reinventing Detroit*. New Brunswick, N.J. and London: Transaction Publishers, in press.

Pew Research Center. (2015). America's changing religious landscape. Retrieved from http://www.pewforum.org/2015/05/12/americas-changing-religious-landscape/

Public Use Microdata Series-Canada (PUMS-Canada). (2006). Microdata derived from the 2006 Canadian Census.

Reckien, Diana, & Martinez-Fernandez, Cristina. (2011). Why do cities shrink? *European Planning Studies, 19*(8), 1375-1397.

Ryan, Brent. (2012). *Design after decline: How America rebuilds shrinking cities*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Sancton, Andrew. (2011). *Canadian local government: An urban perspective*. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press Canada.

Satzewich, Vic. (1989). Racism and Canadian immigration policy: The government's view of Caribbean migration, 1962-1966. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, *21*(1), 77-97.

Schilling, Joe, & Mallach, Alan. (2012). *Cities in Transition: A guide for practicing planners* (PAS report number 568). Chicago: American Planning Association.

Schwinghamer, Steve. (2015). The colour bar at the Canadian border: Black American farmers. *Canadian Museum of Immigration at Pier 21 online article*. Retrieved from http://www.pier21.ca/research/immigration-history/the-colour-bar-at-the-canadian-border-black-american-farmers

Silver, Nate. (2015, May). The most diverse cities are often the most segregated. *FiveThirtyEight*. Retrieved from http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/the-most-diverse-cities-are-often-the-most-segregated/

Sugrue, Thomas. (2005). *The origins of the urban crisis: Race and inequality in postwar Detroit*. (Princeton Classic Edition). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Tanner, Michael. (2013). Government, not globalization, destroyed Detroit. *Cato Institute Web-Page*. Retrieved from http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/government-not-globalization-destroyed-detroit

Taylor, Leanne, James, Carl, & Saul, Roger. (2007). Who belongs? Exploring race and racialization in Canada. In Genevieve Johnson & Randy Enomoto (Eds.), *Race, racialization, and antiracism in Canada and beyond* (pp. 151-78). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Teaford, Jon. (1979). *City and suburb: Political fragmentation of metropolitan America, 1850-1970*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Thomas, June. (2013). *Redevelopment and race: Planning a finer city in postwar Detroit*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

United States Census. (2015). Quickfacts. Custom retrieval from http://www.census.gov/quickfacts/

United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2015). State and metro area employment, hours, & earnings. Online tables. Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/sae/tables.htm

United States Department of Commerce. (1947). *Census of Manufacturers, 1947*. Washington DC: Bureau of the Census.

United States Department of Commerce. (1972). *Census of Manufacturers, 1972*. Washington DC: Bureau of the Census.

United States Department of Commerce. (1950). *Census of population and housing*. Washington DC: Bureau of the Census.

United States Department of Commerce. (1970). *Census of population and housing*. Washington DC: Bureau of the Census.

United States Department of Commerce. (2002). *Demographic trends in the 20th century*. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/prod/2002pubs/censr-4.pdf

United States Department of Commerce. (2010). *Census of population and housing*. Washington DC: Bureau of the Census.

United States Department of Commerce. (2012). *Economic Census, 2012*. Washington DC: Bureau of the Census.

United States Executive Office of the President. (2013). Revised delineations of metropolitan statistical areas, micropolitan statistical areas, and combined statistical areas, and guidance on uses of the delineations of these areas. Retrieved from https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/bulletins/2013/b-13-01.pdf

United States Federal Bureau of Prisons. (2015). Inmate race. Retrieved from http://www.bop.gov/about/statistics/statistics_inmate_race.jsp

Vickers, Jill. (2002). *The politics of 'race': Canada, Australia, the United States*. Kemptville, ON: Golden Dog Press.

Weir, Margaret. (1995). Poverty, social rights, and the politics of place in the United States. In Stephan Leibfreid & Paul Pierson (Eds.), *European social policy: Between fragmentation and integration* (pp. 329-54). Washington DC: Brookings Institution.

Winks, Robin. (1997). *The Blacks in Canada: A history, second edition*. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.

Endnotes

[1] The Fair Housing Act did not end discrimination, but did push it to the shadows. Massey & Denton (1993) argue that the chief (and very much deliberate) weakness of the Fair Housing Act was that it relies upon individuals and fair housing groups independently pursuing cases of discrimination rather than a central governmental body. Given the expense and complication of pursuing such litigation, the actual number of successfully prosecuted fair housing cases is low.

[2] Figures can (and often do) exceed 100% growth in cases where the core city lost population.

[3] It has also been suggested that the Conservative Provincial Government had hoped to dilute the power of left-leaning Toronto by adding its more conservative suburban voters to its block. If this was the hope, it was generally successful (see: Ford, Rob).

[4] The prominent exceptions are Louisville, Columbus, and Indianapolis, which have all undergone significant annexations in the past 40 years.

[5] Derived by dividing each city's population by its Census Metropolitan Area population in 2006.

[6] Derived by involved dividing each city's population by its Metropolitan Statistical Area population in 2010.

[7] Manufacturing statistics for Ontario were derived from Canadian Department of Trade and Commerce (1947); and Canadian Ministry of Industry, 2012. American statistics were derived from U.S. Department of Commerce (1947), and U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2015).

[8] "Visible minority" is the term used by the Canadian Federal Government to refer to "persons, other than Aboriginal peoples, who are non-Caucasian in race or non-white in colour" (Government of Canada, 2006). Because this is a broad category encapsulating national origins and ethno racial characteristics, this led to an accidental under-counting of Canadian Blacks as one's declaration of national identity (e.g. French) was mutually exclusive from one's ethno-racial declaration (e.g. Black). After 1996, this was rectified so Black Canadian counts are considered more accurate after this point.

[9] According to Statistics Canada, there are eight partial exceptions to this statement insofar as their populations are composed of >50% visible minorities when all groups are aggregated. But in no case was a single group a majority, and in only one case (Richmond BC) do they constitute more than 40%. Moreover, the most sizeable "group" is "East Asian"—within which there are significant national origin differences. Additionally, all of the Ontario cities (Brampton, Markham, Mississauga, Richmond Hill) in this category are relatively prosperous suburbs (so their residents are not coming to Canada as marginalized in terms of economic class). Still some native-born Canadians have viewed such groups as a threat to their identity and interests. For example, White Vancouverites have voiced frustration that wealthy Chinese capitalists are driving up the cost of "their" real estate and building "monster homes" (Mitchell, 2004).

[10] They were legally authorized throughout Canada in 1850, but some cities like Toronto never formally adopted the policy.

[11] For cross-tabulated and race data, this study used 2006 numbers for Canada, as recent changes to the Canadian Census have rendered the 2011 data less reliable. When possible (as with the income cross-tabulations), 2006 U.S. data is used to make it more comparable.

[12] The cities are Brampton (13.5% in 2011) and Ajax, Ontario (16.0% in 2011), both suburbs of Toronto.

[13] Incarceration rates are difficult to compare in part because the United States imprisons all groups more actively than any other country in the OECD (Dauvergne, 2012). So, as a percentage of the population, Canadian Blacks are incarcerated less frequently than American Blacks (as is the case for all ethnic group comparisons). But as a percentage of the federal prison population in the two countries, their rates of over-representation are similar. In Canada, Blacks make up 9.5% of the federal prison population, which is 3.28 times their population percentage (2.9%) (Canadian Office of Correctional Investigator, 2013). In the United States, Blacks make up 37.5% of the federal prison population which is 2.76 times their population percentage (13.6% in 2010) (United States Federal Bureau of Prisons, 2015).

[14] Importantly the extent of mortgage discrimination is not known, in large part because Canada does not possess an equivalent of the Fair Housing Act of 1968, the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975, or the numerous public and private audits of housing discrimination (see Massey and Denton, 1993, chapter 4). These measures allow researchers in the United States to document the level of discrimination. All of these acts and datasets are in part the product of significant Black political mobilization against discrimination in the U.S.

[15] The most common measure of residential segregation, the index of dissimilarity, places southern Ontario cities (Darden, 2004) in the "moderate" category (30-60) as classified by Massey and Denton (1993). The Ontario city

level is on par with American cities where the Black population is small (see Silver, 2015), and the nineteenth century version of cities that are currently very segregated (such as Detroit), also when the Black population was small (Massey & Denton, 1993).