

# 2006 Census Research Paper Series



## #4 – Migration and Mobility Trends in Northern Ontario: 2001 to 2006

by **Chris Southcott, Ph.D.**  
**Lakehead University**

**December, 2007**

*Prepared for the Local Boards of Northern Ontario*



# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## **Background to the Report:**

This study has been prepared for the 5 Local Boards in Northern Ontario and the Algoma Workforce Investment Committee. Due to the particular economic conditions in Northern Ontario, it is very important for the Northern Boards to properly understand the demographic trends occurring in their region. This is the fourth research report in a series that examines the current trends in Northern Ontario using data from the 2006 Census. Based on concerns expressed in the Trends, Opportunities, and Priorities (TOP) Reports, this report attempts to examine mobility and migration trends in Northern Ontario.

## **Methodology:**

This report is based on newly released data from the 2006 Census as prepared by Statistics Canada. Data is also used from other Census years as compiled by Statistics Canada.

## **Findings:**

The analysis of the 2001 Census data for migration has shown us several important facts about migration patterns in Northern Ontario. They are as follows:

- Northern Ontario has few migrants compared to Ontario as a whole
- The differences in percentage of migrants decreased slightly from 2001
- Almost all migrants to Northern Ontario continue to come from within Ontario
- Very few migrants from outside Canada come to Northern Ontario but numbers are increasing slightly
- While Northern Ontario attracts few immigrants, of the ones that do come a higher percentage come from the US and Africa

In addition, our analysis has shown that there is a great deal of variation within the region in terms of the percentage of in-migrants. The main differences are as follows:

- There is a great deal of variation between the Districts of Northern Ontario
- Communities with the highest percentage of in-migrants are in the southern parts of the region, rural, and based on mining
- Communities with the lowest percentage of in-migrants tend to be Aboriginal and forest-dependent
- Most immigrants go to the larger urban areas

# **Section One: Introduction**

## **1.1 Background to the Report**

This study has been prepared for the 5 Local Boards in Northern Ontario and the Algoma Workforce Investment Committee. The Muskoka, Nipissing, Parry Sound Local Training and Adjustment Board (Local Board #20), the Sudbury and Manitoulin Workforce Partnerships Board (Local Board #21), the Far Northeast Training Board (Local Board #23), the North Superior Training Board (Local Board #24) and the Northwest Training and Adjustment Board (Local Board #25) are among the 21 Local Boards established in Ontario in 1994.<sup>1</sup> These Boards were created to assist in assessing the workforce development needs and issues of each area. Each Local Board Area is made up of representatives of the key labour market partner groups; primarily business and labour, but also including educators and trainers, Aboriginal groups, women, persons with disabilities, francophones, racial minorities and youth. The Boards are sponsored by the Ontario Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities.

The 2001 Census Research Series produced by the Northern Boards from 2002 to 2004 showed that Northern Ontario is a region undergoing important transformations. Economic growth in Northern Ontario has been significantly less than the provincial average since the 1970s. Since workforce development is seen as crucial to economic development by most people in the region, regional Boards are therefore necessarily involved in economic development discussions. Population and demographic trends are an indicator of economic development. These trends also have an important impact on future development decisions. It, therefore, becomes very important for the Local Boards of Northern Ontario to understand what trends exist in their region.

This is the fourth research report in a series that examines the current trends in Northern Ontario using data from the 2006 Census. The first report analyzed the general population trends following release of that data in March, 2007. The second report looks at trends in youth out-migration using the 2001 Census data released in July, 2007. The third report looked at the extent to which the population of Northern Ontario is aging.

# **Section Two: Background to the Issue in Northern Ontario**

## **2.1 Introduction to Northern Ontario**

Northern Ontario comprises more than 88% of the land mass of Ontario but represents only 6.5% of the total population of the province (2006 Census). This percentage represents a decrease from 6.9% in 2001. As the region has no legislated boundaries, the definition of the region varies, especially as concerns its southern border. Currently, for the purpose of programming and statistical analysis, the provincial government has defined Northern Ontario as comprising the City of Greater Sudbury and the following districts: Kenora, Rainy River, Thunder Bay, Algoma, Cochrane, Manitoulin, Sudbury, Timiskaming, Nipissing, and Parry Sound. In 2000, the Ontario

government decided to also include the Muskoka District Municipality in its definition of Northern Ontario. This inclusion was somewhat problematic in that the socio-economic characteristics of the Muskoka District Municipality differ from that of the other districts in Northern Ontario. In 2004 the government changed the definition to once again to exclude the Muskoka District Municipality. For the purposes of FedNor programming, the federal government continues to include the Muskoka District Municipality in its operational definition of Northern Ontario. In the 2001 Census Research Series, the Muskoka District Municipality was included in statistics relating to Northern Ontario. Due to the recent change in definition by the provincial government, 2006-based reports will exclude the area from statistics relating to Northern Ontario.<sup>2</sup> Comparisons between the data presented in the previous report need to take this change in definition into account. The Muskoka district will however be included in statistics related to the Muskoka, Nipissing, Parry Sound Local Training and Adjustment Board (Board #20).

The history of continuous settlement by non-Natives in Northern Ontario is relatively recent when compared to the rest of Ontario. Settlement in earnest started with the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the late 1870s and 1880s. This was soon followed by the construction of the Canadian Northern Railway and the Grand Trunk and National Transcontinental Railways. Most non-Aboriginal communities in the region were initially railway towns.

Following the building of the railways, the region's growth has been driven primarily by the forest industry and by mining. The development of communities was, for the most part, undertaken by large resource extraction corporations based outside the region rather than by local entrepreneurs. This fact has meant that the social and economic structure of this region exhibits several unique characteristics.<sup>3</sup>

The first of these characteristics relates to an overdependence on natural resource exploitation. This has meant a high degree of vulnerability to resource depletion, world commodity prices, corporate policy changes, the boom and bust cycles of the resource industries, changes in the Canadian exchange rate, and changes in government policies regarding Northern Ontario.<sup>4</sup>

The second characteristic is a high degree of dependency on external forces. The fact that most communities were developed by outside interests means that local entrepreneurship has been more limited than in other areas. This has served as a barrier to the cultivation of an entrepreneurial culture in these communities. This dependence is also seen in the area of political decision-making. Unlike most areas of Ontario, Northern Ontario is made up of Districts instead of Counties. Unlike Counties, Districts do not have regional governments. Northern Ontario is unique in Ontario in that unlike the Counties of Southern Ontario there is no regional government serving as an intermediary between the provincial government and municipalities.<sup>5</sup>

While all communities in the region share some common characteristics, Northern Ontario can be divided internally into three different types of communities:

Small and Medium-sized cities - Northern Ontario includes 5 cities with over 40,000 inhabitants. They are, in order of size, Sudbury (157,857), Thunder Bay (109,140), Sault Ste. Marie (74,948), North Bay (53,966), and Timmins (42,997).<sup>6</sup> While these centres are heavily dependent on

resource industries they are also relatively diversified in that they tend to be important centres for health, education, and other services for the outlying regions.

**Resource Dependent Communities** - The vast majority of the remaining non-Aboriginal communities in the region are resource dependent communities, or single industry towns, which share many distinct characteristics.<sup>7</sup> These communities are smaller and less diversified economically than the small and medium-sized cities. They are much more directly dependent on resource industries.

**Aboriginal Communities** - The region of Northern Ontario is unique in terms of its large number of Aboriginal communities. The Aboriginal population makes up almost 8 percent of the population of the region.<sup>8</sup> The population in the area of the region north of the 50<sup>th</sup> parallel is almost entirely made up of these communities. Of all the communities in the region, Aboriginal communities face the greatest number of social and economic challenges.

## **2.2 Migration Patterns as a social indicator**

As was pointed out in our analysis of 2001 census data, migration patterns can tell us a lot about what is happening in a particular community or region. If a region has a relatively large number of people moving into the area, it usually means the region is going through a period of economic growth. If the region has a relatively small number of people coming into the area, it usually means the region is going through a period of economic stagnation or decline. A community that has a large number of in-migrants but little population growth is usually going through a period of economic transition.

Knowing where migrants are coming from helps communities understand how their population is changing and enables them to prepare for shifts in the nature of the population. It also enables a community to compare changes it is experiencing to changes in other communities. In an era of increased globalization the ability to attract immigrants from other countries can not only be an indicator of economic growth but can also be an important support for economic development. The study of migration patterns can help communities determine what needs to be done to capitalize on growth through the attraction of immigrants.

## **2.3 Migration Patterns in Canada**

There has been a substantial amount of research done in Canada on interprovincial migration.<sup>9</sup> At the same time there has been relatively little research done on migration between rural and urban areas and less on migration within provinces themselves.<sup>10</sup>

There were a few studies concerning rural migration patterns that appeared at the beginning of this decade.<sup>11</sup> Although this research is not directly related to the situation of Northern Ontario, the fact that much of Northern Ontario falls within the official Statistics Canada definition of “rural and small town” Canada means that this rural-urban research is a good place to start looking for migration patterns in Canada that are relevant to Northern Ontario.<sup>12</sup>

According to Rothwell et al, in a report released in 2002 using 1996 and earlier census data, rural and small town Canada experienced a net out-migration of people at the end of the 60s.<sup>13</sup> During the 1970s this situation reversed itself. Rural and small town Canada experienced a net in-migration of people due to lower levels of out-migration and higher levels of in-migration.

During the 1980s this trend reversed itself.<sup>14</sup> This decade saw a net out-migration of people from rural and small town Canada due largely to a decrease in the numbers of in-migrants. Finally, from 1991 to 1996 the trend again reversed itself with a return to a net in-migration of people due to lower levels of out-migration. This research also showed that from 1971 to 1996, the percentage of in-migrants for rural and small town Canada for each 5 year census period remained fairly stable at or around 10% of the population.<sup>15</sup> More recently, out-migration rates for rural and small town areas have increased.<sup>16</sup>

## **2.4 History of Migration Patterns in Northern Ontario**

For most of the history of Northern Ontario the region has been highly mobile. As the region started to grow in the 1880s, in-migration rates were very high. This lasted until the beginning of the First World War. From 1919 until the late 30s the regions saw selected in-migration and selected out-migration as the resource sector experienced boom and bust periods. Following the Second World War, the region experienced high rates of in-migration until the 1960s, this included large numbers of immigrants from outside Canada.

Following the Second World War, resource-dependent regions such as Northern Ontario experienced labour retention problems which were often costly to resource companies. The small one-industry towns found it hard to keep young male workers in their communities for long periods of time. They would come, work for a while, and then move on, requiring the industry to find new workers and train them. Companies went to considerable effort to find ways of keeping the young male workers in the communities.<sup>17</sup>

Since the 1960s there has been a noticeable change in migration patterns in Northern Ontario. The Regional Outlook of the Training Boards for the year 2000 noted slow population growth, a lack of new immigrants, and continued period of high net youth out-migration.<sup>18</sup> These changes were evident in our report using 2001 Census data. In that report we saw that compared to Ontario, migration rates in Northern Ontario during the 1990s were low. Almost all migrants to Northern Ontario came from within the Province of Ontario and very few came from outside Canada. The report also noted a great deal of variation within the region in terms of migration rates. The communities with the highest rates of in-migration tended to be closest to the urban centers of Southern Ontario and tended to be rural. In 2001, the communities with the lowest percentage of in-migrants tended to be the large urban centers of Northern Ontario, Aboriginal communities, and the more isolated resource towns.

## **Section 3: Methodology**

This report attempts to describe the migration patterns in Northern Ontario based on data contained in the 2006 Census. It examines whether the trends found in our report on the data from the 2001 Census can still be seen in 2006. The report is based on newly released data from the 2006 Census as prepared by Statistics Canada. Data is also used from other Census years as compiled by Statistics Canada. As is pointed out below, the report will only be able to analyze the patterns of in-migration.

Data for Northern Ontario from the 1996, 2001, and 2006 Census is from special profiles ordered from Statistics Canada by the researcher. Data from the 1991 and 1986 Census was taken from the Census Profiles CDs created by Statistics Canada.

### **3.1 In-Migrants versus Out-Migrants**

In terms of the analysis of all the main migration patterns in Northern Ontario, this report is limited to the analysis of in-migrants. Available data only allows us to find out who is moving into Northern Ontario, where they are moving to, and, to a certain extent, where they are moving from. In the long form census questionnaire which is given to 20% of the population, a question is asked referring to where the person lived 5 years ago. If the person lived in a different community (or census sub-division), she is considered a migrant. Those people who moved from one location to another within the same community are not considered migrants for the purpose of this report. The data which this report analyzes is the responses to this question from everyone who lived in Northern Ontario on May 15, 2006.

It is possible to find out information on out-migrants from Northern Ontario (their characteristics, where they moved from, and where they moved to) but this particular analysis did not have the financial resources to purchase this data from Statistics Canada.

### **3.2 Potential problems with our method**

Our method has two potential problems which must be mentioned: sampling error, the “random rounding” technique used by Statistics Canada, and problems with data for Aboriginal communities in Northern Ontario. Unlike the first three reports in this series, the data used is not from 100% of the population. Statistics Canada has two census forms; a short one that goes to all residences, and a long one, Form 2B, which goes to 20% of residences. The data analyzed here is from Form 2B which went to 20% of homes. This data is therefore a “sample” of total possible responses. It is meant to represent 100% of the population but, being a sample, it often does not. When the responses from the sample differ from what the responses would be from the entire population, we say there is “sampling error”.<sup>19</sup>

Using statistical analyses, we can calculate what the likelihood of sampling error is for a given number of responses. Generally speaking, the larger the number of respondents, the less sampling error is a problem. In our study, the data from smaller communities has a higher possibility of sampling error.

Another potential problem is the use of random rounding by Statistics Canada in its census data.<sup>20</sup> In order to ensure confidentiality, census data is round up or down to the nearest 5 count. This has an insignificant effect on large numbers. On very small numbers however this process can introduce a significant degree of error. This limits our ability to be confident about the percentage of migrants for very small communities in Northern Ontario.

The third problem was mentioned in the first report in this series dealing with population change. The population figures for the census divisions in Northern Ontario are not as reliable as the census divisions in most of Ontario. This is due to the large number of Aboriginal communities which, for various reasons, were improperly counted. If Statistics Canada can not properly count a community, the population of that community is not included in the population totals for that census division. As a result, the population figures for almost all the census divisions in Northern Ontario are incomplete. Comparison from census year to census year becomes difficult when a particular community was not counted in one year but counted in another year. This means that there is a certain degree of error in the statistics used in the report.


## **Section 4: Migration Patterns in Northern Ontario**

### **4.1 Migration Patterns in Northern Ontario Continue to Differ Significantly from Ontario as a Whole**

#### **4.1.1 Northern Ontario has few migrants compared to Ontario as a whole**

Data from the 2001 Census showed that contrary to historic patterns, when comparing the percentage of the population in Northern Ontario that had moved to a different community over the previous 5 years, to that of Ontario and Canada, the population of Northern Ontario was considerably more stable. Only 12.9% of the population of Northern Ontario had changed communities compared to 19.6% for Ontario and 19.5% for Canada.<sup>21</sup>


In Figure 1 we see that differences between the percentages of the population that are migrants continue to exist in 2006. While the national and provincial percentages are both 18.9%, the percentage for Northern Ontario is 13.2%. The North continues then to have a much more stable population than Canada and Ontario as a whole.



**Figure 1** Source: Statistics Canada, Census of Canada, 2001 and 2006.

**4.1.2 The Differences in percentage of migrants decreased slightly from 2001**

Figure 2 shows that the percentage of the population who are migrants has decreased continuously since 1991 for Canada, and Ontario. In large part this decrease is due to the aging of the population since the older the population the less likely that people are to migrate.<sup>22</sup> In Northern Ontario the percentage decreased from 1991 to 2001 but increased slightly from 2001 to 2006. The figures do indicate a slight convergence between the North and the rest of the province. The real percentage difference between Northern Ontario and Ontario was 5.7 whereas in 2001 this difference was 6.7.




**Figure 2** Source: Statistics Canada, Census of Canada, 1986, 1991, 1996, 2001, and 2006.

**4.1.3 Almost all migrants to Northern Ontario continue to come from within Ontario**

In 2001, another difference between the migration patterns for Ontario as a whole and Northern

Ontario was that a higher percentage of migrants in Northern Ontario moved from another community in the same province (intraprovincial migrants). In 2001, 81.2% of all the migrants in Northern Ontario came from Ontario. Corresponding figures for Ontario and Canada were 63.6 and 65.5 respectively. This trend continued from 2001 to 2006. According to the 2006 Census 80.9% of all migrants came from Ontario compared to 63.9% for Canada and 65% for Ontario. It is likely that a large percentage of Northern Ontario's migrants are not "in-migrants" from the point of view of the region but residents of Northern Ontario that are simply moving to another location in the same region.<sup>23</sup> While the differences between Northern Ontario and Ontario are still significant there is some indication in the 2006 Census data that indicates that these differences are no longer increasing.



**Figure 3** Source: Statistics Canada, Census of Canada, 2001 and 2006


#### 4.1.4 Very few migrants from outside Canada come to Northern Ontario but numbers are increasing slightly

Our previous analysis of migration showed that one of the most significant differences between Northern Ontario and the rest of the province is that the North no longer attracts migrants from outside the country. In 2001 we saw that almost 5% of the population of Ontario as a whole who were 5 years of age or older in 2001 had come to the province from outside the country since 1996. The corresponding figure for Canada was 3.5%. In Northern Ontario, however, less than 0.5% of the population, or 3,555 people, had moved to the region from outside the country since 1996.

One of the more important recent migration patterns for Ontario as whole has been a rapid increase in the number of migrants from outside Canada coming to the province. In 1986, 221,325 people had migrated to Ontario from outside the country during the previous 5 years. In 2006 this number had increased to 566,715 – more than double.


In Northern Ontario however, a region which, in the past, had a history of welcoming relatively large numbers of migrants from outside the country, the reverse has been true. As Figure 4 shows, in 2006, 5% of the population of Ontario as a whole who were 5 years of age or older in 2006 had come to the province from outside the country since 2001. The corresponding figure for Canada was 3.9%. In Northern Ontario, however, only 0.6% of the population, or 4,775

people, had moved to the region from outside the country since 2001.



**Figure 4** Source: Statistics Canada, Census of Canada, 2001 and 2006

The 2006 Census does indicate however that this trend may be starting to change. Figure 5 shows that in 1986, Northern Ontario welcomed 4,955 migrants from outside the country during the previous 5 years. By 2001, this number had decreased to 3555. In 2006 this number increased by 34% to 4,775. This indicates that while the North continues to attract few migrants from outside the country compared to the province as a whole, the situation may be improving.



**Figure 5** Source: Statistics Canada, Census of Canada, 1986, 1991, 1996, 2001, and 2006

While Northern Ontario may be attracting more migrants from outside the country, this is not necessarily the case when it comes to immigrants. Migrants from outside the country include transient migrants such as university students and people on short-term work contracts. Many of these migrants are temporarily in Northern Ontario and do not come here with the intention to stay for a long period of time. When we look at the numbers of recently arrived landed immigrants, those landed immigrants who have arrived in Northern Ontario since 2001, the total number is 2,550. In 2001 this number was 2,410. This represents a relatively small increase of

5.8%. Newly arrived immigrants continue to represent only 0.3% of the total population of Northern Ontario. For Ontario as a whole, newly arrived immigrants represent 4.8% of the population.

**Table 1: Origins of Recent Immigrants 2006**

Country of Origin	Ontario		Northern Ontario	
	Total Immigrants	Percentage of total immigrants	Total Immigrants	Percentage of total immigrants
United States of America	18300	3.2	605	23.8
Central America	9315	1.6	45	1.8
Caribbean and Bermuda	20100	3.5	35	1.4
South America	30390	5.2	40	1.6
Europe	84585	14.6	530	20.9
Africa	40320	6.9	360	14.2
Asia and the Middle East	375225	64.6	795	31.3
Oceania and other	2495	0.4	105	4.1
Total recent immigrants	580740		2540	

Source: Statistics Canada, Census of Canada, 2006

In our 2001 Census report we noted that another interesting difference between Northern Ontario and the rest of the province is not only in the total number of landed immigrants, but where these immigrants come from. By far the largest birthplace of landed immigrants that had come to Northern Ontario between 1996 and 2001 had been the United States. Almost 22% of all landed immigrants to Northern Ontario came from the United States, followed by the People's Republic of China, at 8.4%, Germany, at 7.3%, and the United Kingdom at 6.4%. For Ontario as a whole the largest source of landed immigrants was the People's Republic of China, at 12.8%, followed by India at 10.9%, Pakistan at 6.5%, and the Philippines at 4.9%. While the largest numbers of landed immigrants to Ontario come from non-traditional sources, the landed immigrants to the North still tended to come from the traditional sources of Europe and America.

As Table 1 shows these trends continue in 2006. Of the 2,550 immigrants coming to Northern Ontario between 2001 and 2006, 605, or almost 24%, were born in the United States. A total of 530, or 21% were born in Europe. Compared to Ontario as a whole, a higher percentage of immigrants come from the United States and Europe. Data from 2006 also shows that when compared to the province, Northern Ontario also has a higher percentage of its immigrants coming from Africa and a lower percentage coming from Asia.

## 4.2 Differences within Northern Ontario

While it is important to know the migration patterns for Northern Ontario as a whole, it is also important to examine variations in these patterns within Northern Ontario. Such analysis gives us

a better idea of which areas and communities within the region are the most affected by either high or low rates of in-migration

#### 4.2.1 There is a great deal of variation between the Districts of Northern Ontario

**Table 2: In-Migrants as a Percentage of the Population**

	1986	1991	1996	2001	2006
<b>Ontario</b>	20.2	25.3	20.4	19.6	18.9
<b>Northern Ontario</b>	15	17.9	14.5	12.9	13.2
<b>Muskoka District Municipality</b>	22.2	29.5	20.7	21.9	20
<b>Parry Sound District</b>	21.4	28.4	22.3	21.6	22.2
<b>Nipissing District</b>	19.1	23.9	18.1	18.0	17.7
<b>Timiskaming District</b>	19.1	20.7	18.1	18.2	18.5
<b>Manitoulin District</b>	19.2	22.1	20.6	16.1	17.7
<b>Sudbury District</b>	17.8	20.9	16.9	17.0	18
<b>Kenora District</b>	19.7	19.6	16.6	13.5	12.9
<b>Rainy River District</b>	15.4	18.5	14.5	13.7	11.9
<b>Cochrane District</b>	12.9	15.2	11.7	12.3	11.1
<b>Algoma District</b>	12.6	13.9	12.6	11.9	12.1
<b>Thunder Bay District</b>	13.6	13.9	10.9	10.0	10.9
<b>Greater Sudbury Division</b>	12.5	18.9	15.0	9.2	10.5

Source: Statistics Canada, Census of Canada, 1986, 1991, 1996, 2001 and 2006.

Table 2 shows that while migration rates for the regions of Northern Ontario as a whole are less than that of Ontario as a whole, there is a great deal of variation between Districts within Northern Ontario. These variations mirror the situation found in 2001. The Northern Ontario district closest to the main metropolitan areas of Ontario, the District of Parry Sound, has migration rate that are consistently higher than the average for Northern Ontario and Ontario as a whole. As mentioned in earlier reports, it is likely that migration rates in this District are high due to cottage conversions.

The Districts of Nipissing, Timiskaming, Manitoulin, and Sudbury all have migrations rates that, while below provincial averages, have consistently exceeded the regional average over the past 25 years. The District of Kenora used to be in this situation but in 2006 it had a percentage of in-migrants that was slightly less than Northern Ontario. The Districts of Cochrane, Algoma, and Thunder Bay have had migration rates consistently below the provincial and regional averages. The Greater Sudbury Division has had the greatest variation in relative migration rates from year to year.

In our 2001 Census report we noted that not only do the rates of migration vary among districts but there is a great deal of variation as well in terms of the source of these migrants. The Districts of Muskoka, Parry Sound, and Manitoulin all had percentages of intraprovincial migrants significantly above the regional norms. In the case of the Muskoka District Municipality and the District of Parry Sound this was likely the result of cottagers from Southern

Ontario converting their cottages upon retirement. In terms of interprovincial migrants, the Districts of Kenora, Thunder Bay, and Rainy River all had percentages significantly higher than the regional norm. This is likely a reflection of the relative proximity of these districts to Manitoba. Finally, looking at external migrants, the Districts of Rainy River and Thunder Bay, as well as the Greater Sudbury Division, all had percentages of external migrants significantly higher than the average percentage for the region. In the case of the Greater Sudbury Division and the District of Thunder Bay, this was probably the result of the presence of post-secondary educational institutions in the cities of Sudbury and Thunder Bay. In the case of the District of Rainy River it was the result of its proximity to the American border.

**Table 3: Type of Migrants as a Percentage of All Migrants 2006**

	<b>Intraprovincial Migrants</b>	<b>Interprovincial Migrants</b>	<b>External Migrants</b>
<b>Ontario</b>	65.0	8.6	26.3
<b>Northern Ontario</b>	80.9	14.2	4.9
<b>Muskoka District Municipality</b>	89.0	4.7	6.3
<b>Nipissing District</b>	83.9	12.1	4.0
<b>Parry Sound District</b>	92.5	3.4	4.0
<b>Manitoulin District</b>	89.8	5.1	5.1
<b>Sudbury District</b>	94.0	4.5	1.5
<b>Greater Sudbury Division</b>	79.3	14.9	5.7
<b>Timiskaming District</b>	90.4	7.0	2.7
<b>Cochrane District</b>	83.4	14.0	2.7
<b>Algoma District</b>	84.7	9.9	5.4
<b>Thunder Bay District</b>	72.3	20.0	7.7
<b>Rainy River District</b>	71.2	23.8	5.0
<b>Kenora District</b>	60.7	34.1	5.2

Source: Statistics Canada, Census of Canada, 2006

Table 3 shows that these same general trends are found in the 2006 Census data. Indeed the only major change in sources of migrants was found in the District of Sudbury. In 2001, 12.3% of migrants were from outside the province. In 2006 this percentage was reduced to 4.5% while the percentage of intraprovincial migrants increased from 86.1% in 2001 to 94% in 2006.

#### **4.2.2 Communities with the Highest Percentage of In-Migrants: In the South, Rural and Based on Mining**

Our understanding of migration patterns in Northern Ontario can be helped by a comparison of rates for specific communities within Northern Ontario. In the section above we have compared rates for the Districts within Northern Ontario. These Districts represent the census divisions used by Statistics Canada for Northern Ontario. The Districts, or census divisions, are further broken down into census sub-divisions. These census sub-divisions represent cities, towns, townships, reserves, or unorganized areas. This report refers to these census sub-divisions as communities.

When analyzing migration rates for specific communities within Northern Ontario we have to be aware of the problem of sampling error. This was not the case in the first three reports in this series which dealt with data representing 100 percent of the population. The data used for analyzing migration patterns represents a sample of only 20% of the population. This means two things for our analysis. First, data for very small communities tends not to be very reliable. In our analysis we have decided to exclude communities which had a population of less than 400 in 2006. Second, the order of the communities tends not to be reliable. We can say that a community has a high rate of in-migration. We can not say with a great deal of reliability that, for example, the township of Ryerson has, in reality, the 4<sup>th</sup> highest rate of in-migration.

Our analysis of 2001 Census data showed that communities with the highest rates of in-migration tended to be in the more southern areas of Northern Ontario. Out of the 25 communities listed, 16 were located in the Muskoka District Municipality, the District of Parry Sound, and the District of Nipissing. The communities with the highest rates of in-migration also tended to be rural or small towns. Of the 25 communities listed as having the highest in-migration rates for 2001, 18 were townships that did not contain large communities. There was only one city listed and only 3 towns. There was no apparent relationship between high migration rates and the economic base of the community.

**Table 4: Communities with the Highest Percentage of Migrants 2006**

	Type of Community	Population in 2001	Number of In-Migrants	Migrants as % of Pop	District	Board
Pickle Lake	TP	479	185	40.7	Kenora	25
Latchford	T	446	150	34.9	Timiskaming	23
Callander	MU	3249	1025	33.1	Parry Sound	20
Ryerson	TP	686	220	32.1	Parry Sound	20
McKellar	TP	1080	335	31.9	Parry Sound	20
St.-Charles	MU	1159	360	31.6	Sudbury Dist	21
Armour	TP	1249	370	31.1	Parry Sound	20
Johnson	TP	701	200	30.5	Algoma	22
Killarney	MU	454	125	30.5	Manitoulin	21
Nipissing	TP	1642	480	30.3	Parry Sound	20
Calvin	TP	608	175	30.2	Nipissing	20
Englehart	T	1494	395	28.5	Timiskaming	23
Assiginack	TP	914	245	28.3	Manitoulin	21
Billings	TP	539	150	28.0	Manitoulin	21
Red Lake	MU	4526	1175	27.7	Kenora	25
South River	VL	1069	270	27.6	Parry Sound	20
Temagami	MU	934	240	26.5	Nipissing	20
Gordon	TP	412	105	26.3	Manitoulin	21
East Ferris	TP	4200	1040	26.2	Nipissing	20
Chisholm	TP	1318	330	26.0	Nipissing	20
Parry Sound, Unorganized, Centre Part	UNO	2424	610	25.9	Parry Sound	20

Whitestone	MU	1030	255	25.4	Parry Sound	20
La Vallee	TP	1067	260	25.2	Rainy River	25
Magnetawan	MU	1610	390	24.8	Parry Sound	20
Cobalt	T	1229	280	24.5	Timiskaming	23

Source: Statistics Canada, Census of Canada, 2006.

Our analysis of the 2006 Census data shows some of the same tendencies but also shows some new ones. While the Muskoka District Municipality is excluded from the analysis for 2006, we still see a comparatively large number of communities in Parry Sound with high in-migration rates. Of the 25 top in-migrant communities, 9 were in the District of Parry Sound and therefore in relatively close proximity to the urban areas of Southern Ontario. In addition, 4 communities were located in the Nipissing District and 4 in the Manitoulin District. These communities continue to be predominantly rural and as such the in-migration may be based on wilderness amenities.

A new tendency is seen in the presence of two mining communities on the list. Both Red Lake and Pickle Lake are gold mining communities in the District of Kenora. The fact that mining based communities have higher levels of in-migrants than that seen in 2001 reflects the commodities boom that the world markets have experienced over the past few years.

#### 4.2.3 Communities with the Lowest Percentage of In-migrants: Aboriginal and Forest-dependent

In our 2001 study we also looked at communities in Northern Ontario with the lowest percentage of in-migrants. The first characteristic that was noticeable at that time was that many were Aboriginal communities (R). Another interesting characteristic of these communities was that they included most of the large urban centers of Northern Ontario. The cities of Sudbury, Thunder Bay, Sault Ste. Marie, and Timmins all had relatively low rates of in-migrants. North Bay, at 18%, was the only large urban centre in Northern Ontario to have rates of in-migration higher than the norm. Finally, the list of communities with low rates of in-migration also contained many of the more isolated resource dependent communities of Northern Ontario.

**Table 5: Communities with the Lowest Percentage of In-migrants 2006**

	Type of Community	Population in 2001	Number of In-migrants	In-Migrants as a % of Pop.	District	Board
Wunnumin 1	R	487	10	2.3	Kenora	25
Kasabonika Lake	R	681	15	2.6	Kenora	25
Fauquier-Strickland	TP	568	20	3.7	Cochrane	23
Prince	TP	971	40	4.2	Algoma	22
Kitchenuhmaykoosib Aaki 84 (Big Trout Lake)	R	916	35	4.5	Kenora	25
Deer Lake	R	681	30	5.1	Kenora	25

Fort Hope 64	R	1144	50	5.2	Kenora	24
Webequie	R	614	30	5.8	Kenora	24
Charlton and Dack	MU	613	35	5.9	Timiskaming	23
Smooth Rock Falls	T	1473	90	6.5	Cochrane	23
Terrace Bay	TP	1625	105	6.8	Thunder Bay	24
Lac Seul 28	R	821	50	6.9	Kenora	25
English River 21	R	633	40	7.0	Kenora	25
Whitefish Bay 32A	R	622	40	7.1	Kenora	25
Chapple	TP	856	55	7.1	Rainy River	25
Atikokan	TP	3293	230	7.5	Rainy River	25
Dubreuilville	TP	773	55	7.7	Algoma	22
Neebing	MU	2184	165	8.0	Thunder Bay	24
Weagamow Lake 87	R	700	50	8.1	Kenora	25
White River	TP	841	70	8.6	Algoma	22
Morley	TP	492	45	9.2	Rainy River	25
Fort Frances	T	8103	705	9.4	Rainy River	25
Sault Ste. Marie	CY	74948	6725	9.5	Algoma	22
Hornepayne	TP	1209	110	9.6	Algoma	23
Kenora	CY	15177	1400	9.7	Kenora	25

Source: Statistics Canada, Census of Canada, 2006.

The data from the 2006 Census shows that Aboriginal communities still tend to be among those with the lowest rates of in-migrants. In Table 5 we see that 9 out of the 25 communities listed were Aboriginal communities. Another type of community with low rates of in-migration are those that are heavily dependent on forestry. Another 9 communities listed in Table 4 are forest-dependent communities.<sup>24</sup> Unlike the situation in 2001, only one major urban area of Northern Ontario is on the list for the lowest rates of in-migrants – Sault Ste. Marie. The rate for the City of Thunder Bay was 10.2% while that of Sudbury was 10.5%. These are still lower than the average for the region but to a lesser degree than other communities.

#### 4.2.4 Most immigrants go to the larger urban areas

While data from the 2006 Census shows that Northern Ontario attracts very few immigrants compared to the province as a whole, it is still worthwhile to ask where those few immigrants who do come to Northern Ontario go. Table 6 lists those communities in Northern Ontario that attracted more than 50 immigrants between 2001 and 2006. It is interesting to note that one community in Northern Ontario was able to attract immigrants at a rate higher than the norm for the province as a whole. This was the border community of Rainy River which attracted 55 new immigrants on a population base of 909. This meant that 6.1 percent of the total population of Rainy River had immigrated to Canada between 2001 and 2006. It should be noted that all of the recent immigrants were from the United States. Two other areas that attracted a large number of

immigrants from the United States were the community of Sioux Lookout and the Kenora District Unorganized Areas.


**Table 6: Communities with the highest numbers of recent immigrants and selected places of origin**

	Total recent immigrants	Recent Immigrants as a % of Pop	United States of America	Europe	Africa	Asia and the Middle East
Ontario	580740	4.8	18300	84585	40320	375225
Rainy River	55	6.1	55	0	0	0
Sioux Lookout	75	1.4	25	0	20	30
Kenora, Unorganized	60	0.9	35	10	10	0
Thunder Bay	660	0.6	75	135	145	235
North Bay	270	0.5	30	70	50	80
Greater Sudbury	660	0.4	105	160	130	230
Sault Ste. Marie	180	0.2	30	10	0	110
Timmins	75	0.2	15	10	0	35

Source: Statistics Canada, Census of Canada, 2006.

Other than the above mentioned areas, almost all other immigrants to Northern Ontario were attracted to the largest communities. Thunder Bay and Sudbury attracted 660 each while North Bay attracted 270.

## Section 5: Comparing the Training Board Areas of Northern Ontario



**Figure 6** Source: Statistics Canada, Census of Canada, 2001 and 2006

## 5.1 Migration in the Muskoka, Nipissing, Parry Sound Local Training and Adjustment Board (Board #20)

Figure 6 shows the in-migration rates for 2006 for each of the Local Boards in Northern Ontario compared to 2001. The Board with the highest percentage for both years was Local Board #20 which includes the District Municipality of Muskoka and the Districts of Parry Sound and Nipissing. The communities in this area are characterized by their relative proximity to the major urban areas of Southern Ontario and by the presence in the area of a large number of seasonal residences.

**Table 7: Communities in Local Board #20 Area by Percentage of Migrants 2006**

	Type	Total Pop 5 years and over	Migrants	Migrants as a % of Pop	Intra provincial migrants	Inter provinci al migrants	External migrants
<b>Local Board #20</b>		224610	43935	19.6	38660	3005	2250
<b>Gravenhurst</b>	T	53945	10775	20.0	9595	510	675
<b>Bracebridge</b>	T	9845	2010	20.4	1780	55	175
<b>Lake of Bays</b>	TP	14720	3035	20.6	2595	190	245
<b>Huntsville</b>	T	3465	700	20.2	665	0	35
<b>Muskoka Lakes</b>	TP	17170	3260	19.0	2940	170	150
<b>Georgian Bay</b>	TP	6300	1320	21.0	1180	90	50
<b>Moose Point 79</b>	R	2260	415	18.4	395	0	15
<b>South Algonquin</b>	TP	190	30	15.8	30	0	0
<b>Papineau-Cameron</b>	TP	995	220	22.1	125	85	0
<b>Mattawan</b>	TP	150	25	16.7	25	0	0
<b>Mattawa</b>	T	1850	310	16.8	215	90	0
<b>Calvin</b>	TP	580	175	30.2	175	0	0
<b>Bonfield</b>	TP	1960	380	19.4	335	40	10
<b>Chisholm</b>	TP	1270	330	26.0	320	0	10
<b>East Ferris</b>	TP	3975	1040	26.2	930	80	30
<b>North Bay</b>	CY	50645	8585	17.0	6910	1195	475
<b>West Nipissing</b>	M	12590	1970	15.6	1775	170	25
<b>Temagami</b>	MU	905	240	26.5	230	0	0
<b>Nipissing 10</b>	R	1350	270	20.0	245	15	10
<b>Nipissing, Unorganized, South Part</b>	UNO	1690	255	15.1	230	20	0
<b>Seguin</b>	TP	4040	965	23.9	845	40	75
<b>The Archipelago</b>	TP	550	110	20.0	95	10	0
<b>McMurrich/Monteith</b>	TP	755	175	23.2	165	15	0
<b>Perry</b>	TP	1920	430	22.4	415	0	15
<b>Kearney</b>	T	770	175	22.7	150	10	15
<b>Armour</b>	TP	1190	370	31.1	340	20	10
<b>Burk's Falls</b>	VL	855	175	20.5	180	0	0



<b>Local Board 21</b>		178155	21015	11.8	17380	2565	1045
<b>Tehkummah</b>	TP	385	35	9.1	35	0	0
<b>Central Manitoulin</b>	TP	1870	450	24.1	360	35	50
<b>Assiginack</b>	TP	865	245	28.3	210	30	0
<b>Northeastern Manitoulin and the Islands</b>	T	2525	390	15.4	360	10	15
<b>Billings</b>	TP	535	150	28.0	150	0	0
<b>Gordon</b>	TP	400	105	26.3	95	10	0
<b>Gore Bay</b>	T	780	85	10.9	85	0	0
<b>Burpee and Mills</b>	TP	325	25	7.7	30	0	0
<b>Barrie Island</b>	TP	40	25	62.5	20	0	0
<b>Killarney</b>	MU	410	125	30.5	120	0	10
<b>Whitefish River (Part) 4</b>	R	350	75	21.4	65	0	10
<b>Sucker Creek 23</b>	R	330	35	10.6	35	0	0
<b>Sheguiandah 24</b>	R	150	35	23.3	35	10	0
<b>Wiwemikong Unceded</b>	R	2185	230	10.5	190	15	20
<b>Sheshegwaning 20</b>	R	100	25	25.0	20	0	0
<b>M'Chigeeng 22 (West Bay 22)</b>	R	700	85	12.1	75	0	0
<b>Manitoulin, Unorganized, West Part</b>		-	-	ERR	-	-	-
<b>Zhiibaahaasing 19A (Cockburn Island 19A)</b>	R	40	10	25.0	0	0	0
<b>French River / Rivière des Français</b>	MU	2525	505	20.0	480	15	10
<b>St.-Charles</b>	MU	1140	360	31.6	360	0	0
<b>Markstay-Warren</b>	MU	2380	545	22.9	530	15	0
<b>Sables-Spanish Rivers</b>	TP	3025	560	18.5	535	25	0
<b>Espanola</b>	T	5035	765	15.2	710	45	10
<b>Baldwin</b>	TP	515	85	16.5	85	0	0
<b>Nairn and Hyman</b>	TP	465	95	20.4	95	0	0
<b>Whitefish Lake 6</b>	R	320	35	10.9	35	0	0

<b>Sudbury, Unorganized, North Part</b>	UNO	2370	310	13.1	260	25	25
<b>Duck Lake 76B</b>	R	75	15	20.0	20	0	0
<b>Wahnapeitei 11</b>	R	50	10	20.0	10	0	0
Greater Sudbury	CY	148265	15600	10.5	12375	2330	895

Source: Statistics Canada, Census of Canada, 2006.

### 5.3 Migration in the Algoma Workforce Investment Committee Area (Local Board Area#22)

Local Board #22 is comprised of most of the District of Algoma. As was the case with the Board 21 area, the Board 22 area has, at 12.1%, a lower migration rate than for Northern Ontario as a whole. As was the case with area for Board 21, the main reason for the relatively low numbers of migrants was the major urban centre in the area. Only 9.5% of the population of the City of Sault Ste. Marie was composed of people who had moved into the city from 2001 to 2006. This is similar to the situation we found in 2001. As was found five years earlier, those townships in the Southern part of the area that contain lakeshore property continue to have relatively high rates of in-migrants.

**Table 9: Communities in Local Board #22 Area by Percentage of Migrants 2006**

	Type	Total Pop. 5 Years and Over	Migrants	Migrants as a % of Pop.	Intra provincial Migrants	Inter provincial Migrants	External Migrants
<b>Local Board 22</b>		109990	13300	12.1	11255	1270	705
<b>Johnson</b>	TP	655	200	30.5	200	0	0
<b>Jocelyn</b>	TP	260	65	25.0	60	0	0
<b>White River</b>	TP	810	70	8.6	65	0	0
<b>Dubreuilville</b>	TP	715	55	7.7	15	45	0
<b>Gros Cap 49</b>	R	50	15	30.0	15	0	0
<b>Goulais Bay 15A</b>	R	80	10	12.5	15	0	0
<b>Michipicoten</b>	TP	3025	470	15.5	410	50	10
<b>Rankin Location 15D</b>	R	530	105	19.8	100	0	0
<b>Garden River 14</b>	R	915	145	15.8	135	0	0
<b>Mississagi River 8</b>	R	390	95	24.4	90	0	0
<b>Serpent River 7</b>	R	315	40	12.7	40	0	0
<b>Sagamok</b>	R	820	100	12.2	90	0	0
<b>Prince</b>	TP	955	40	4.2	40	0	0
<b>Sault Ste.</b>	CY	70645	6725	9.5	5435	805	485

<b>Marie</b>							
<b>Macdonald, Meredith and Aberdeen Additional</b>	TP	1485	225	15.2	225	0	0
<b>Elliot Lake</b>	CY	11100	2485	22.4	2240	150	90
<b>North Shore</b>	TP	530	100	18.9	90	0	0
<b>Spanish</b>	T	700	85	12.1	80	0	10
<b>Blind River</b>	T	3535	490	13.9	405	75	0
<b>Huron Shores</b>	MU	1645	235	14.3	170	60	0
<b>Thessalon</b>	T	1155	255	22.1	200	50	0
<b>Thessalon 12</b>	R	110	10	9.1	0	0	0
<b>Bruce Mines</b>	T	545	105	19.3	110	0	0
<b>Tarbutt and Tarbutt Additional</b>	TP	365	60	16.4	55	0	0
<b>Laird</b>	TP	1035	195	18.8	200	0	0
<b>St. Joseph</b>	TP	1105	120	10.9	120	0	0
<b>Hilton Beach</b>	VL	180	20	11.1	20	0	0
<b>Hilton</b>	TP	230	30	13.0	25	0	0
<b>Algoma, Unorganized, North Part</b>	UNO	5525	650	11.8	500	35	110
<b>Plummer Additional</b>	TP	580	100	17.2	105	0	0

Source: Statistics Canada, Census of Canada, 2006.

#### 5.4 Migration in the Far Northeast Training Board Area (Board #23)

Local Board #23, also known as the Far Northeast Training Board, comprises the Districts of Cochrane and Timiskaming and small parts of several neighbouring districts. In 2006 this area had a migration rate slightly above the average for Northern Ontario. One of the reasons for this was the large numbers of migrants who moved into the communities of New Liskeard, Haileybury and Smooth Rock Falls. The towns of Kapuskasing and Kirkland Lake also had relatively high rates of in-migrants compared to the rest of Northern Ontario.

In 2006 the percentage of in-migrants in this Board Area was exactly the same as that for Northern Ontario. Temiskaming Shores, Cobalt, Latchford, and Kirkland Lake all had high numbers of in-migrants, almost all of whom came from within Ontario. Timmins and Kapuskasing had relatively low percentages of in-migrants.

**Table 10: Communities in Local Board #23 Area by Percentage of Migrants 2006**

	Type	Total Pop. 5 Years and Over	Migrants	Migrants as a % of Pop.	Intra provincial Migrants	Inter provincial Migrants	External Migrants
--	------	-----------------------------	----------	-------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------	-------------------

<b>Local Board 23</b>		108685	14400	13.2	12395.0	1600	380
<b>Timmins</b>	CY	40300	4410	10.9	3580	655	175
<b>Iroquois Falls</b>	T	4480	605	13.5	485	110	0
<b>Abitibi 70</b>	R	105	15	14.3	15	0	0
<b>Fauquier-Strickland</b>	TP	540	20	3.7	25	0	0
<b>Moonbeam</b>	TP	1250	170	13.6	165	0	0
<b>Cochrane</b>	T	5130	570	11.1	420	130	10
<b>Smooth Rock Falls</b>	T	1390	90	6.5	60	30	0
<b>Opasatika</b>	TP	260	25	9.6	25	0	0
<b>Hearst</b>	T	5250	670	12.8	540	105	25
<b>Mattice-Val Côté</b>	TP	740	85	11.5	85	0	0
<b>Cochrane, Unorganized, North Part</b>	UNO	2315	270	11.7	260	10	10
<b>Constance Lake 92</b>	R	620	70	11.3	65	0	0
<b>New Post 69A</b>	R	70	10	14.3	15	0	0
<b>Black River-Matheson</b>	TP	2490	305	12.2	280	30	0
<b>Timiskaming, Unorganized, West Part</b>	UNO	3120	650	20.8	630	15	10
<b>Kirkland Lake</b>	T	7665	1220	15.9	1045	95	80
<b>Gauthier</b>	TP	135	40	29.6	40	0	0
<b>Larder Lake</b>	TP	710	155	21.8	140	15	0
<b>Kapuskaing</b>	T	7990	805	10.1	730	75	0
<b>Mattagami 71</b>	R	165	40	24.2	20	15	0
<b>McGarry</b>	TP	655	125	19.1	110	15	0
<b>Matachewan 72</b>	R	75	30	40.0	30	0	0
<b>Chamberlain</b>	TP	305	45	14.8	40	10	0
<b>Englehart</b>	T	1385	395	28.5	390	0	0
<b>Evanturel</b>	TP	450	55	12.2	55	0	0
<b>Charlton and Dack</b>	MU	595	35	5.9	30	0	0
<b>James</b>	TP	400	60	15.0	55	0	0
<b>Thornloe</b>	VL	100	0	0.0	0	0	0
<b>Armstrong</b>	TP	1105	185	16.7	180	0	0
<b>Hilliard</b>	TP	210	55	26.2	50	0	0
<b>Brethour</b>	TP	105	40	38.1	35	0	0
<b>Casey</b>	TP	375	45	12.0	45	0	0

<b>Harley</b>	TP	505	90	17.8	90	0	0
<b>Kerns</b>	TP	315	0	0.0	0	0	0
<b>Hudson</b>	TP	295	20	6.8	15	0	0
<b>Temiskaming Shores</b>	CY	10055	1785	17.8	1490	225	60
<b>Harris</b>	TP	490	85	17.3	85	0	0
<b>Cobalt</b>	T	1145	280	24.5	275	10	0
<b>Latchford</b>	T	430	150	34.9	150	0	0
<b>Coleman</b>	TP	425	95	22.4	95	10	0
<b>Chapleau 75</b>	R	85	20	23.5	25	0	0
<b>Val Rita-Harty</b>	TP	910	120	13.2	105	10	0
<b>Chapleau</b>	TP	2200	310	14.1	280	25	10
<b>Hornepayne</b>	TP	1145	110	9.6	100	10	0
<b>Peawanuck</b>	S	200	40	20.0	40	0	0

Source: Statistics Canada, Census of Canada, 2006.

### 5.5 Migration in the North Superior Training Board Area (Board #24)

Local Board #24 is also known as the North Superior Training Board. It comprises the District of Thunder Bay and several Aboriginal communities just north of the boundaries of the District of Thunder Bay. In 2001 it had the lowest migration rate of all the Boards in Northern Ontario. The main reason that this area attracted the lowest percentage of migrants from 1996 to 2001 was because of the City of Thunder Bay. Only 8.9% of its population had arrived between 1996 and 2001.

These same trends continue in 2006. At 10.8% the percentage of in-migrants increased slightly from 2001 but it is still the lowest of the Northern Ontario Boards. Once again the City of Thunder Bay had relatively low numbers of in-migrants.

**Table 11: Communities in Local Board #24 Area by Percentage of Migrants 2006**

	Type	Total Pop. 5 Years and Over	Migrants	Migrants as a % of Pop.	Intra provincial Migrants	Inter provincial Migrants	External Migrants
<b>Local Board 24</b>		141565	15305	10.8	11080	3025	1165
<b>Neebing</b>	MU	2075	165	8.0	135	30	0
<b>Thunder Bay</b>	CY	102230	10420	10.2	7120	2305	995
<b>Oliver Paipoonge</b>	MU	5505	715	13.0	545	150	15
<b>Fort William 52</b>	R	840	85	10.1	70	10	10
<b>O'Connor</b>	TP	675	95	14.1	50	40	0
<b>Conmee</b>	TP	675	90	13.3	90	10	0
<b>Shuniah</b>	TP	2855	375	13.1	305	60	15
<b>Dorion</b>	TP	335	35	10.4	30	0	0

<b>Red Rock</b>	TP	1005	115	11.4	115	0	0
<b>Nipigon</b>	TP	1665	170	10.2	140	30	0
<b>Gillies</b>	TP	510	55	10.8	50	0	0
<b>Terrace Bay</b>	TP	1545	105	6.8	95	0	0
<b>Marathon</b>	T	3665	600	16.4	425	105	80
<b>Pic Moberth North</b>	R	120	10	8.3	0	0	0
<b>Pic Moberth South</b>	R	105	15	14.3	15	0	0
<b>Pic River 50</b>	R	355	35	9.9	35	0	0
<b>Pays Plat 51</b>	R	70	20	28.6	10	0	0
<b>Lake Helen 53A</b>	R	265	45	17.0	45	0	0
<b>Manitouwadge</b>	TP	2180	425	19.5	335	90	0
<b>Ginoogaming First Nation</b>	R	160	25	15.6	20	0	0
<b>Long Lake 58</b>	R	365	30	8.2	25	0	0
<b>Rocky Bay 1</b>	R	145	15	10.3	15	0	0
<b>Greenstone</b>	MU	4575	500	10.9	415	85	0
<b>Aroland 83</b>	R	295	10	3.4	10	0	0
<b>Osnaburgh 63A</b>	R	130	0	0.0	0	0	0
<b>Thunder Bay, Unorganized</b>	UNO	6350	970	15.3	805	110	50
<b>Whitesand</b>	R	215	15	7.0	20	0	0
<b>Fort Hope 64</b>	R	960	50	5.2	50	0	0
<b>Summer Beaver</b>	S	310	0	0.0	0	0	0
<b>Schreiber</b>	TP	865	85	9.8	85	0	0
<b>Webequie</b>	R	520	30	5.8	25	0	0

Source: Statistics Canada, Census of Canada, 2006.

## 5.6 Migration in the Northwest Training and Adjustment Board Area (Board #25)

Local Board #25 is also known as the Northwest Training and Adjustment Board. It is comprised of the District of Rainy River and most of the District of Kenora. In 2001, at 14.4%, this area had the second highest percentage of in-migrants of all the Board areas in Northern Ontario, slightly above the average for the whole of Northern Ontario. The main reason for this higher migration rate was the relatively large numbers of migrants that moved into Sioux Lookout and Red Lake from 1996 to 2001.

The situation has changed slightly in 2006. At 13% the percentage of in-migrants is slightly below the Northern Ontario average of 13.2%. The City of Kenora and the Town of Fort Frances have relatively low rates of in-migrants while Red Lake and Sioux Lookout continue to have high rates of in-migrants.

**Table 12: Communities in Local Board #25 Area by Percentage of Migrants 2006**

	Type	Total Pop. 5 Years and Over	Migrants	Migrants as a % of Pop.	Intra provincial Migrants	Inter provincial Migrants	External Migrants
<b>Local Board 25</b>		75330	9820	13	6180.0	3105	500
<b>Fort Frances</b>	T	7485	705	9.4	485	175	40
<b>La Vallee</b>	TP	1030	260	25.2	170	85	10
<b>Manitou Rapids 11</b>	R	205	30	14.6	20	10	0
<b>Alberton</b>	TP	920	180	19.6	75	95	0
<b>Emo</b>	TP	1250	240	19.2	210	25	0
<b>Chapple</b>	TP	770	55	7.1	55	0	0
<b>Lake of the Woods</b>	TP	310	25	8.1	10	10	10
<b>Big Grassy River 35G</b>	R	170	15	8.8	20	0	0
<b>Saug-a-Gaw-Sing 1</b>	R	85	10	11.8	10	0	0
<b>Morley</b>	TP	490	45	9.2	35	0	10
<b>Rainy Lake 18C</b>	R	90	15	16.7	15	0	0
<b>Dawson</b>	TP	580	130	22.4	125	0	10
<b>Rainy Lake 26A</b>	R	115	20	17.4	20	0	0
<b>Rainy River</b>	T	815	85	10.4	40	30	15
<b>Rainy Lake 17A</b>	R	165	20	12.1	15	0	0
<b>Rainy River, Unorganized</b>		1355	190	14.0	155	30	10
<b>Ignace</b>	TP	1390	140	10.1	115	25	0
<b>Whitefish Bay 32A</b>	R	560	40	7.1	35	0	0
<b>Whitefish Bay 33A</b>	R	50	15	30.0	10	10	0
<b>Sioux Narrows - Nestor Falls</b>	TP	640	95	14.8	40	40	10

Kenora	CY	14385	1400	9.7	775	575	50
Machin	TP	945	140	14.8	95	40	10
Neguaguon Lake 25D	R	230	20	8.7	15	0	10
Dryden	CY	7765	995	12.8	555	345	90
Ear Falls	TP	1105	245	22.2	155	80	0
Couchiching 16A	R	625	75	12.0	65	0	10
Red Lake	MU	4240	1175	27.7	620	470	85
Slate Falls	S	140	25	17.9	25	0	0
Pickle Lake	TP	455	185	40.7	90	90	0
Marten Falls 65	R	185	10	5.4	10	0	0
Seine River 23A	R	245	35	14.3	25	10	0
Cat Lake 63C	R	410	70	17.1	65	10	0
Osnaburgh 63B	R	295	0	0.0	0	0	0
Lac Seul 28	R	725	50	6.9	45	10	0
Wabigoon Lake 27	R	140	25	17.9	20	0	0
English River 21	R	570	40	7.0	25	15	0
Weagamow Lake 87	R	620	50	8.1	45	10	0
Wabaseemoong	R	700	70	10.0	35	35	0
Sabaskong Bay 35D	R	335	30	9.0	25	0	0
Shoal Lake 34B2	R	115	20	17.4	15	10	0
Lake Of The Woods 37	R	55	0	0.0	0	0	0
Kenora 38B	R	310	45	14.5	40	10	0
Poplar Hill	R	385	25	6.5	25	0	0
Shoal Lake (Part) 39A	R	305	45	14.8	25	20	0
Deer Lake	R	590	30	5.1	25	0	0
Sandy Lake 88	R	1580	170	10.8	90	75	0
Kitchenuhmaykoosib Aaki 84 (Big Trout Lake)	R	775	35	4.5	25	0	0
Sachigo Lake 1	R	385	25	6.5	15	0	0
Eagle Lake 27	R	220	30	13.6	25	0	0
North Spirit Lake	R	230	45	19.6	30	25	0
Shoal Lake (Part) 40	R	95	20	21.1	10	10	0
Whitefish Bay 34A	R	75	0	0.0	0	0	0
Wabauskang 21	R	80	20	25.0	20	0	0
Wunnumin 1	R	435	10	2.3	10	0	0
Sioux Lookout	MU	4795	950	19.8	650	225	70
Wapekeka 2	R	295	20	6.8	20	0	0
The Dalles 38C	R	140	45	32.1	15	30	0
Kenora, Unorganized	UNO	6760	955	14.1	510	390	50
Atikokan	TP	3055	230	7.5	155	65	0
Neskantaga	R	225	15	6.7	15	0	0
Bearskin Lake	R	395	40	10.1	25	10	10
Kasabonika Lake	R	580	15	2.6	15	0	0

<b>Muskrat Dam Lake</b>	R	220	30	13.6	30	0	0
<b>Kingfisher Lake 1</b>	R	360	15	4.2	15	0	0
<b>Kee-Way-Win</b>	R	280	30	10.7	25	10	0

Source: Statistics Canada, Census of Canada, 2006.

## Section Six: Observations

Trends in 2001	Trends in 2006
Migration patterns differ from Ontario	Migration patterns continue to differ
Northern Ontario has few migrants	Northern Ontario has few migrants
Differences between Ontario and the North are increasing	Differences decreased slightly from 2001
Northern Ontario has low rates of in-migration	Northern Ontario continues to have low rates of in-migration
Almost all in-migrants in Northern Ontario are from Ontario	Almost all in-migrants continue to come from Ontario
Few migrants from outside Canada come to Northern Ontario	Few migrants come to Northern Ontario but numbers are increasing slightly
Fewer and fewer immigrants are choosing to come to Northern Ontario each year	Few immigrants come to Northern Ontario but numbers are increasing very slightly
Communities with the highest rates of in-migrants are in the south and are rural	Communities with high rates of in-migrants are in the south, rural and based on mining
Communities with the lowest rates of in-migrants are Aboriginal, urban, and isolated	Communities with low rates of in-migrants are Aboriginal and forest-dependent
	Most immigrants to Northern Ontario go to the largest cities

The analysis of the 2001 Census data has shown us several important facts about migration patterns in Northern Ontario. They are as follows:

- Northern Ontario has few migrants compared to Ontario as a whole
- The differences in percentage of migrants decreased slightly from 2001
- Almost all migrants to Northern Ontario continue to come from within Ontario
- Very few migrants from outside Canada come to Northern Ontario but numbers are increasing slightly
- While Northern Ontario attracts few immigrants, of the ones that do come a higher percentage come from the US and Africa

In addition, our analysis has shown that there is a great deal of variation within the region in terms of the percentage of in-migrants. The main differences are as follows:

- There is a great deal of variation between the Districts of Northern Ontario
- Communities with the highest percentage of in-migrants are in the south, rural, and based on mining
- Communities with the lowest percentage of in-migrants tend to be Aboriginal and forest-dependent
- Most immigrants go to the larger urban areas

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> As this report is being written, the Board #22 area, covering most of the Algoma District, is being represented by the recently established Algoma Workforce Investment Committee.

<sup>2</sup> While most of the statistics will exclude the Muskoka District Municipality, historical data prior to 2006 will sometimes include this region. It should be pointed out that while this inclusion will have a slight effect on the precise calculations, Muskoka's relative small size as a percentage of Northern Ontario's population means that it will have little effect on isolating overall trends.

<sup>3</sup> This has been pointed out by several government studies undertaken over the past 30 years including the Royal Commission on the Northern Environment (Fahlgren Commission). Final Report, Toronto, 1985 and the Task Force on Resource Dependent Communities in Northern Ontario, (the Rosehart Report) Final Report, 1986.

<sup>4</sup> For an elaboration on these points see Dadgostar, B., Jankowski, W.B., and Moazzami, B. The Economy of Northwestern Ontario: Structure, Performance and Future Challenges, Thunder Bay: Centre for Northern Studies, Lakehead University, 1992.

<sup>5</sup> For a detailed discussion of this aspect of Northern Ontario see McBride, Stephen, McKay, Sharon, and Hill, Mary Ellen. "Unemployment in a Northern Hinterland: The Social Impact of Political Neglect" in Chris Southcott (ed.) A Provincial Hinterland: Social Inequality in Northwestern Ontario, Halifax: Fernwood, 1993.

<sup>6</sup> Canada, 2006 Census.

<sup>7</sup> An elaboration on these unique characteristics can be found in Randall, James and R. G. Ironside "Communities on the Edge: An Economic Geography of Resource-Dependent Communities in Canada" The Canadian Geographer 40(10):17-35, 1996.

<sup>8</sup> Census population statistics for Aboriginal communities tend to be less reliable than those for non-Native communities. These statistics are based on 2001 Census data as 2006 data was not available at the time this report was prepared.

<sup>9</sup> See Courchene, T. Migration, Income and Employment, Toronto, C.D. Howe Institute, 1974.; Grant, K.E. and J. Vanderkamp, The Economic Causes and Effects of Migration: Canada, 1965-71, Economic Council of Canada, 1976.; Finnie, R. "Interprovincial Mobility in Canada: A Longitudinal Analysis", Working Paper W-98-5E.a, Applied Research Branch, Human Resources Development Canada, 1998.; and Finnie, R. "Interprovincial Mobility in Canada: Who Moves? A Panel Logit Model Analysis", Working Paper W-98-5E.b, Applied Research Branch, Human Resources Development Canada, 1998.

---

<sup>10</sup> Dupuy, Richard; Mayer, Francine; and Morissette, René. Rural Youth: Stayers, Leavers and Return Migrants, Canadian Rural Partnership, 2000, p. 1.

<sup>11</sup> See Dupuy, Richard; Mayer, Francine; and Morissette, René. Rural Youth: Stayers, Leavers and Return Migrants, Canadian Rural Partnership, 2000.; Neil Rothwell, Ray D. Bollman, Juno Tremblay and Jeff Marshall, Recent Migration Patterns in Rural and Small Town Canada, Agriculture and Rural Working Paper Series Working Paper No. 55, Agriculture Division, Statistics Canada, 2002.; Tremblay, Juno. Rural youth migration between 1971 and 1996, Working Paper# 44, Agriculture Division, Statistics Canada, 2001.; R.A. Malatest & Associates Ltd., Rural Youth Migration: Exploring the Reality Behind the Myths, Canadian Rural Partnership, 2002.

<sup>12</sup> Neil Rothwell, Ray D. Bollman, Juno Tremblay and Jeff Marshall, Recent Migration Patterns in Rural and Small Town Canada, Agriculture and Rural Working Paper Series Working Paper No. 55, Agriculture Division, Statistics Canada, 2002, p. 3.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid, p. 5.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid, p. 6.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid, p. 7.

<sup>16</sup> See Ferguson, M., K. Ali, M. R. Olfert, and M. Partridge. "Voting with their feet: Jobs versus amenities." Growth and Change 38, no. 1:77-110, 2007 and Finnie, R. "Who moves? A logit model analysis of inter-provincial migration in Canada". Applied Economics 36, no. 16:1759-1779, 2004.

<sup>17</sup> See Himelfarb, Alex. "The Social Characteristics of Single Industry Towns" in R.T. Bowles (ed) Little Communities and Big Industry, Toronto, Butterworths, 1982.

<sup>18</sup> Southcott, Chris. A Regional Outlook for Northern Boards: A Northern Approach to Regional Labour Force Development, Dryden: Training Boards of Northern Ontario, 2000, p. 5.

<sup>19</sup> The following is the explanation of sampling error found in the 2001 Census Dictionary:

**Sampling Errors**

Estimates obtained by weighting up responses collected on a sample basis are subject to error due to the fact that the distribution of characteristics within the sample will not usually be identical to the distribution of characteristics within the population from which the sample has been selected.

The potential error introduced by sampling will vary according to the relative scarcity of the characteristics in the population. For large cell values, the potential error due to sampling, as a proportion of the cell value, will be relatively small. For small cell values, this potential error, as a proportion of the cell value, will be relatively large. The potential error due to sampling is usually expressed in terms of the so-called "standard error". This is the square root of the average, taken over all possible samples of the same size and design, of the squared deviation of the sample estimate from the value for the total population.

The following table provides approximate measures of the standard error due to sampling. These measures are intended as a general guide only.

**Table: Approximate Standard Error Due to Sampling for 2001 Census Sample Data**

---

**Cell Value Approximate Standard Error**

50 or less	15
100 -	20
200 -	30
500 -	45
1,000 -	65
2,000 -	90
5,000 -	140
10,000 -	200
20,000 -	280
50,000 -	450
100,000 -	630
500,000 -	1,400

Statistics Canada, 2001 Census Dictionary, Ottawa: Ministry of Industry, 2002, p. 295,296.

<sup>20</sup> The following is the explanation of random rounding found in the 2001 Census Dictionary: **Confidentiality and Random Rounding** The figures shown in the tables have been subjected to a confidentiality procedure known as **random rounding** to prevent the possibility of associating statistical data with any identifiable individual. Under this method, all figures, including totals and margins, are randomly rounded either up or down to a multiple of “5”, and in some cases “10”. While providing strong protection against disclosure, this technique does not add significant error to the census data. The user should be aware that totals and margins are rounded independently of the cell data so that some differences between these and the sum of rounded cell data may exist. Also, minor differences can be expected in corresponding totals and cell values among various census tabulations. Similarly, percentages, which are calculated on rounded figures, do not necessarily add up to 100%. Order statistics (median, quartiles, percentiles, etc.) and measures of dispersion such as the standard error are computed in the usual manner. When a statistic is defined as the quotient of two numbers (which is the case for averages, percentages, and proportions), the two numbers are rounded before the division is performed, except for income, owner’s payments, value of dwelling, hours worked, weeks worked and age. For these variables, the two numbers in the quotient are not rounded. The sum is invariably defined as the product of the average and the rounded weighted frequency. It should also be noted that small cell counts may suffer a significant distortion as a result of random rounding. Individual data cells containing small numbers may lose their precision as a result. Statistics Canada, 2001 Census Dictionary, Ottawa: Ministry of Industry, 2002, p. 296.

<sup>21</sup> In the 2001 Census report, figures for Northern Ontario used included the District Municipality of Muskoka. As such, the percentage of migrants was listed as 13.4%. Recalculated without the Muskoka District Municipality, the percentage for 2001 was 12.9%.

<sup>22</sup> Statistics Canada, Profile of the Canadian Population by Mobility Status: Canada, a Nation on the Move. Ottawa, December, 2002, p.5.

<sup>23</sup> See Suthey Holler Associates, Youth Out-Migration From The FNETB Area, Hearst: Far Northeast Training Board, 2001.

<sup>24</sup> Fauquier-Strickland, Smooth Rock Falls, Terrace Bay, Atikokan, Dubreuilville, White River, Fort Frances, Hornepayne, and Kenora.

## Appendix A

### Census Sub-divisions of Northern Ontario by Percentage of Migrants arriving Between 2001 and 2006

	Type of Community	Board Area	Total population 5 years and over	Migrants	Mig as % of Pop
<b>Ontario</b>			11354360	2151160	18.9
<b>Barrie Island</b>	TP	21	40	25	62.5
<b>Pickle Lake</b>	TP	25	455	185	40.7
<b>Parry Sound, Unorganized, North East Part</b>	UNO	20	235	95	40.4
<b>Matachewan 72</b>	R	23	75	30	40.0
<b>Brethour</b>	TP	23	105	40	38.1
<b>Latchford</b>	T	23	430	150	34.9
<b>Callander</b>	MU	20	3100	1025	33.1
<b>The Dalles 38C</b>	R	25	140	45	32.1
<b>Ryerson</b>	TP	20	685	220	32.1
<b>McKellar</b>	TP	20	1050	335	31.9
<b>St.-Charles</b>	MU	21	1140	360	31.6
<b>Armour</b>	TP	20	1190	370	31.1
<b>Johnson</b>	TP	22	655	200	30.5
<b>Killarney</b>	MU	21	410	125	30.5
<b>Nipissing</b>	TP	20	1585	480	30.3
<b>Calvin</b>	TP	20	580	175	30.2
<b>Whitefish Bay 33A</b>	R	25	50	15	30.0
<b>Gros Cap 49</b>	R	22	50	15	30.0
<b>Gauthier</b>	TP	23	135	40	29.6
<b>Pays Plat 51</b>	R	24	70	20	28.6
<b>Englehart</b>	T	23	1385	395	28.5
<b>Assignack</b>	TP	21	865	245	28.3
<b>Billings</b>	TP	21	535	150	28.0
<b>Red Lake</b>	MU	25	4240	1175	27.7
<b>South River</b>	VL	20	980	270	27.6
<b>Temagami</b>	MU	20	905	240	26.5
<b>French River 13</b>	R	20	95	25	26.3
<b>Gordon</b>	TP	21	400	105	26.3
<b>Hilliard</b>	TP	23	210	55	26.2
<b>East Ferris</b>	TP	20	3975	1040	26.2
<b>Chisholm</b>	TP	20	1270	330	26.0
<b>Parry Sound, Unorganized, Centre Part</b>	UNO	20	2355	610	25.9
<b>Whitestone</b>	MU	20	1005	255	25.4

La Vallee	TP	25	1030	260	25.2
Sheshegwaning 20	R	21	100	25	25.0
Zhiibaahaasing 19A (Cockburn Island 19A)	R	21	40	10	25.0
Jocelyn	TP	22	260	65	25.0
Wabauskang 21	R	25	80	20	25.0
Magnetawan	MU	20	1575	390	24.8
Cobalt	T	23	1145	280	24.5
Mississagi River 8	R	22	390	95	24.4
Mattagami 71	R	23	165	40	24.2
Central Manitoulin	TP	21	1870	450	24.1
Seguin	TP	20	4040	965	23.9
Chapleau 75	R	23	85	20	23.5
Sheguiandah 24	R	21	150	35	23.3
McMurrich/Monteith	TP	20	755	175	23.2
Markstay-Warren	MU	21	2380	545	22.9
Kearney	T	20	770	175	22.7
Strong	TP	20	1260	285	22.6
Dawson	TP	25	580	130	22.4
Perry	TP	20	1920	430	22.4
Elliot Lake	CY	22	11100	2485	22.4
Coleman	TP	23	425	95	22.4
Shawanaga 17	R	20	180	40	22.2
Ear Falls	TP	25	1105	245	22.2
Papineau-Cameron	TP	20	995	220	22.1
Thessalon	T	22	1155	255	22.1
Larder Lake	TP	23	710	155	21.8
Whitefish River (Part) 4	R	21	350	75	21.4
Shoal Lake (Part) 40	R	25	95	20	21.1
Timiskaming, Unorganized, West Part	UNO	23	3120	650	20.8
Burk's Falls	VL	20	855	175	20.5
Nairn and Hyman	TP	21	465	95	20.4
The Archipelago	TP	20	550	110	20.0
French River	MU	21	2525	505	20.0
Peawanuck	S	23	200	40	20.0
Nipissing 10	R	20	1350	270	20.0
Magnetawan 1	R	20	75	15	20.0
Duck Lake 76B	R	21	75	15	20.0
Wahnapitei 11	R	21	50	10	20.0
Sioux Lookout	MU	25	4795	950	19.8
Rankin Location 15D	R	22	530	105	19.8
Alberton	TP	25	920	180	19.6
North Spirit Lake	R	25	230	45	19.6
Machar	TP	20	845	165	19.5

<b>Manitouwadge</b>	TP	24	2180	425	19.5
<b>Bonfield</b>	TP	20	1960	380	19.4
<b>Bruce Mines</b>	T	22	545	105	19.3
<b>Emo</b>	TP	25	1250	240	19.2
<b>McGarry</b>	TP	23	655	125	19.1
<b>North Shore</b>	TP	22	530	100	18.9
<b>Laird</b>	TP	22	1035	195	18.8
<b>Sables-Spanish Rivers</b>	TP	21	3025	560	18.5
<b>South Algonquin</b>	TP	20	1225	225	18.4
<b>McDougall</b>	MU	20	2585	465	18.0
<b>Joly</b>	TP	20	280	50	17.9
<b>Wabigoon Lake 27</b>	R	25	140	25	17.9
<b>Slate Falls</b>	S	25	140	25	17.9
<b>Harley</b>	TP	23	505	90	17.8
<b>Temiskaming Shores</b>	CY	23	10055	1785	17.8
<b>Shoal Lake 34B2</b>	R	25	115	20	17.4
<b>Rainy Lake 26A</b>	R	25	115	20	17.4
<b>Harris</b>	TP	23	490	85	17.3
<b>Plummer Additional</b>	TP	22	580	100	17.2
<b>Cat Lake 63C</b>	R	25	410	70	17.1
<b>Lake Helen 53A</b>	R	24	265	45	17.0
<b>North Bay</b>	CY	20	50645	8585	17.0
<b>Mattawa</b>	T	20	1850	310	16.8
<b>Armstrong</b>	TP	23	1105	185	16.7
<b>Rainy Lake 18C</b>	R	25	90	15	16.7
<b>Mattawan</b>	TP	20	150	25	16.7
<b>Baldwin</b>	TP	21	515	85	16.5
<b>Tarbutt and Tarbutt Additional</b>	TP	22	365	60	16.4
<b>Marathon</b>	T	24	3665	600	16.4
<b>Kirkland Lake</b>	T	23	7665	1220	15.9
<b>Garden River 14</b>	R	22	915	145	15.8
<b>West Nipissing</b>	M	20	12590	1970	15.6
<b>Ginoogaming First Nation</b>	R	24	160	25	15.6
<b>Michipicoten</b>	TP	22	3025	470	15.5
<b>Northeastern Manitoulin and the Islands</b>	T	21	2525	390	15.4
<b>Powassan</b>	MU	20	2950	455	15.4
<b>Thunder Bay, Unorganized</b>	UNO	24	6350	970	15.3
<b>Espanola</b>	T	21	5035	765	15.2
<b>Macdonald, Meredith and Aberdeen Additional</b>	TP	22	1485	225	15.2
<b>Nipissing, Unorganized, South Part</b>	UNO	20	1690	255	15.1
<b>James</b>	TP	23	400	60	15.0
<b>Sioux Narrows - Nestor Falls</b>	TP	25	640	95	14.8

Sundridge	VL	20	910	135	14.8
Machin	TP	25	945	140	14.8
Shoal Lake (Part) 39A	R	25	305	45	14.8
Chamberlain	TP	23	305	45	14.8
Manitou Rapids 11	R	25	205	30	14.6
Kenora 38B	R	25	310	45	14.5
Huron Shores	MU	22	1645	235	14.3
Seine River 23A	R	25	245	35	14.3
Pic Mobert South	R	24	105	15	14.3
New Post 69A	R	23	70	10	14.3
Abitibi 70	R	23	105	15	14.3
Kenora, Unorganized	UNO	25	6760	955	14.1
Chapleau	TP	23	2200	310	14.1
O'Connor	TP	24	675	95	14.1
Rainy River, Unorganized		25	1355	190	14.0
Blind River	T	22	3535	490	13.9
Muskrat Dam Lake	R	25	220	30	13.6
Eagle Lake 27	R	25	220	30	13.6
Moonbeam	TP	23	1250	170	13.6
Iroquois Falls	T	23	4480	605	13.5
Carling	TP	20	1085	145	13.4
Conmee	TP	24	675	90	13.3
Val Rita-Harty	TP	23	910	120	13.2
Shuniah	TP	24	2855	375	13.1
Sudbury, Unorganized, North Part	UNO	21	2370	310	13.1
Hilton	TP	22	230	30	13.0
Oliver Paipoonge	MU	24	5505	715	13.0
Dryden	CY	25	7765	995	12.8
Hearst	T	23	5250	670	12.8
Serpent River 7	R	22	315	40	12.7
Parry Sound	T	20	5325	670	12.6
Goulais Bay 15A	R	22	80	10	12.5
Black River-Matheson	TP	23	2490	305	12.2
Evanturel	TP	23	450	55	12.2
Sagamok	R	22	820	100	12.2
M'Chigeeng 22 (West Bay 22)	R	21	700	85	12.1
Spanish	T	22	700	85	12.1
Rainy Lake 17A	R	25	165	20	12.1
Parry Island First Nation	R	20	330	40	12.1
Couchiching 16A	R	25	625	75	12.0
Casey	TP	23	375	45	12.0
Algoma, Unorganized, North Part		22	5525	650	11.8
Saug-a-Gaw-Sing 1	R	25	85	10	11.8

<b>Cochrane, Unorganized, North Part</b>	UNO	23	2315	270	11.7
<b>Mattice-Val Côté</b>	TP	23	740	85	11.5
<b>Red Rock</b>	TP	24	1005	115	11.4
<b>Constance Lake 92</b>	R	23	620	70	11.3
<b>Cochrane</b>	T	23	5130	570	11.1
<b>Hilton Beach</b>	VL	22	180	20	11.1
<b>Timmins</b>	CY	23	40300	4410	10.9
<b>Whitefish Lake 6</b>	R	21	320	35	10.9
<b>Greenstone</b>	MU	24	4575	500	10.9
<b>Gore Bay</b>	T	21	780	85	10.9
<b>St. Joseph</b>	TP	22	1105	120	10.9
<b>Dokis 9</b>	R	20	185	20	10.8
<b>Gillies</b>	TP	24	510	55	10.8
<b>Sandy Lake 88</b>	R	25	1580	170	10.8
<b>Kee-Way-Win</b>	R	25	280	30	10.7
<b>Sucker Creek 23</b>	R	21	330	35	10.6
<b>Wikwemikong Unceded</b>	R	21	2185	230	10.5
<b>Greater Sudbury / Grand Sudbury</b>	CY	21	148265	15600	10.5
<b>Dorion</b>	TP	24	335	35	10.4
<b>Rainy River</b>	T	25	815	85	10.4
<b>Rocky Bay 1</b>	R	24	145	15	10.3
<b>Nipigon</b>	TP	24	1665	170	10.2
<b>Thunder Bay</b>	CY	24	102230	10420	10.2
<b>Bearskin Lake</b>	R	25	395	40	10.1
<b>Fort William 52</b>	R	24	840	85	10.1
<b>Kapuskaing</b>	T	23	7990	805	10.1
<b>Ignace</b>	TP	25	1390	140	10.1
<b>Wabaseemoong</b>	R	25	700	70	10.0
<b>Pic River 50</b>	R	24	355	35	9.9
<b>Schreiber</b>	TP	24	865	85	9.8
<b>Kenora</b>	CY	25	14385	1400	9.7
<b>Opasatika</b>	TP	23	260	25	9.6
<b>Hornepayne</b>	TP	23	1145	110	9.6
<b>Sault Ste. Marie</b>	CY	22	70645	6725	9.5
<b>Fort Frances</b>	T	25	7485	705	9.4
<b>Morley</b>	TP	25	490	45	9.2
<b>Thessalon 12</b>	R	22	110	10	9.1
<b>Tehkummah</b>	TP	21	385	35	9.1
<b>Sabaskong Bay 35D</b>	R	25	335	30	9.0
<b>Big Grassy River 35G</b>	R	25	170	15	8.8
<b>Neguaguon Lake 25D</b>	R	25	230	20	8.7
<b>White River</b>	TP	22	810	70	8.6
<b>Pic Moberth North</b>	R	24	120	10	8.3

Long Lake 58	R	24	365	30	8.2
Lake of the Woods	TP	25	310	25	8.1
Weagamow Lake 87	R	25	620	50	8.1
Neebing	MU	24	2075	165	8.0
Dubreuilville	TP	22	715	55	7.7
Burpee and Mills	TP	21	325	25	7.7
Atikokan	TP	25	3055	230	7.5
Whitefish Bay 32A	R	25	560	40	7.1
Chapple	TP	25	770	55	7.1
English River 21	R	25	570	40	7.0
Whitesand	R	24	215	15	7.0
Lac Seul 28	R	25	725	50	6.9
Terrace Bay	TP	24	1545	105	6.8
Wapekeka 2	R	25	295	20	6.8
Hudson	TP	23	295	20	6.8
Neskantaga	R	25	225	15	6.7
Poplar Hill	R	25	385	25	6.5
Sachigo Lake 1	R	25	385	25	6.5
Smooth Rock Falls	T	23	1390	90	6.5
Charlton and Dack	MU	23	595	35	5.9
Webequie	R	24	520	30	5.8
Marten Falls 65	R	25	185	10	5.4
Fort Hope 64	R	24	960	50	5.2
Deer Lake	R	25	590	30	5.1
Kitchenuhmaykoosib Aaki 84 (Big Trout Lake)	R	25	775	35	4.5
Prince	TP	22	955	40	4.2
Kingfisher Lake 1	R	25	360	15	4.2
Fauquier-Strickland	TP	23	540	20	3.7
Aroland 83	R	24	295	10	3.4
Kasabonika Lake	R	25	580	15	2.6
Wunnumin 1	R	25	435	10	2.3
Kerns	TP	23	315	0	0.0
Thornloe	VL	23	100	0	0.0
Summer Beaver	S	24	310	0	0.0
Lake Of The Woods 37	R	25	55	0	0.0
Whitefish Bay 34A	R	25	75	0	0.0
Osnaburgh 63B	R	25	295	0	0.0
Osnaburgh 63A	R	24	130	0	0.0
Manitoulin, Unorganized, West Part		21	-	-	

Source: Statistics Canada, Census of Canada, 2006. Note: Due to sampling error, results from smaller census sub-divisions are less reliable than the results from the larger census sub-divisions.

