# "MULTICULTURALISM

AS A

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM"

Richard G. Stock April 1973. M.A. Political Science

© Richard G. Stock 1973

#### ABSTRACT

**AUTHOR:** 

1

RICHARD G. STOCK

TITLE:

MULTICULTURALISM AS A COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

**DEPARIMENT:** 

POLITICAL SCIENCE

DEGREE SOUGHT: MASTER OF ARTS

SUMMARY:

The thesis attempts to establish whether the essentials for adequate community development are actually present in the federal government policy and programs of multiculturalism as they affect the cultural preservation and development of ethnic communities in Montreal. Accordingly the roots of cultural pluralism in Canada and in the federal government are traced. The multiculturalism policy processes and structures are examined in the context of a community development orientation. This is supplemented by an examination of the first year of activity of the multiculturalism grants program. Finally an analysis is done of some of the needs and characteristics of Montreal ethnic organizations and the degree of congruency with the multiculturalism program. It is hoped that by examining the structures and processes of a single government program, one will be able to establish the degree of its relevance to local ethnic communities, thereby ascertaining its usefulness as a local community development mechanism.

## RESUME

AUTEUR:

RICHARD G. STOCK

TITRE:

MULTICULTURALISM AS A COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

DEPARTEMENT:

SCIENCES POLITIOUES

CYCLE:

MAITRISE

RESUME:

Le sujet de la thèse tente d'établir si les éléments pour un développement communautaire adéquat existent dans la politique et les programmes fédéraux du multi-culturalisme en ce qui a trait à la préservation et au développement culturel des communautés ethniques de Montréal.

Etant donné ceci, nous avons tracé l'évolution d'un pluralisme culturel au Canada et auprès du gouvernement fédéral. Le fonctionnement et la structure de la politique du multiculturalisme sont examinés dans le contexte du développement communautaire. Ceci est complété par une étude sur la première année d'activités du programme de subventions de cette politique.

Enfin, une analyse sur les besoins et particularités des organismes ethniques de Montréal a été faite.

Il est anticipé que l'analyse des structures et processus d'un programme gouvernemental établira l'utilité d'un tel mécanisme de développement communautaire.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

| INTRODUCTION |   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |                                        |  |  |
|--------------|---|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|--|--|
| CHAPTER I    | - | STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                        |  |  |
|              |   | A. Community Development and Citizen Participation B. The Problem of the Lack of Ongoing Consultation built into Program Administrative Structures and Processes                                                                                                                   | 12                                     |  |  |
| CHAPTER II   | - | CULTURAL PILIRALISM AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MULTICULTURALISM POLICY                                                                                                                                                                                                             | 17                                     |  |  |
|              |   | A. Towards a Development of the "Ideology" of Cultural Pluralism in Canada - Anglo-Conformity - Melting Pot - The Beginnings of Cultural Pluralism - The Vertical Mosaic - Ethnic Mosaic - Social Mobility and the Ethnic Mosaic                                                   | 17<br>17<br>18<br>18<br>20<br>20<br>21 |  |  |
|              |   | B. The Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism - The Recommendations and an Overview of Book IV - Terms of Reference - Cultural Dualism - The Beginnings of Multiculturalism - Recommendations                                                                          | 26<br>26<br>27<br>28<br>29             |  |  |
|              |   | C. Development of a Federal Policy towards Ethnic Diversity - Political Preparation - Department Consultations - Results of Consultations                                                                                                                                          | 32<br>32<br>37<br>39                   |  |  |
|              |   | D. The Announcement of the Multicultural Program - Announcement - Reaction to the Policy - Program Content 1. Grants 2. Cultural Development Program 3. Ethnic Histories 4. Canadian Ethnic Studies 5. Teaching of Official Languages 6. Programs of the Federal Cultural Agencies | 41<br>41<br>42<br>43                   |  |  |

| ÇHAPTER III |  | PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION OF THE MULTICULTURALISM POLICY                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |          |
|-------------|--|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
|             |  | A. A Rational Framework for the Multiculturalism Policy - The Policy Formation Framework - A Policy Execution Framework                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 49<br>49<br>53             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |          |
|             |  | <ul> <li>B. Application of the Multiculturalism Policy to a Policy Execution Framework</li> <li>Application of the Policy as a Whole to the Execution Framework</li> <li>Selection of the Grants Program for Further Application</li> <li>Application of the Grants Program to the Execution Framework</li> <li>C. The Responsiveness of Program Execution</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                       | 62<br>62<br>64<br>65<br>69 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |          |
| CHAPTER IV  |  | COMMUNITY NEED FOR AND RESPONSE TO THE MULTI-<br>CULTURALISM PROGRAM                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | 72                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |          |
|             |  | A. An Analysis of the Submissions and Responses to the Multiculturalism Grants Program  - Source of the Project  1. First Session - February, 1972  2. Second Session - May, 1972  3. Third Session - September, 1972  - An Examination of the Distribution of Multicultural Grants Application by Ethnic Origin  - An Examination of the Budgets and Grants Given to Projects in the Montreal Area  1. Amounts Requested  2. An Analysis of Funds Granted  3. An Analysis of the Number of Projects Funded | 72<br>72<br>77<br>78       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |          |
|             |  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                            | <ul> <li>A Comparison of Grant Applications by Content</li> <li>Funding of Projects</li> <li>1. Percentage of Grants Given by Type of Project Across Categories of Groups</li> <li>2. Distribution of Grants Across Categories of Groups, Three Sessions Total</li> <li>3. Percentage of Grants Given by Type of Project</li> <li>4. Distribution of Grants by Type Given to Groups in Montreal over Three Sessions</li> </ul> | 81<br>84 |

|   |                  | B. An Analysis of the Characteristics and Needs of Some of Montreal's Ethnic Organizations, and the Degree of Congruency with the Multiculturalism Program - The Characteristics of Ethnic Organizations 1. Size 2. Language Tendency 3. Length of Residency 4. Occupation 5. Central Meeting Place 6. Social Services 7. Cultural Services 8. Language 9. Legal Services - The Needs and Desires of Ethnic Organizations 1. Language Needs | 89<br>89 |
|---|------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
|   |                  | <ol> <li>Cultural Needs</li> <li>Counselling and Information Needs</li> <li>Core Funding</li> <li>Immigration</li> </ol>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |          |
|   | CHAPTER V -      | CONCLUSION                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 113      |
| C | APPENDIX I       | LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS INTERVIEWED                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | 118      |
|   | APPENDIX II -    | QUESTIONNAIRE                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 120      |
|   | PRIMARY SOURCES  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | 129      |
|   | SECONDARY SOURCE | es ·                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | 131      |
|   |                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |          |

#### Introduction

In general, the subject matter of this thesis appears to have been little studied by political scientists. Community development as a program and as a process has been increasingly emphasized by governments of all levels in recent years. Although sociological and other studies of this relatively new phenomenon have been conducted, it is only in the last ten years or so that the "politics of participation" have come into vogue. Intense government involvement in fields that are not strictly economic, but rather social and cultural in content, have given us a whole new dimension of political processes to study. It has become paramount for both citizens as well as policy-makers to know the actual and desirable levels of involvement for those affected by government policies and programs.

I have selected the general area of culture for this study. In this context, culture can be understood to affect the leisure time activities of the Canadian population. Technological development since World War II has given individuals more time for activities which they themselves plan. In recent years, governments have taken some responsibility and initiative for legislation and measures concerning the "quality of life". Such new responsibility has been paralleled by increased awareness and participation of citizens in planning and influencing measures which affect them on a local community basis. This thesis will deal primarily with the cultural characteristics and needs of the members of some of Montreal's ethnic communities. Although the case study could have included other cities or other groups, it was felt that the number of organizations consulted was sufficiently representative for the purpose of studying the characteristics and effects of a local

community development policy and program.

The subject matter of this thesis is developed in four major stages, each corresponding to a chapter, plus a conclusion. The first stage attempts to place this study in its context and state the problem under examination. Accordingly, the concepts of community development and citizen participation are examined. With the working hypothesis that some degree of government involvement is necessary for balanced community development, the first chapter limits the area of concern to culture as a leisure time activity for individuals and groups. Individual citizens are affected by the government's cultural policies and programs, and especially by those with a local focus or operation. More specifically then, we shall establish whether the essentials for community development are actually present in the government policies and programs affecting the cultural preservation and development of the members of local ethnic communities.

The second stage of the thesis, in the second chapter, traces the evolution of the concept of cultural pluralism in Canada as well as the manner in which the government has translated it into official policy and programs. This is necessary as background information for the further discussion of a multiculturalism policy. Accordingly, the first section of the chapter traces the roots and development of the concept of cultural pluralism. The second section documents the beginnings of government awareness of this concept, and its implications, through the activities and recommendations of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism regarding the cultural contribution of the other ethnic groups. The third section briefly presents the actual process of policy formation on this subject, as well as the input of various groups and

individuals in this endeavor. The final section of this chapter presents an overview of the content of the federal government cultural policy and programs for Canada's ethnic groups. It is important to note that the underlying theme of each of the four previously-mentioned sections is the degree of consultation and/or participation by local ethnic community groups or individuals.

The third stage of the thesis attempts to place the multiculturalism policy in a public administration context. In order to do
this, the rational planning framework for government policies will be
examined. The multiculturalism policy, and more specifically its grants
program, will be compared and applied to this framework. The second
section of this chapter will concern itself with an analysis of the degree
and types of administrative decentralization of the multiculturalism
grants program. Finally, the implications of this decentralization for
effective community development and citizen participation will be studied.

The fourth and final stage of the thesis examines in greater detail the application of the program and evaluates whether the forementioned aspects are relevant to the needs and characteristics of Montreal's ethnic communities. Accordingly, the submissions to and responses of the grants program are evaluated for the Montreal region. Factors concerning the grants applications, such as the ethnic origin of the applicant, the amounts requested and funded, and the content of the application will be analyzed. The last part of this chapter attempts to ascertain, through interviews, some of the characteristics and needs of some forty-six ethnic organizations and their members. This permits a comparison between these needs and the types of projects funded.

A conclusion follows the fourth chapter. It is hoped then, that

by examining the structures, processes and performance of a single government program, that one will be able to establish the degree of its relevance to local cultural communities, and thereby ascertain its usefulness as a local community development mechanism.

1

## CHAPTER I - STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

#### A. Community Development and Citizen Participation

The term "community development" has come into current usage, and is usually understood to refer to the processes by which the efforts of the people themselves are united with those of the governmental authorities to improve the economic, social and cultural conditions of communities and to integrate these local communities into the life of the nation by permitting them to contribute fully to its progress. This complex of processes is then made up of two essential elements: the participation by the people themselves in efforts to improve their mode of living with as much reliance as possible on their own initiative; and the provision of technical and other services in ways which encourage initiative and self-help to make these more effective. These programs are usually concerned with local communities, because of the fact that the people living in a locality have many and varied interests in common. Some of these interests are expressed through functional groups organized to further a more limited range of interests primarily determined by locality. These groups can include legal aid clinics, food cooperatives and health facilities. It is the relation between these group's interests and the response of government to them which shall be examined.

In relation to the people, community development is essentially both an educational and organizational process. It is educational because it is concerned with changing such attitudes and practices as are obstacles to social and economic improvements, engendering particular attitudes which are conducive to these improvements and, more generally, promoting a greater receptivity to change. This implies developing the capacities of individuals who are affected by progressive programs initiated from outside

1

1

a local community to the point where they can readily contribute to setting the local objectives of these activities and determine and evaluate the effects of such activities on themselves.

Community development is organizational not only because people acting together are better able to pursue the interests which they have in common, but also because it requires the re-orientation of existing institutions or the creation of new types of institutions to make self-help fully effective and to provide the necessary channels for government services. It is this organizational aspect of community development, that is to say, the mechanisms for liaison and bilateral information transfer, which will be elaborated on in this presentation. In short, this is the problem of the accessibility or inaccessibility of voluntary organizations to government for the purpose of establishing community development programs which will be responsive to local needs.

If the full benefits of an improved organization are to be realized in a local community, two conditions are necessary. First, the felt needs of the people should be taken into consideration. The first duty of those responsible for community development programs is to identify the felt needs of the people. They should also assist the people in making better judgments for themselves on what their needs are and how to satisfy them. Finally, they should be able to identify needs not yet perceived and make the people conscious of them and aware of the importance of satisfying them. Ideally, these steps should be undertaken jointly by government and local organizers, in all cases where government affects local community life, through services or other programs. It should be recognized, however, that it is often not feasible to satisfy some local needs, and that these needs may be inconsistent with government policy for the

economic and social development of the nation.

The very concept of community development elaborated above demands the use of the knowledge and skills of all relevant national services in an integrated rather than an isolated or fragmentary way. To serve the ultimate objective of a better life for individuals within the community, technical services must be conceived in a way which recognizes the primacy of the welfare of the individual.

In this connection, it needs to be kept constantly in mind that community development has been considered in various ways. It has been defined as a process, implying transition from one phase to another.

"The education-for-action process helps people achieve group goals democratically; the leader becomes an agent for constructing learning experience rather than the proponent of a program for community improvement; primary importance is attached to the community level; the means employed in the solution are more important than the solution itself; and it is one of several types of purposive change". 

1

Community development is also a method or approach that emphasizes popular participation and the direct involvement of a population in the process of development. This is often the conception held by local community organizers. On the other hand, the government conception of community development often takes the shape of local activities organized with a separate administration and staff. This conception can be called community development as a program. It contends that community development as a process cannot be imparted and practiced without creating a program. As a set of new attitudes, ideas, concepts and techniques that challenges the status quo, community development can succeed only if it develops an organization and a program committed to the advancement of its ideology.

In the absence of community development organization and program, it is maintained, there is no mechanism available to coordinate the distribution of services, and to integrate the development plans at local and regional levels.

If the development of a community and of the individuals within it, requires a co-ordinated and integrated approach, especially at the field or local level, there has to be an effective co-ordinating structure, which community development is well-suited to provide. Community development programs can help bridge the gap between local needs and national programs. In the absence of effective channels of communication between the national government and the masses, community development programs take on a very special importance.

With the foregoing introductory remarks, I have attempted to set the framework for the presentation of the problem in political terms. It is important to remember that it is the organizational aspects of a community development program which will be studied. Although only one government funding program in particular will be examined, there will be elements of the discussion and conclusions which should be applicable to a variety of policies and programs classified under the rubric of community development. It is maintained that variations, or lack of them, in the structure and the administration of a program could directly affect its effectiveness and applicability to a local community. Such variations can take the form of the number of administrators, their relative degrees of training or even the amount of delegated decision-making power.

B. The Problem of the Lack of Ongoing Consultation built into Program Administrative Structures and Processes.

To illustrate the importance of the role of community organizations and groups in expressing local needs and interests, to demonstrate the potential for community development which exists in certain government programs, and finally, to underline the need for effective channels of communication between local groups and the local government, I have selected for study the federal government program of Multiculturalism.

The previous section of this chapter spoke of the participation of people, and also of the provision of services for the development of communities. In many communities, local organizers have tried to do the first, while government agencies have attempted to do the second. Seldom have the two been merged or even co-ordinated. Rather, each existed parallel to the other. The concept of community development which was elaborated in the previous section, dictates that local interests should be expressed by and represented in the types of services or programs offered to them. This is a prerequisite for genuinely effective community development, as was maintained by Michel Blondin of the Conseil des Oeuvres de Montréal. "Pour pénétrer l'âme du quartier, un autre type de connaissance est essentiel, bien que difficile à obtenir. Il s'agit de saisir et d'analyser les valeurs culturelles de ce milieu. Pour rejoindre la population d'un milieu donné, il est essentiel de comprendre ce qui la fait agir, ce qui est sensible à son imagination et à son émotivité, et de connaître son hiérarchie de valeurs. La connaissance des valeurs du milieu suppose une sensibilité bien entraînée à saisir ces phénomènes culturels. C'est un reproche fréquemment adressé aux travailleurs sociaux et aux gens de disciplines connexes qu'ils ne comprennent rien aux populations qui

habitent ces quartiers et qu'ils exigent des actes impossibles à poser."2

 $\left( \right)$ 

The concept of culture, plus knowledge about the actual culture, enables us to study aspects of public administration in Canadian society in relation to all factors which surround and condition, as well as constitute, "l'âme du quartier". This includes, among other things, political theories, the educational system, class distinctions, the economy and technology. By permitting us to see administration in terms of the environment, culture permits us to understand the normal differences between societies which would be inexplicable if we were viewing administration in terms of the universals of administration itself. For as the constituent parts of culture vary within the Canadian society, so should administration vary as a system of national co-operative action in society, that is to say between government and local organizers.

Since administration, such as that which can be found in a community development program, can be defined as a system of rational cooperative action, it therefore also initiates and controls much social change.

Administration can be viewed as a method whereby society attempts to manage its culture and, through various programs and policies, such as Multiculturalism, seeks to achieve simultaneously the goals of stability and the goals of change. Within the framework of the Multiculturalism policy, these last two shall be discussed and referred to under the names of national integration and cultural diversity.

One government administrator in charge of a national program of local community development for Indians and Eskimos subscribes to the following viewpoint: "Humanist planners strongly maintain that the various structures and administrative systems must be such that they can respond to the expressed desires and aspirations of individuals and communities. They

believe that program creation should begin in local communities, where the consumers of the service provided have a share in its planning; further, that organization at the municipal, provincial and federal levels should arise out of complete knowledge of local conditions and needs".

(

"Both in making plans and carrying them out, communication is absolutely essential. Information concerning needs at the local level must go in a steady and systematic way to the policy-makers and providers of resources for development. The planners and providers in turn must communicate in the same way with the beneficiaries of their programs. This two-way flow of information, with accompanying dialogue is participatory democracy".

As outlined in the first section of this chapter, it is the organizational aspects, that is the structures of community development programs, which shall be examined in the multiculturalism policy, to verify whether the needs and interests of the local community are adequately represented. A two-way flow of information, and a quest for dialogue are also essential on the local level. "On acceptera de collaborer dans la mesure ou le gouvernement permettra à ceux qu'il consulte d'être conscients de l'importance et de l'efficacité de leur collaboration. Autrement, la participation devient un vain mot avec lequel tout le monde se leurre pour éviter un affrontement trop dur avec la réalité".

"On a dit que le gouvernement dispose de tous les moyens pour aller chercher l'information dont il a besoin. Et, en fait l'information quantitative statistique, celle qui rapporte des chiffres, ne manque pas.

L'information qualitative est plus difficile à recueillir, et peut être plus compromettante".

Thus, in brief, the political problem presents itself in the form

of who exercises, and should exercise, control over the quality and direction of life in local communities. Increasingly, there are government community development programs initiated in response to certain felt needs. Which ongoing structures and systems can and should be established to ensure that those affected by these programs will have a modicum of control in them? Whatever is answered or proposed in response to this question must reflect a realism and understanding of the existing social, economic and political systems and of the difficulty in affecting change in a culture or community, whose overall society is neither static nor revolutionary.

"In community development, the journey is the learning, the skills and the confidence acquired by those participating in the process.

Community development implies a very particular value system".

"In community development, citizen participation is concerned with the development of communities and the self-growth of individuals within them. Such endeavors may culminate in greater economic independence, in increased social security, or in improved social conditions, but its worth lies in enhancing human dignity. The goals are inseparable from the challenges of maximizing the creative use of leisure time and the communities for learning, and of extending fundamental human rights to all". 5

#### **FOOTNOTES**

- 1. Irwin T. Sanders, The Concept of Community Development. in Lee J. Cary, ed. Community Development as a Process. University of Missouri Press, 1970. pg. 20.
- 2. Michel Blondin, <u>Le Projet St-Henri</u>. Conseil des Oeuvres; Août, 1965. pg. 51.
- 3. E.R. McEwen, Citizenship and the Disadvantaged. in J. Draper, Citizen Participation: Canada. New Press; Toronto, 1971. pg. 61.
- 4. Institut Canadien pour l'Education des Adultes. Colloque sur "L'Information au Gouvernement Fédéral". 8 janvier, 1969. pg. 8.
- 5. James Draper, <u>Citizen Participation</u>: <u>Canada</u>. New Press; Toronto, 1971. Introduction.

# CHAPTER II - CULTURAL PLURALISM IN CANADA AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MULTICULTURALISM POLICY

A. Towards a development of the "ideology" of cultural pluralism in Canada.

In order to deal with administration and citizen participation in community development through a case study of the Multiculturalism policy and program, the policy and concept of multiculturalism must first be defined and placed in perspective. Accordingly, for the sake of background information, I will briefly trace some of the various concepts of assimilation and immigrant integration to which Canada has adhered since its origins. The common thread of these concepts is that they are analyzed from the point of view of the immigrant. They are general attitudes or social pressures which he has been obliged to face, when coming to Canada, throughout this country's history. Although there may be some chronological or geographical overlapping of the existence of these concepts, they are discussed in order of appearance in Canada.

#### Anglo-Conformity

The predominant ideology of assimilation in English Canada before 1940 was that of Anglo-conformity. Proponents of this theory argued that it was the obligation of new arrivals to conform to the institutions of Canadian society which were already fixed into a mold cast by Canada's British population. If the immigrant could not conform, he should be excluded. "Anglo-conformity was the predominant aim of the public-school system and was an underlying theme in the textbooks".

"Anglo-conformity failed in its most radical manifestations because
the non-British groups were too numerous and they were settled in homogeneous
communities in many cases; it failed also because the host society was

unprepared and unable to absorb so large and so diverse a segment of the population".

#### Melting Pot

The second main theory of assimilation, the melting pot concept had no impact in Canada and never achieved the popularity it enjoyed in the United States. It articulated the view that a "new man" as being created in America and captured the elements of diversity and fluidity which have long characterized American life. Although the melting pot concept was not acceptable to French Canadians who struggled to maintain their own culture, it did have its advocates in Canada.

#### The Beginnings of Cultural Pluralism

Perhaps the single most important factor in the gradual erosion of the foothold in Canada of the two forementioned concepts was the creation and activity of the Nationalities Branch of the Department of National War Services. This Branch was established in 1942 to encourage and assure ethnic participation in the war effort. At the end of the war, the Branch was transformed into the Citizenship Branch which concerned itself with the social and cultural adjustment of immigrants in Canada and their acceptance by Canadians. The establishment of this Branch is the first deliberate incidence of concern demonstrated by the Canadian government for the integration of its immigrant population.

The two fundamental forces of resistance to immigration, the French-Canadians and organized labor, had modified their positions by the end of World War II, and were favorable to immigration. Opposition from these groups dwindled as they became convinced of the connection between immigration and economic growth, as the government promised to assume greater control over the whole immigration process, and as pressures for

ethnic tolerance were brought increasingly to bear on these groups.

(

(

Although all of these factors played their part in increasing the acceptance of immigrants, probably the most important factor has been the large proportion of educated and skilled among the post-war immigrants. "In the post-industrial phase a new mode of articulation of migrant populations to the host society is likely to emerge. The outstanding characteristics of the new type of migrant are their high educational qualifications, cosmopolitan outlook and lack of permanency in any one country or locality. By their very nature these immigrants are neither "assimilable" nor will they be "integrated" in the usual sense. Instead, they will be the agents of the post-industrial revolution responsible for mobilizing the Canadian economy and transforming its social system to meet the needs of a population, which itself will become increasingly mobile". 9 It is undoubtedly true that recent immigrants differ radically in training and background from the political émigrés from Europe immediately following the Second World War. They are more skilled and possess one of Canada's official languages. Richmond's assertion can therefore be interpreted to mean that these people are more likely to contribute sooner to Canada's post-industrial development than were their predecessors.

Pressures were increased at both federal and provincial levels for greater recognition of Canada's ethnic diversity, whether this was through increased content about Canada's ethnic diversity in the school curriculum, appointment of senators of a particular ethnic origin, introduction of ethnic languages as languages of instruction in the school system and the like. These demands for greater government recognition of the non-French and non-English ethnic groups increased during the 1960's in response to the French Canadian assertion of their rights and the subsequent federal government measures to assure the status of the French language and the

French culture.

#### The Vertical Mosaic

The partial resolution of the pressures for policy change, mentioned in the previous section of this chapter, was the present government's acceptance of the assertion that, in fact, Canada is a "multicultural" country and that steps should be taken by the federal government to give a public recognition of Canada's ethnic diversity and to give symbolic support through grants for some of the activities of the ethnic groups. Neither the terms "mosaic" nor "multicultural" are wholly accurate descriptions of Canadian reality, but both have been used to convey the image of Canada as a multi-ethnic society.

John Porter's thesis claims that the maintenance of ethnicity inhibits social mobility for those of non-British origin. He maintains that to encourage the mosaic is really to encourage a vertical mosaic where class and ethnic lines coincide and that those of British origin are on top.

Maintenance of ethnicity according to this view preserves values which are detrimental to social and economic mobility and directs energy from economic advancement to group maintenance. In his view, the mosaic is a conspiracy promoted by the British elite to further their own interests, that the only really important differences in society are class differences, and finally that emphasis on ethnicity detracts attention from these issues. <sup>10</sup> This line of argument is better suited to an economic context than it is to a discussion of culture and cultural groups in Canada.

#### Ethnic Mosaic

Perhaps one should differentiate between mosaics at this point. Porter's mosaic concept implies that ethnic groups are stratified in a hierarchical order, with the British and the French "charter" member groups on or close

to the top with power and prestige, and native peoples and other immigrant groups on the bottom. A vertical mosaic can be said to contain minority and majority group structures. This is not the case with an ethnic mosaic, which as a societal symbol is different from a vertical mosaic. An ethnic mosaic does not have the rank-ordered ethnic stratification patterns inherent in the vertical mosaic concept. An ethnic mosaic is perhaps more useful as a sociological concept while the vertical mosaic may serve in an economic context. Thus an ethnic mosaic is perhaps a more accurate statement of the Trudeau government's purpose, with the multicultural policy, than the vertical mosaic imagery, even if the latter is still considered by some as an accurate description of the Canadian social structure.

# Social Mobility and the Ethnic Mosaic

Nevertheless, the questions which Porter raises about the relationship between social mobility and ethnicity are important ones. The way to break down the vertical mosaic could be either to change the attitudes of the elites, or to encourage Anglo-conformity, the second of which is Porter's solution. A distinction has been made, by F. Vallee et al, between "behavioral assimilation" and "structural assimilation". The first means the extent to which the minority group has absorbed the cultural patterns of the "host" society and even perhaps had an effect on it. Structural assimilation means the process by which ethnic groups have become distributed in the institutional structure of the receiving society, and in particular have assumed roles in general civic life. Structural assimulation exists when ethnic origin is not a relevant attribute in the allocation of people to positions in the social system or in the distribution of rights. $^{12}$  It is possible to see individuals in Canada as behaviorally assimilated in the sense meant by Vallée et al. It would

probably be accurate to say that an ethnic group has integrated itself into Canadian society and perhaps changed or altered that culture which goes to make up Canada. Assimilation has overtones of Anglo or Franco-conformity without any remnants of previous cultural origin. Increasingly, many non-French and non-English ethnic groups are recognized and accepted as Canadians without substantially changing their behavior patterns. This is "behavioral assimilation" in a Canadian context.

"Structural assimilation" is usually longer in coming because it must normally occur on an individual basis. It appears that there are many more economic factors which figure in "structural assimilation" than in "behavioral assimilation". Nevertheless, as the Department of Manpower and Immigration has been quick to point out in recent years, substantial industry and commerce is controlled and initiated by new Canadians. They are increasingly "structurally assimilated", or integrated into Canadian economic life.

An increased acceptance of cultural pluralism will probably enhance rather than decrease chances for upward mobility, if the theory of attitude change in elites holds true. This is to say that behavioral assimilation, as defined above, usually paves the way for structural assimilation in Canada. Thus an official recognition of Canada's inherent cultural pluralism could eventually draw anglo-or franco-conformists, in decision-making positions, toward a more favorable attitude of economic pluralism. Even if the ideology of cultural pluralism facilitates social mobility, there are still important questions concerning the relationship between social mobility and ethnic maintenance which need to be considered.

If the political, economic and social elites of the country, who are in areas still predominantly Anglo-Saxon, 13 either ceased to judge non-Anglo-Saxons negatively on the basis of their ethnic origin, or gave positive

value to ethnic diversity, would this connection between upward social mobility and decline of group involvement and ethnic identification cease to exist? This connection would certainly lessen, but it is doubtful that it would disappear. The values which dominate the professional, intellectual and business worlds tend to be more universal, instrumental, individualistic, rational and secular, while in contrast, most ethnic groups emphasize particularistic, traditional and sacred values. It should be noted that these last values are more common among groups which come from traditional societies, predominantly those of eastern Europe and Asia. Usually, these two value systems come into conflict, either in the life of the individual or in generational lacunae. The lack of integration on the cultural level is reflected in the relative absence of common values, and the multiplicity of organizations devoted to the preservation and development of heterogeneous cultural traditions. It is to these organizations that much of the multiculturalism policy and program addresses itself.

(

Where integration has occurred, the dominant ethnic groups have had a disproportionate influence on its nature. It is feasable, however, that partial integration may occur in many areas of the society without at the same time creating a homogeneous society. The integrated part of the plural society, the part in which the constituent elements meet and overlap, can be referred to here as the "common domain" or mainstream. This mainstream can be very weak in some areas, such as culture, and strong in others, such as the economy. Where it is strong, it tends to exert pressure on, or appeal to the distinct groups to abandon their ways and become part of it. Where it is weak, there is little activity or a great variety of divergent forms. Some groups inevitably have a stronger influence on the

character of the common domain than others.

( :

The values associated with upward mobility and the types of values associated with the social circles into which the upwardly mobile move are not usually conducive to the maintenance of ethnic solidarity. Increasing occupational and educational differentiation which comes with upward mobility also usually corrodes cultural consensus and solidarity. Ironically then, it might be argued that the side of cultural pluralism which facilitates the breaking down of social barriers and encourages social mobility may frustrate the side of cultural pluralism which encourages the preservation of ethnic heritage.

There is a link between class and ethnicity. There is a decline of ethnic elites in Canada. To a certain extent, ethnic groups mobilize within class boundaries resulting in mutually reinforcing cleavages, which by their nature are non-integrative. Minorities must feel that they have a stake in the political system, and class differentiation is not conducive to such a feeling. We are faced with the peculiar irony that mass communications, technology and high rates of geographic and social mobility undermine the basis of ethnic solidarity and ethnic identity, and yet at the same time they give rise to an impersonal "mass" society which in turn creates needs that can only be met through primary groups like ethnic groups. Thus we see an increased acceptance of the ideology of cultural pluralism or ethnic mosaic precisely at the time that the reality of cultural pluralism is being eroded, and both are caused by the same social forces. <sup>13</sup>

At the level of social reality as opposed to ideology, the comparison between the melting pot and the mosaic underestimates the degree to which both cultural and structural pluralism, that is, ethnic and vertical mosaics, have been maintained in the United States and over-estimates the degree to which this pluralism has been maintained in Canada among the non-British and non-French groups. 14

It is in an attempt to offset this incorrect assessment in Canada that the federal government adopted the policy of multiculturalism. It was felt that by legitimizing sub-group values, this would provide for status differentiation around a larger number of values, thus increasing the number of alternatives open to people and helping to prevent insurmountable frustration. This, therefore, represents a concerted government attempt to alter the vertical mosaic through a process of attitude change directed both at the members of the two "charter" groups and at members of the non-French and non-British groups. It is the preparation of this policy through its research stages, beginning with the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, which we shall examine in more detail in the next section of this chapter.

B. The Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism - The recommendations and an overview of Book IV

This section of chapter two is only a list of events and background for the introduction of the Multiculturalism policy. It is not meant to be an analysis of the political or other factors which may have influenced the decision to announce such a policy. Such an analysis could be the subject of another thesis. The orientation is more toward the implementation rather than the preparation of the policy.

#### Terms of Reference

The terms of reference instructed the Commission, in 1963, "to recommend what steps should be taken to develop the Canadian Confederation on the basis of an equal partnership between the two founding races, taking into account the contribution made by the other ethnic groups to the cultural enrichment of Canada and the measures that should be taken to safeguard that contribution". The Commission was further directed "to report on the role of public and private organizations, including the mass communications media, in promoting bilingualism, better cultural relations and a more widespread appreciation of the basically bicultural character of the country and of the subsequent contribution made by the other cultures". These two passages call attention to the key terms of the Commission's mandate concerning the "other ethnic groups".

The Commission is quite clear about its approach to the other ethnic groups, in relation to its mandate. Accordingly, rather than attempting to extrapolate or distill this information, I prefer to quote it at length. "It will be noted immediately that while the terms of reference deal with questions of those of ethnic origin other than British or French, they do so in relation to the basic problem of bilingualism and biculturalism,

from which they are inseparable, and in the context of the coexistence of the Francophone and Anglophone communities. Also the terms of reference do not call for an exhaustive study of the position of those of non-British, non-French origin, but rather an examination of the way they have taken their place within the two societies that have provided Canada's social structures and institutions. We will look at their contribution to Canadian life, and especially to the enrichment that results from the meeting of a number of languages and cultures. This contribution is seen, within the Canadian reality, in the active participation of those whose mother tongue is neither French nor English in various facets of community life. The resulting exchange of values - particularly those relating to language and culture - is beneficial to the country provided that it is carried out in a spirit of understanding and with a view to mutual enrichment". 17

#### Cultural Dualism

(

The foregoing passage synthesizes the Commission's position regarding ethnic groups. It would be useful as well however, to establish the conceptual framework of Canada used by the RCB & B. This is to establish a point for comparison between the Commission and the government's position concerning the conclusions and recommendations of the Commission.

The immigrant "should know that Canada recognizes two official languages and that it possesses two predominant cultures that have produced two societies - Francophone and Anglophone - which form two distinct communities within an overall Canadian context". 18

"All the available evidence indicates that those of other languages and cultures are more or less integrated with the Francophone and Anglophone communities, where they should find opportunities for self-fulfillment and

equality of status. It is within these two societies that their cultural distinctiveness should find a climate of respect and encouragement to survive". 19

(]:

A final passage will establish as absolutely clear the Commission's conception of Canada's cultural duality. "We would rather regard the "other ethnic groups" as cultural groups. Their role in Canadian society, seen in this light, has been our principal concern in the preparation of this Book. Fortunately, their cultural contribution, stressed by our terms of reference, corresponds to the sociological facts ... For us, 'culture is a way of living, thinking, feeling. It is a living force animating a significant group of individuals united by a common tongue and sharing the same customs, habits and experiences' ... This definition is applied essentially to the two dominant cultures of Canada, those of the Francophone and Anglophone societies. To a certain degree, it also fits the other cultures in this country, particularly if they have brought enrichment to one of the two dominant cultures and continue to flourish and benefit through their integration with one of the two societies". The Beginnings of "Multiculturalism"

Throughout the active years of the Commission, the above conception permeated all its thinking, even when some groups objected to the biculturalism position. The Commission dealt with this opposition as follows.

"Among those of non-British and non-French origin, some accept official bilingualism without hesitation but categorically reject biculturalism.

They consider Canada to be a country that is official bilingual but fundamentally multi-cultural. In reply to this objection we wish to repeat that "in our view the term 'biculturalism' covers two main realities. The first is the state of each of the two cultures, and the opportunity of

each to exist and flourish. The second is the coexistence and collaboration of these two cultures". On the other hand, our terms of reference mention the "basically bicultural nature of our country and the subsequent contribution made by the other cultures". It is thus clear that we must not overlook Canada's cultural diversity, keeping in mind that there are two dominant cultures, the French and the British. It is in this perspective that human relations attain more significance through encounter, collaboration and enrichment, that we shall study the contribution of various other cultures to the life of the country". It appears that the Commission could not answer such a challenge without being forced to step out of its mandate. The essence of their answer was that the question of "multiculturalism" was outside its terms of reference. Given this prologue, we shall now pass to a brief overview of the recommendations of the commission regarding the cultural contribution of the other ethnic groups.

#### Recommendations

Each of the recommendations below 22 is presented in a shortened form along with the agency or organization responsible for its implementation.

#### TOPIC

- 1. Human rights legislation
- 2. Citizenship Rights

- 3. Teaching of languages other than French or English in elementary schools.
- 4. Teaching of official languages to the children of immigrants.

#### AGENCY RESPONSIBLE

- 1. Provinces and some federal research
- 2. Canadian Elections Act.
- Provinces in cooperation with federal research by the Secretary of State.
- 4. Provinces with federal financing.

- subjects for high schools. Secretary of State. University broadening of lan-
- 6. quages admission requirements.
- 7. University broadening of fields of study.
- 8. That CRTC remove language restrictions for private broadcasting licensing.
- 9. That CBC remove its proscription 9. CBC on use of other languages in broadcasting.
- 10. That CRIC research the potential 10. CRIC and CBC in conjunction of broadcasting for the maintenance of language and culture (also CBC).
- 11. CRTC research on nature and effects of portrayal of groups on public and private owned radio and TV.
- 12. That National Film Board publicize its work on other groups.
- 13. That the National Film Board continue to produce and develop these films.
- 14. That the federal, provincial and municipal agencies have funds to support the cultural research organizations to foster arts and letters of cultural groups.
- 15. Administrative costs of the Canadian Folk Art Council should be offset by the Citizenship Branch.
- 16. National Museum of Man project for the history of social organization and folk arts of cultural groups.

- 5. Provinces and federal "ethnic histories program" from
- 6. Universities through the provinces individually.
- 7. Universities through the provinces individually.
- 8. CRTC
- with the Citizenship Branch language retention study.
- 11. This study on the effect of the media will fall within the scope of the language retention study conducted under the authority of Department of the Secretary of State.
- 12. NFB
- 13. NFB
- 14. Citizenship Branch of the Secretary of State.
- 15. Citizenship Branch of the Secretary of Stateé
- 16. National Museum of Man

A more detailed examination of the recommendations, and resultant programs in this overview, will be found in section B of chapter III.

The above information suffices to provide us with a backdrop against which to analyse the federal government approach to Canada's ethnic diversity.

# C. <u>Development of a Federal Policy Towards Ethnic Diversity</u> Political Preparation

( :

**(** :

The recommendations and findings of the Commission concerning the cultural contribution of the other ethnic groups were terminated on October 23, 1969, but not published until April, 1970. The federal government's official cultural policy previous to this date was essentially the same as that claimed by the Commissioners. "Par ailleurs, il existe aussi des minorités, francophones et anglophones, qui vivent dans l'isolement, qui ont besoin d'être nourries, tonifiées à même les ressources de leur propre culture. Le biculturalisme nous commande de voir à ce que ces collectivités entrent dans le courant majeur de leur culture, ce qu'elles ne sauraient faire toutes seules. Il faut que la culture française ou anglaise soit accessible à tous leurs adhérents de Terre-Neuve à Vancouver. Je voudrais pour ma part faire du Secrétariat d'Etat le protecteur des minorités françaises d'abord, parce qu'elles sont les plus nombreuses, sans oublier les quelques ilôts d'anglophones en milieu français". 23

After October 1969, we can see the beginnings of a policy change in speeches made both by the Secretary of State himself, and by Robert Stanbury, then the Minister without Portfolio in Charge of Citizenship. In response to a question put to him at a public meeting in January 1970, he answered: "I think as far as biculturalism is concerned, I don't like the term. The fourth volume of the B & B Commission used it in a particularly narrow sense and I think you have to go back and read their definition of terms before you can see that I don't think it is as serious as you might feel because what they're saying is that there are two ways of life if you like; there are people who live and work in using the French language and

there are people who live and work in using the English language and to that extent I suppose it's true that the country is bicultural but my concept of the country is one of many cultures each one as important as the other. I give no special status to either English or French. It only happens that they are convenient modes of expression for Canadians and there's quite a difference in my estimation between bilinqualism and biculturalism. "But I prefer not to talk in terms of biculturalism because I think it tends to make people think in terms of official cultures and official peoples. I don't think we have those and I don't think we want them". 24 At the same meeting, the Minister without Portfolio made several statements to imply that the Commission's report was not as important as many perceived. "Well, the point I was trying to make was that the B & B Commission doesn't just talk about biculturalism. There are different levels of definition and they recognize that there are many cultures which should be preserved and in the Fourth Volume they make certain recommendations as to what the Federal Government and Provincial Government could do to preserve and help other heritages to be developed". $^{25}$ 

"There are a number of recommendations in the Fourth Volume of the B & B Commission which suggest how the governments might help to preserve these various cultures. That has just been released within the last few weeks and no governments have had a chance as yet to formulate a policy in response to it". 25

"The Fourth Volume is really part of the guide to what perhaps could be done in this field in the future. ... The government has disagreed with that approach and has stated that we feel that Canada is a country of many cultures, that the diversity is something that will always be with us and in fact that it is an advantage, if we only see it for that". 25

By February of 1970, the cabinet was attempting to develop a framework

for the development of its citizenship policy, and mandated Robert
Stanbury to prepare such a working hypothesis, including the place of
the third force in the Canadian citizenship policy, and an examination
of the highly emotive concepts of "integration" and "assimilation" in
connection with such a policy. The term "third force" refers to all
non-French and non-British ethnic groups and arose in relation to the
two main forces studied by the Commission in the context of cultural
dualism. It was hoped that the yet to be released Fourth Volume would
be taken into consideration and also that this task would be terminated
before the end of March 1970.

In an attempt to consult with local groups while fulfilling the aforementioned mandate, the Minister in charge of citizenship held several public meetings. The attempt was to establish a framework whereby groups could participate in policy formation. "Some will forcefully retort that the establishment does not permit them to participate in decision-making, that such a goal is utopian and that pessimism sometimes seems to override optimism. The only valid reply to this challenge lies in the word participation; participation by all major groups of society in the decision-making process, participation by cultural groups regardless of whether they are a minority or a majority, and lastly, participation in accordance with one's beliefs, aspirations, language and culture. Only under such conditions will we be able to have true participation". 26

In anticipation of its forthcoming policy on multiculturalism as a community development program, Stanbury said that he was "seeking the opinions of community leaders and representatives of many facets of the community structure on many aspects of citizenship and the quality of life in Canada" and "in discussing the role and potential of any voluntary

organization, we are discussing the life, the health, the survival of Canadian society, because voluntary action - participation in voluntary organizations, is citizenship in creative and positive practice. The voluntary organization, in whatever guise it appears, is the symbol and vehicle of "doing your own thing" in co-operation with your neighbors. Individuals will provide most extraordinary kinds of commitment, energy and intelligence when acting in a voluntary capacity. This has been one of the great strengths of our society". 27

Finally, speaking at the Canadian Ethnic Press Federation's biennial meeting, Robert Stanbury affirmed the government's view of Canada's cultural diversity. "In our officially bilingual and richly multicultural Canada, you show newcomers that there is a legitimate and welcome place for their maternal language in their new country". 28 days later, on April 14, 1970, the Cabinet Committee on Priorities and Planning agreed (1) to expand existing programs for ethnic groups and (2) to approve \$325,000. for the 1971-72 fiscal year for this purpose. On April 16 1970, Information Canada released Volume Four for distribution to the general public. By the time several weeks had passed, Robert Stanbury was informing the public of a clear-cut government policy. "Nous sommes une nation où règne une grande diversité, et qui habite un pays où la diversité est reine. Je crois que nous apprenons, lentement et parfois non sans peine, à respecter, à apprécier et même à nous réjouir de nos différences. Nous savons que celles-ci ne constituent pas forcément un facteur de division, mais qu'elles peuvent nous enrichir si nous les acceptons pleinement.

"C'est peut-être cela le nouveau canadianisme - un nationalisme positif et créateur qui se nourrit de sa propre diversité, qui est chez lui dans le monde entier; qui puise dans notre diversité son dynamisme et le moyen de contribuer, d'une façon nettement canadienne, au sentiment de solidarité de l'homme. N'est-ce pas là un objectif national que nous pourrions tous adopter pour les années'70?"<sup>29</sup>

On May 7 1970, the Cabinet resolved that the Citizenship Branch of the Secretary of State should be called upon to respond to Book IV.

The other cultural agencies, mentioned in the previous section of this chapter, would also be asked to respond. The following day, Robert

Stanbury continued his sensitization of the population to the new multiculturalism policy. "Beyond our official languages, ethnic organizations and publications help many of our people feel more at home here and give Canada added cultural dimensions. Where else in the world's cities can you taste so many different living cultures as you can in Winnipeg,

Montreal, Toronto or Vancouver?. This very diversity in the Canadian mosaic may be the source of our new, awakening sense of identity and the energy which finds our national vitality". 30

On June 11 1970, the Privy Council office formally asked the Under-Secretary of State to prepare a response to Book IV. This final statement by Robert Stanbury clearly establishes the framework within which the officials of the Secretary of State had to prepare a series of programs in response to Book IV. "Canada, after all, is a nation of newcomers, and perhaps the world's greatest cultural mosaic. Each of us has a heritage which we are obliged to neither deny nor forget because we are in Canada. While we have found it just and convenient to have two official languages, no language is foreign in Canada and we have no official cultures or peoples... Ours is a country of many cultures, and this we value as a national asset". 31

# Department Consultations

On July 20 1970, the Treasury Board agreed to certain expenses requisitioned by the Secretary of State to help it in its consultations for the preparation of the "multiculturalism program". A total of some \$140,000 was allocated for (1) an Advisory Committee of Consultants (2) Social surveys on values and symbols and (3) Consultation service contracts with voluntary agencies and others. These consultations, and others noted on the following list, were of immense value to the Department of the Secretary of State in preparing a number of government programs. The Royal Commission had not been mandated to seek out this type of information. Accordingly, a series of informal hearings and research took place to acquire the necessary information. Most of this took place between July 1970 and May 1971.

#### List of Consultations

- Public dialogues involving the Minister responsible for Citizenship.
   A number of these were cited early in this section.
- 2. The Manitoba Mosaic Congress in Winnipeg, October 7-13, 1970 produces a series of sixteen resolutions directed at various levels of government on a number of topics. This was perhaps the single most important input source from the public.
- 3. Public Conferences on Book IV
  - 1) Thunder Bay August 1970
  - 2) Toronto August 7-8, 1970
  - 3) Edmonton August 28, 1970
  - 4) Ottawa November 1, 1970
  - 5) Sudbury April 3-4, 1971
  - 6) Regina May 1971

- 4. Meetings with ethnic Community Leaders from Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver, July and August 1970.
- 5. Meetings of inter-governmental officials.
- 6. Special consultations in Toronto and Ottawa in the spring of 1971 regarding
  - 1) Non-official language teaching
  - 2) Canadian Ethnic Studies center
  - 3) Ethnic participation policy and grants
  - 4) National languages and literature
- 7. Symposium on Languages and Cultures in a Multi-Ethnic Society May 21-23, 1971.
- 8. Analysis of the clippings of the ethnic press.

Two other important events also entered into consideration. The first was the conference organized by the Canadian Folk Arts Council in Toronto in late 1968. The results of this conference, although it was not an official consultation, and did pre-date Book IV, resembled the final programs announced concerning the Canada Council, the National Film Board, and the CBC, as well as a number of other points.

The second important event was the speech made by Gérard Pelletier to the Canadian Conference of the Arts in September 1970. There appears in it some vestige of biculturalism if interpreted literally. It is more probable, however, that the terms "two main cultures" are purely a reference to the numerical dominance of the French and British in Canada. "When we speak of cultural pluralism, we are making a fundamental choice for Canada, both now and for the future, for we are talking about the development in Canada of a multi-cultural society. The Government refuses to sacrifice, in the name of unity through conformity, any of the cultures which are represented in our population, whether these cultures are

European or native to Canada such as those of the Indians and Eskimos. Canada is not a "melting pot" and the government is opposed to any measure aimed at assimilation. On the contrary, it encourages all initiatives which have as their object the promotion and dissemination — alongside the two main cultures, English and French — of other cultural values." 32

### Results of Consultations

(

By May 1971, consultations had all but terminated and Robert Stanbury was announcing the general results. "Yous n'ignorez pas que le gouvernement fédéral ne s'est pas contenté d'accepter l'idée d'un Canada pluriculturel, mais qu'il s'emploie activement à l'élaboration de programmes visant à favoriser le pluriculturalisme. Nous croyons que de tels programmes doivent se fonder sur une conception nette de ce qu'est la diversité culturelle". 33

"J'espère avoir suffisamment montré que le gouvernement accepte les exigences du pluralisme culturel. Encore faut-il se demander comment ces exigences peuvent être le mieux satisfaites. Le gouvernement ne peut ni ne doit se porter garant de la survivance de tous les groupes ethniques. Le but de notre politique est d'assurer le maintien et le développement de la langue et de la culture des groupes ethniques dans la mesure où ces derniers en manifestent le désir".

"En résumé, notre gouvernement a quatre grands objectifs de principe en ce qui concerne la participation des groupes ethniques à la vie canadienne:

- L'intégration des nouveaux immigrants et des citoyens de la première génération;
- 2) Le maintien et le développement de la langue et de la culture des groupes ethniques dans la mesure où ceux-ci en manifestent le désir;
- 3) Une participation accrue des groupes ethniques à la vie canadienne et

l'acceptation de cette participation par les Canadiens, et

( )

4) Un développement harmonieux des échanges interculturels". 33

On July 13th 1971, the Department of the Secretary of State presented its response to Book IV, to the Cabinet. On September 23rd 1971, the Cabinet approved the principal and programs of multiculturalism. The policy and programs were discussed in caucus October 6th and announced in the House October 8th 1971. It is the substance of this announcement which shall be analyzed in the next section of this chapter.

# D. The Announcement of the Multicultural Program

This chapter section will be divided into three parts: the first will deal with the content and rational of the policy announcement, the second deals with actual and anticipated reaction to the policy, and the third treats the substance of the program content, as opposed to policy.

Announcement

On October 8th 1971, the Prime Minister made the government statement to the House of Commons concerning Book IV of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. The essence of the short statement, which was accompanied by a tabled document explaining the programs, consisted of the same four major points enunciated by Robert Stanbury to the International Symposium on Languages and Cultures in a Multi-Ethnic Society earlier in May of the same year. <sup>34</sup> Basically, the government was concerned with preserving human rights, developing Canadian identity, strengthening citizenship participation, reinforcing Canadian unity and encouraging cultural diversification within a bilingual framework.

For the time being, we shall deal only with the eight recommendations, numbers eight through sixteen included 35, which are addressed specifically to the Federal Government or its agencies. The rationale behind the government's support of these eight recommendations is as follows: "Cultural diversity throughout the world is being eroded by the impact of industrial technology, mass communications and urbanization. Many writers have discussed this as the creation of a mass society - in which mass produced culture and entertainment and large impersonal institutions threaten to denature and depersonalize man. One of man's basic needs is a sense of belonging, and a good deal of contemporary social unrest - in all age groups - exists because this need has not been met. Ethnic groups are

certainly not the only way in which this need for belonging can be met, but they have been an important one in Canadian society. Ethnic pluralism can help us overcome or prevent the homogenization and depersonalization of mass society. Vibrant ethnic groups can give Canadians of the second, third and subsequent generations a feeling that they are connected with tradition and with human experience in various parts of the world and different periods of time". <sup>36</sup>

# Reaction to the Policy

In anticipation of adverse reaction to the policy announcement, the government included two counter arguments in the document tabled to explain the rationale of the policy. 37 The first was to offset any misconception of, or confusion between, cultural identity and national allegiance. It was felt that ethnic groups often provided people with a sense of belonging which made them better able to cope with the rest of society than they would as isolated individuals. Ethnic loyalties usually do not detract from other loyalties to community and country. "Every ethnic group has the right to develop its own culture and values within the Canadian context. To say we have two official languages is not to say we have two official cultures, and no particular culture is more official than another. A policy of multiculturalism must be a policy for all Canadians". 38

The second argument presented was an attempt to offset any potential opposition that would be forthcoming from French-Canadians. The distinction between language and culture has never been clearly defined. The very name of the Royal Commission whose recommendations we now seek to implement tends to indicate that bilingualism and biculturalism are indivisible. But, biculturalism does not properly describe our society; multiculturalism is more accurate". <sup>39</sup> Guy Rocher, a Quebec sociologist is correct in his

assertion that the Government policy contradicts the mandate given to the Royal Commission. "En réalité la prise de position du gouvernement va carrément à l'encontre du mandat qui avait été assigné à la Commission et les conclusions auxquelles cette dernière en était arrivée". 40

The substance of Rocher's argument is the absolute dependence of linguistic preservation on cultural preservation. French appears threatened because the French culture no longer has any special status. Rocher feels that the harm done is one to the symbols and aspirations of French Canadians. The government paper explains, or rather postpones, its answer to this question by announcing that it has ordered a study on the relation of retention of culture to retention of language and that no results will be available for some time as a number of ethnic groups must be studied.

Most reaction at the time of the announcement was of the same nature as that of Rocher's arguments. It consisted of an objection to the principles of multiculturalism rather than to the program content. This is still the case after more than one year of activity in the multiculturalism grants program. It is unlikely that either the provincial authorities or the population of the province of Quebec would oppose the programs of the multiculturalism policy until such time as those aspects concerning third language instruction and texts are activated. As the conclusion will show in more detail, the grants program of the multiculturalism policy does not have as its objectives to answer to the full range of cultural, educational and social needs of Canada's ethnic groups.

### Program Content

In response to some of the recommendations, notably those addressed to the federal government and its social agencies the following programs

were formulated. 41

#### 1) Grants

A grants program was developed in support of ethnic activities such as multicultural encounters, citizenship preparation, conferences, cultural development projects, etc. These projects had to be able to meet the policy principles (see footnote 33) and other criteria not ready at the time of the policy announcement, but which would be publicized in the ethnic communities. There are also grants available for multicultural centers which are considered a priority program in cities where there is a demonstrated need and a desire for aid in the areas of integration, cultural maintenance and development of full participation in Canadian life. This program is in response to recommendations 14 and 15.

### 2) Cultural Development Program

In response to recommendations 3, 10 and 11, this program was designed to produce much needed data on the precise relationship of language to cultural development, as well as to provide essential information on the extent and nature of the demands of individual ethnic groups for third language retention and cultural development. The program was to examine existing organizations, including educational institutions, the press, radio and television to determine present roles and their potential role in cultural development. Firm program recommendations were expected within one year from the announcement on the subjects of concern to the CRTC.

Although no special recommendation was made regarding the ethnic press, a study of the press and ethnic radio was to be undertaken by the Citizenship Branch and financial support given to the Press's biennial

conferences. The federal government also undertook to find a suitable way to solve the problem of third language teaching aids, that is textbooks, in cooperation with the provinces and ethnic community leaders.

#### 3) Ethnic Histories

**(** 

In response to recommendation 5, it was proposed that twenty histories be commissioned which would be based on scholarly research and directed to the background, cultural contributions and problems of various ethnic groups in Canada. This program would promote knowledge and respect for cultural heritages within and among the groups concerned as well as invaluable resource material for students, writers and government agencies. The first stage of this program was to involve the research and writing of a basic work on the history of the ethnic group concerned. It was anticipated that commercial, university or government publishers would be interested in such publications. The second stage begins as each history is completed from stage one, money is allocated for the editing, writing, translation and illustration of bilingual versions for publication by the government. These versions would be designed to appeal to a slightly larger public. According to a press release dated July 5th 1972, eleven out of the twenty histories had been commissioned.

#### 4) Canadian Ethnic Studies

The Department of the Secretary of State, again in response to recommendation 5, was to conduct a detailed investigation of the problems of development of a Canadian Ethnic Studies Programme or Center and the preparation of a plan of implementation for presentation to Cabinet in 1972.

5) Teaching of Official Languages

(

- The federal government already assists the provinces in the teaching of English and French to adult immigrants. The federal government was willing, under this program, to enter into agreements with the provinces to offer this teaching to the children of immigrants.
- In response to recommendations 12, 13 and 16, the government committed its various cultural agencies to a series of diversified projects directed at the collection, research and exposition of artifacts, information, etc., for the cultural preservation of other ethnic groups. The agencies implicated are the National Museum of Man, National Film Board, the National Library and the Public Archives. These six programs were established October 8th 1971, but no immediate funding was announced at the time. A press release dated January 12th 1972, finally stipulated the amounts alloted to each program. Over three million dollars was made available for the five quarters extending from January 12th 1972, to March 31st 1973. Slightly over one million dollars of this sum was allocated to the first program, that is the multicultural grants program.

#### **FOOTNOTES**

- 6. M. R. Lupil, Some Aspects of Western Education. Paper presented at seminar on comparative education, York University, June 1969.
- 7. Cornelius Jaenen, "Federal Policy Vis-a-Vis Ethnic Groups" unpublished paper, Ottawa, 1971. pg. 11.
- 8. For an elaboration of this theory see, Philip Gleason, The Melting Pot: Symbol of Fusion or Confusion? American Quarterly, Spring 1964. pg. 20-46.
- 9. Anthony Richmond, "Immigration and Pluralism in Canada". International Migration Review; Fall, 1969.
- 10. For more on this position see John Porter, The Vertical Mosaic, University of Toronto Press 1968 and John Porter Dilemnas and Contributions of a Multi-Ethnic Society. Paper presented to Section II, Royal Society of Canada, St.John's, Nfld. June 8 1972.
- 11. Frank Vallée, Mildred Schwartz, F. Draknell, Ethnic Assimilation and Differentiation in Canada. CJEPS. vol. XXIII, no 4. Nov. 1957.
- 12. John Porter, The Vertical Mosaic. University of Toronto Press, Toronto 1968. pg. 72.
- 13. For a more detailed statement of this paradox see Ramsay book, The Maple Leaf Forever. Toronto 1971 and S.D. Clark, Movements of Protest in Post War Canadian Society. Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, 1970. pg. 223-238.
- 14. For a further discussion of this process in the United States, consult Nathan Glazer and Daniel Moynihan. Beyond the Melting Pot. 2nd Edition, Cambridge 1970, and Milton Gordon, Assimilation in American Life.
- 15. RCB & B Book IV pg. 3.
- 16. Idem

(

- 17. Idem
- 18. Ibid. 4
- 19. Ibid. 10
- 20. Ibid. 11
- 21. Ibid. 12
- 22. Ibid. 223
- 23. Gérard Pelletier, <u>"Vers la Définition d'une Politique Culturelle"</u>. Allocution prononcée devant la Chambre de Commerce de Montréal, Montréal, 28 octobre, 1968. pg. 11.

- 24. Robert Stanbury "Community Dialogue'70". Thunder Bay, January 23 1970. pg. 7.
- 25. Ibid. 9
- 26. Robert Stanbury, "Symposium on National Unity". MacDonald-Cartier Secondary School. February 28, 1970. Sudbury, pg. 2.
- 27. Robert Stanbury, Notes from a Speech to the <u>Canadian Citizenship</u> Federation. April 5 1970. Winnipeg. pg. 7.
- 28. Robert Stanbury, Notes from a Speech to the <u>Canadian Ethnic Press</u> <u>Federation</u>. April 11 1970. Toronto; pg. 1.
- 29. Robert Stanbury, Notes d'une allocution prononcée à la 5lième Réunion Annuelle des <u>Services Canadiens d'Assistance aux Immigrants Juifs.</u>
  Montréal; 4 mai 1970. pg. 8.
- 30. Robert Stanbury, Notes from a Speech to the Men's Canadian Club. Vancouver; Mai 8 1970. pg. 3.
- 31. Robert Stanbury, Notes from a Speech at Czechoslovak Day and Sokol Festival. Scarborough; July 5 1970. pg. 3.
- 32. Gérard Pelletier, Notes from a Speech to the <u>Canadian Conference of the Arts</u>. Toronto; September 12, 1970.
- 33. Robert Stanbury, Notes d'une allocution prononcée au <u>Colloque International</u> sur les Langues et les Cultures au Sein d'une <u>Société Pluriculturelle</u>. Comité inter-universitaire canadien-slave. Ottawa; 22 mai 1971. pg. 1, 9.
- 34. Idem
- 35. See footnote 22.
- 36. Federal Government Response to Book IV of the Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. Ottawa Published; October 8, 1971. pg. 2.
- 37. For a detailed explanation of these two arguments see the same document as the immediately forementioned, pg. 3 & 4.
- 38. Idem.
- 39. Idem.
- 40. Guy Rocher, <u>Les Ambiguités d'un Canada Bilingue et Multiculturel.</u>
  Présenté à une session de la réunion annuelle de la Société Canadienne de Sociologie et d'Anthropologie. 30 mai, 1972. pg. 3.
- 41. Federal Government Response to Book IV. pg. 6-10.

## A. A Rational Framework for the Multiculturalism Policy

Although the essential core of this chapter is concerned primarily with the output or implementation and administration of the multiculturalism policy, it is important to present a complete background of
the structures and processes involved in the policy formation as well
as the policy execution or administration of multiculturalism. The
thesis is concerned with the output of the policy by means of its various
programs. Nevertheless, the input or policy formation stages must be
mentioned in some formal way.

## The Policy Formation Framework

Before reviewing some of the components in the formation of the multiculturalism policy as mentioned in chapter two, section c, it is important to outline the decisional framework within which any such policies are formulated. This is done in order to establish a norm or common process and structure against which one can compare the multiculturalism policy formation and implementation structures and processes. Until as recently as the mid-1960's, the Canadian federal government approached the task of estimating the requirements for funds in what can be termed an incremental fashion. The Estimates were prepared each year on the basis of objects of expenditures under categories such as salaries, rentals, materials and supply, and information services. The system did not permit the consideration of the total costs of attaining a particular goal or objective since all departments were lumped together. In fact, many departments had no formalized concepts of goals and objectives. "One of the major limitations of this earlier process was the complete absence of formalized planning within departments, the absence of clearly enunciated objectives to which

expenditures could be related, and the deficiency in quantitative justification of expenditure proposals". $^{42}$ 

The federal government felt a certain dissatisfaction with this lack of rational planning, and consequently a number of structural and procedural changes in Canada's policy-making system have been implemented. I will not attempt to debate the merits or to trace the historical development of these structures. I only wish to note their role in order to provide a background for further discussion of community development program implementation in the next part of this chapter. Therefore, I believe it would be useful to briefly enumerate the primary mechanisms and their roles in the policy formation process.

The setting of priorities, and even the development of policies such as the multiculturalism policy, is the business of the political process as a whole and accomplished by the expression by the public of its preference in elections, in Parliament, by the press, and by way of various community and interest groups. Within government, the ministers collectively identify community values and objectives and consider the directions of policy which are necessary for these community or group needs to be answered in a manner consistent with those values. These same ministers also evaluate alternative programs as instruments for the more specific objectives agreed upon by the government. These alternatives are sometimes presented in the form of cabinet documents.

There is a complex of cabinet committees, which is co-ordinated by the Cabinet as a whole. "The key committee is the Committee on Priorities and Planning chaired by the Prime Minister, and it develops and proposes to cabinet the broad priorities and policy directions of the government. In the scale of the many elements in the decision-making process, it works from the top down. It is the committee which related the community's

values and its emerging problems to the government's policies and programs, and vice versa, and out of this develops for cabinet consideration the broad policies which are seen to achieve the nation's and government's objectives".  $^{43}$ 

The functional committees of cabinet are concerned with policy areas such as economic, social, external affairs and defense, culture and information and science and technology. "Each of these committees receives from the responsible ministries proposals for program changes in its particular policy area, and evaluates them in terms of their subsequent inherent merits, in terms of their relationships to other policies and programs within the field of competence of the committee, and in terms of their bearing upon the overall policy directions of the government. Out of these deliberations emerge both program proposals to the government, and a general set of priorities within the several functional areas of government".

The third level in this process of rational policy formation is represented by the Treasury Board. The Board takes these "several priorities and policy directions and program proposals and puts them together into annual expenditure plans which will reflect the government's policies and priorities, and at the same time achieve the optimum results for the citizen in the use of his dollar. This is accomplished, as has been said, by allocating funds, in diminishing order, to those programs which are most in accord with the government's priorities and most effective in achieving the goals inherent in these priorities". The Treasury Board "seeks to sum up the relative social benefits of specific proposals in terms of priority ranking accorded by the cabinet to broad policy areas, in terms of the effectiveness and the efficiency of the particular programs and projects proposed, and in terms of the effect of the several programs and

projects upon other goals and other programs". 47

(

We have now reviewed some of the major components for the formation of policy. Accordingly, it is possible to briefly insert the multiculturalism policy formation in this policy formation framework. We have noted that the Cabinet received the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Bilinqualism and Biculturalism for Book 4 in October 1969. In February 1970, the Cabinet mandated Robert Stanbury to develop a framework for a citizenship policy, and to take into consideration the yet to be released Fourth Volume. Mr. Stanbury was to report back to Cabinet for the end of March 1970. On April 14 1970, the Cabinet Committee on Priorities and Planning agreed to expand existing programs for ethnic groups and to approve \$325,000 for the 1971-72 fiscal year for this purpose. On May 7 1970, the Cabinet resolved that the Citizenship Branch of the Secretary of State, along with the other federal cultural agencies, should be called upon to respond to Book 4. This decision was formally communicated to the Under-Secretary of State by the Privy Council on June 11 1970. The department of the Secretary of State submitted its response to Book 4 in the form of a cabinet document on July 13 1971. On September 23 1971, the Cabinet approved the principals and programs of the multiculturalism policy. One will observe that although some of the structures of the policy formation process were involved in the case of the multiculturalism policy, the fact still remains that the motivation for accepting the policy's principle is primarily political. It is not exactly clear how political expediency and rational government planning can be reconciled in this case. One cannot discern if there was any equilibrium between these two considerations. However, the concern of this thesis is to examine the results of this decision, with a limited regard to the factors involved in its genesis.

Before proceeding, it suffices to say that the multiculturalism policy did go through the policy formation channels of the Cabinet Committee on Priorities and Planning and the Treasury Board. It is not possible to say whether the decision to expand the existing programs and apportion additional funding was taken in isolation or in competition with other dissimilar proposals made to the Cabinet and its committees on other subjects. This chronological overview of the policy evolution of multiculturalism against the background of the normal policy formation process provides us with half of the rational framework for the mulcitulturalism policy.

#### A Policy Execution Framework

The second half of the rational framework for the multiculturalism, or any other policy, consists of the execution or public administration framework. Both the policy formation and policy execution should ideally be part of a rational complex of political processes. One should note that in practice though there is considerable overlapping between policy formation and policy execution, and that the proportion of the two is not always in the best practices of rational government planning.

Any number and variety of factors can contribute to the Cabinet deciding that something should be a priority or an objective. We will not examine these contributing factors at this point. Rather, the object of this chapter section is to establish the norm for the implementation of a policy once it has been designated a priority or objective. For purposes of discussion in this thesis, I am defining the execution of any given government community development policy as being composed of a complex of processes.

It is important to note that for every process, there is some type of

structure. In this context, the term structure refers to organizations, agencies or mechanisms. Quite often, a single process such as investigation can implicate many structures or mechanisms such as research teams, economists, royal commissions, task forces, etc. At times, a structure may also contribute to various processes over a duration of time. Accordingly, one will note that some of the structures mentioned below have implications for policy formation as well as policy execution. It should be noted, however, that the focus of our discussion is on policy execution processes and structures.

It is possible to isolate at least five processes which can constitute policy execution. These processes and their contingent structures can make up an ideal type of participation process and structure with which the current multiculturalism grants program can be compared, when discussing the level of participation and input of the citizen in the formation of funding criteria and the administration of a program. This comparison exercise will take place in Part B of this chapter.

1. "Investigation" is the first of the five policy execution processes. It is the process by which all those concerned with a specific question or issue, such as multiculturalism, seek and receive the information that is relevant and useful in the public administration or execution of the policy. This process of investigation must include the flow of relevant information in both directions between the citizens themselves and between the government and the citizens.

Accordingly, for this process to be carried out effectively, especially in terms of a relevant community development program, the structures or mechanisms must insure that the citizens, and especially groups of citizens are related to each other by some formal or semi-formal process. This

relationship can take the form of citizens' meetings, committees or other organizational means that will bring groups of citizens together for communication, exchange and collaboration with respect to the pursuit of goals and the solution of problems of immediate interest to themselves. This structure and process of investigation is more thorough and accurate if as many as possible of those concerned are reached.

Accordingly, the more equal the distribution of transactions such as initiative, ideas and proposed solutions among them, the more the interaction is likely to insure the effectiveness of these activities and cohesion among groups and individuals.

This equality is partly a result or function of the organizational strength of the various groups and this strength is related to the distribution of expertise among various groups, qualities of leadership, ability of each group to be mobilized and the size of the group. Any investigation process contributing toward the establishment and execution of a community development program must be based, at least in part, on this structure.

There is a second structural requirement in the investigation process for the proper execution of a viable community development program. This mechanism or structure must be to connect citizens and groups of citizens to the government and its agencies in some formal or semi-formal way.

Royal commissions, task forces and research groups can be that structural connection between citizens and government. Government agencies and officials, as well as members of Parliament can perform a coordinating role among the client groups involved. Several types of problems, in the context of community development, often cannot be adequately dealt with, and several conditions of the five processes cannot be undertaken without the active presence of a coordinating third party either between groups of citizens

or groups of citizens and government.

Thus, we have seen that a normal investigation process for the execution of almost any type of policy concerning community development must provide for both structures to formally connect citizens and groups of citizens with themselves, and structures to formally connect citizens and groups of citizens with the government.

2. "Conclusion" is the name we can give to the second process which must occur in policy formation and execution. It is the process by which those who have been seeking information and direction analyze the facts and concepts, make certain choices of values and goals and then, after considering the views of others, arrive at a consensus. This can also be called a synthesizing process. All those concerned with the investigation process can take part in the conclusion aspect, but certain people or groups of people normally play a leading role in bringing about or facilitating the consensus or conclusion because of their particular expertise or position in the decision-making hierarchy. These individuals can be Members of Parliament, government officials, academics or citizen group leaders.

There are several reasons why such a conclusion process should be centralized. Firstly, this process is primarily problem-solving and instrumental. Thus, efficiency and technique are emphasized over representativeness. Secondly, elites are better prepared to articulate the problems of their groups and to participate in collective decision—making. Care must be taken to have a representative cross-section <sup>48</sup> of these elites in the synthesising or conclusion process. Thirdly, the patterns of social differentiation, that is to say linguistic and regional cleavages on a national level, and the geography of Canada permit only a

collaboration between government and its officials and the elites of groupings. Regional and linguistic cleavages in Canada often take on political significance, and unless care is taken to assure the participation of spokesmen for each of these diverse elements, then the synthesizing or conclusion process or its results can be extremely volatile and counter-productive when national policy and programs are being decided upon.

We have noted two aspects of the conclusion process. Each of them implies a particular structure or organizational prerequisite. The process implies that a structure or mechanism must exist to protect, and perhaps facilitate and support, the attainment of goals and the solution of problems specific to the sub-groups in the community if there is to be policy execution by means of relevant community development programs. These goals must not only be set but must infuse the structure of the conclusion process at all its levels. Not all organizational structures are suitable for the embodiment of any goal or purpose. The formulation of new goals in a community, or the redefinition of old ones would usually entail organizational innovations or change in the structures of citizens groups, of the program administration, and of the linkage between the two.

We see therefore that a certain amount of technique or expertise is required for the synthesizing process. At the government level, then, this implies that a structure or mechanism composed of experts such as economists, sociologists and other researchers in the employ of the government must be present to pull together the results of the investigation process. We also see that in order for these "technicians" to accomplish their task, they must have an input from technicians at the non-government level. In the formation and execution of community development programs such as multiculturalism, these technicians are ethnic group leaders and

community development workers in the various regions of the country. Accordingly, we see here that there must be a formal or semi-formal collaboration between government "synthesizers" and citizens' groups and their leaders. This structural requisite, as we have seen, has an input into part of the investigation process. It is not uncommon in community development program execution that a single structure has an input into different processes such as investigation and conclusion.

In brief then, the conclusion process and structure must have its government experts and local elites or spokesmen attempting to achieve a consensus for a community development program. It is also a logical to believe that the conclusion process is concerned with both the formation and execution aspects of a policy. A synthesis implies a consensus on goals, and this can be part of the policy formation process. But a synthesis can also be a consensus on methods, and this is part of the execution or programming process. This merging of processes insures that the community development policy and program finally agreed upon have some degree of relevance to the clientele. Again we see here the potential overlapping of the policy formation and execution processes.

3. "Decision" is the process which follows investigation and conclusion. It consists of selecting, on the basis of the information shared and the conclusions arrived at, that course of action which will be followed. The conclusion process should terminate with the submission of various program options, in light of the objectives given in the mandate for investigation. These program options normally include budget options as well. In the taking of public decisions, this step in the evolution of a community development program is reserved to those who have been delegated by a majority to act on their behalf. In effect then, the decision for a specific program and budget is usually taken by the Cabinet and the House of Commons. The

structure or mechanism involved in the decision-making process is the group of elected officials who are mandated for this task.

At this point in the evolution of government community development policies and programs, the objective has been set, and the investigation and conclusion as well as decision processes have taken place. These processes can be said to constitute the input for a community development program. The output consists of the implementation or administration of a program. Even though the processes of investigation, conclusion and decision have direct implications for government community development programs, the subsequent processes of execution and evaluation have the involvement of the clientele by design. Given the context of this thesis, it is upon these two aspects of execution and evaluation which we shall focus.

4. The "execution" process consists in carrying out the decision made and is normally undertaken by those who have the technical competence and mandated responsibility to do so. There is, however, a considerable difference between this and the previous process. Once the decision process and structure takes the form of legislation or an order-in-council, certain mechanisms and structures come into play. Normally, responsibility for the implementation and administration of a decision is delegated to a particular government agency or department. We shall examine how this applies to the multiculturalism policy in part B of this chapter.

In order to execute a community development program, the structure or formal connection between the responsible government agency or department and the clientele must have the capacity to induce the voluntary collaboration of the local citizens or groups concerned with those charged with the program execution. This requirement is primarily a socio-psychological factor that facilitates the willingness of the clientele to collaborate. It also

contributes to the identification of the groups and feeling of solidarity with the program objectives, processes and structures. This element is a prerequisite for the success of a community development program.

Accordingly, it must be present in all other processes, that is investigation, conclusion and decision as well as the yet to be discussed process of evaluation. In brief then, all structured or semi-formal mechanisms discussed in the preceding processes must be conducive to the co-operation of the clientele.

The execution of a community development program is often controlled

( )

or managed by the clientele concerned. This participatory nature is representative of the objectives set for community development programs and well suited to the requirements for flexibility and local control. The execution process and structures vary with the programs being implemented. The next section of this chapter will deal more extensively with execution process and structures of the multiculturalism program and the implications of such a client-oriented program in the context of community development. 5. However, before going on to the next part of this chapter, I must touch upon the final, if seldom seriously considered, process involved in viable community development program execution. This process is "evaluation" whereby all of those involved in the decision as well as execution process review the effects of the decision and execution. Evaluations can lead to refinements in execution structures or, more drastically, can initiate new investigation, conclusion and decision processes in order to attain a more desirable level of effectiveness and relevance for community development programs. It is often through the evaluation process and structures that one will determine the extent of the technical competence and actual responsibility and influence of those governmental officials, citizens' groups and citizens involved in the execution process and structures.

At this point, one can determine to a large degree whether a community development program is relevant to the needs of the communities it was designed to serve. This evaluation can be typified by the planning, programming and budgeting system. This system is a series of techniques which can be used to evaluate internal government operations, goals and methods. It is one of many tools available to government personnel involved in the planning of programs or activities, including those affecting the public such as multiculturalism.

In part B of this chapter, we shall analyse the multiculturalism grants program in terms of the framework for rational policy execution. We shall apply this framework for rational policy execution using the five processes and structures outlined above. By doing this, we hope to determine the potential for effectiveness of the multiculturalism grants program as a community development tool or mechanism.

# B. Application of the Multiculturalism Policy to A Policy Execution Framework

## Application of the Policy as a Whole to the Execution Framework

The policy execution framework can be applied to the multiculturalism policy and its six programs collectively. It can also be applied to any one of the six individual programs comprising the execution of the policy. Accordingly, we shall briefly view how the five processes and structures of policy execution apply to the policy as a whole. Part B of this chapter will consist of the application of the execution framework to the multiculturalism grants program in particular.

Although our analysis of the multiculturalism policy formation process, in the beginning of this chapter, shows us that there is some overlapping between the formation and execution processes of the policy, one can isolate the transition point between the two. I believe it is safe to say that the policy, passed into the execution stages on April 14, 1970 when the Cabinet Committee on Priorities and Planning agreed to expand existing programs for ethnic groups and to approve \$325,000 for the 1971-72 fiscal year for this purpose.

The investigation process formally commenced when, on June 11 1970, the Privy Council asked the Under-Secretary of State to prepare a response to Book IV. Information was sought to make the policy's execution relevant and useful. The first of two types of structures required to effectively carry out this process was the series of public conferences and consultations. The total list of these consultations is given in Chapter 2C. Three different types of consultations had the effect of forcing citizens and groups of citizens to meet together and exchange and collaborate for the solution of problems of interest to themselves, in the context of the multiculturalism policy. The first type is the public dialogues held by the Minister res-

ponsible for Citizenship and groups of citizens. The second was the series of public conferences held in six Canadian cities and the last type was the very large congress held in Manitoba in the fall of 1970, as well as the Symposium on Languages and Cultures in a Multi Ethnic Society held in the Spring of 1971.

(\_i

The second structural requirement to effectively carry out the investigation process must have the effect of connecting citizens with the government. As the list of consultations in Chapter 2C will demonstrate, these government-to-public consultations were held with ethnic community leaders in major cities in the summer of 1970, and a series of special consultations on particular subjects was also held. Finally, the Secretary of State conducted an extensive analysis of the contents of the ethnic press in Canada in relation to the multiculturalism policy.

The conclusion or synthesizing process occurred between May and July of 1971. All the information collected over the period of the previous year was synthesized, and submitted in a document to cabinet on July 13 1971. The ministers, deputy ministers, the technical staff and others involved in the consultations devised a number of program options with contingent budgets. These options ranged from cultural dualism, to status quo, to third force to multiculturalism. The Secretary of State and the other federal cultural agencies which had been called upon to submit a response to Book IV were coordinated by an inter-departmental committee. The conclusion process can be said to have lasted approximately two months, from May to July 1971. The regionalization of the investigation process permitted the conclusion process to take into consideration the attainment of goals and the solution of problems specific to ethnic groups

in local communities. This process received an input from the structures involved in the investigation process, and consequently it is normal to expect a certain consensus on methods for policy execution.

As we have seen in the previous part of this chapter section, the decision process is usually reserved to elected officials and their delegates. Accordingly, on September 23rd 1971, the Cabinet approved the principals and programs of multiculturalism. The policy and programs were discussed in caucus on October 6th and announced in the House of Commons on October 8th 1971. The decision process spanned two weeks at best.

The execution process, as we have seen, varies with the program being implemented. Each of the six programs of the multiculturalism policy is itself executed or administered in a particular fashion. Accordingly, each of the six programs can be said to pass through a renewed process of investigation, conclusion, decision, execution and evaluation. The time span varies with each program. For example, the ethnic histories program is designed to be investigated or researched for two years and will not see execution or print until 1974. Given the diversity of the six multiculturalism programs, and given the focus of this thesis concerning community development, we will analyse only the grants program of the multiculturalism policy.

#### Selection of the Grants Program for Further Application

We have selected the grants program because it is the only one which can be interpreted as a community development program. The other five have varying degrees of community or citizen participation but all are basically government-initiated or government-controlled. For the purpose of examining the participatory processes and structural requisites for an

effective community development program, we shall concern ourselves only with the grants program.

The grants program is client-oriented in its objectives, and this must be kept in mind when applying it to the policy execution framework. This means that the grants program is not designed to reach the entire non-French and non-English population of Canada. It is directed only at those of other ethnic origin who wish to contribute to and participate in Canada's cultural development. Thus, the grants program is by design a client-oriented funding program. This clientele can be defined as being primarily ethnic and of non-French and non-British origins. The Department of the Secretary of State has a Bilingualism Programs Branch for the cultural and linguistic preservation and development of each province's linguistic minority. Multiculturalism did not replace the bilingualism programs. This is one of the reasons that such little opposition arose from the French Canadian population with the introduction of the multiculturalism grants program. Accordingly, the effectiveness of such a grants program can only be evaluated through the volume and type of client response to it. This evaluation will take place in Chapter 4. The remainder of this chapter will confine itself to an analysis of the processes and structures involved in the execution of such a grants program. Application of the Grants Program to the Execution Framework.

We will apply the grants program to our framework of five processes and structures, in order to establish the potential for its effectiveness as a community development program.

Investigation is the first process and, as we have seen, has two requirements for its effectiveness. The first requirement is for some type of structured or semi-formal link between the citizens or groups of

citizens so that they may communicate and exchange ideas and approaches with respect to problems of local interest to themselves. It is understandable that not all problems affecting local ethnic organizations can be considered under the grants program. However, the grants program does fund inter- and intracultural encounters to facilitate goal-setting and problem solving on a local basis. An examination of some of the projects funded in the Montreal area during the first three granting sessions will bear this out. The multiculturalism grants program requires groups to submit projects in order to receive grants. These projects must be accepted by the clientele to whom they are directed. Accordingly, discussions between citizens and local ethnic groups are usually initiated by the community concerned. The cultural survival of ethnic groups in Quebec is predicated on this exchange of ideas and concepts between citizens, including French Canadians. The multiculturalism grants program has a build-in provision that the investigation process can be funded for the distribution of expertise among ethnic groups, the development of leadership and other such resources as are necessary to permit ethnic organizations to operate on equal footing with other groups.

(

 $\int_{C}$ 

The second requisite for an effective investigation process for program execution consists of a formal link between citizens and the government. Although the grants program did not immediately provide any personnel to relate to ethnic groups on a daily and local basis, it did use the existing decentralized network of personnel in the twenty Citizenship Branches distributed across Canada. Within a number of months following the announcement of the program, a number of field agents had been recruited in seven major cities to act as coordinators in local communities and to provide some technical assistance and leadership for local groups. This connection between the government and the ethnic clientele completes the

investigation process. The field agents facilitated rational community development and increased participation of ethnic voluntary associations in this development.

The grants program has a conclusion or synthesizing process which is implicit in the investigation process. Investigation and consultations by local ethnic associations among their members normally lead to such an association or group of citizens presenting a project proposal. Implicit in this submission is the fact that the members involved have come to some tentative agreement as to the direction and goals of the ethnic group in the context of a specific project. Secondly, the field agents or "technicians" must also come to some conclusions once a project is submitted. The field agent is requested to make a recommendation on the project, and for this he must draw on and synthesize his experiences with the client group. Clearly the investigation or preparatory process is of longer duration than the conclusion process.

The decision process on grant applications is reserved to elected officials and their delegates. A committee of several members examines all submissions at different periods throughout the fiscal year. Subsequent to their decision, the minister and other officials examine and authorize funding. The decision process of the grants program execution is beyond the control of the local client group.

The execution process of the grants program is almost entirely in the hands of the local ethnic group or organization. A contract is signed between the person responsible for the project, and the Secretary of State. The project organizer agrees to conduct the project as described in the application, to spend funds according to the agreement between his group and the Secretary of State, and to submit a final report of the project within two months of the completion of the project. No government

personnel staffs the project. In all projects funded through the multiculturalism grants program, voluntary organizations and local groups execute them according to local needs and objectives. Some projects may consist of a conference or a course and thus can take only a few days to execute. Others such as information and referral centers, may be in the execution process up to a year's time.

Evaluation is the final process and structure comprising the multiculturalism program. Each project contract signed with the Secretary of State includes as a condition the submission of a final report by the ethnic organizations within two months of the project completion. There is also a provision that the project may at any time be visited by department field officers and that all pertinent information be provided them.

Each individual project can be and is evaluated, but as is the case with the five other multiculturalism programs, the multiculturalism grants program as a whole has not yet been evaluated for its effectiveness, efficiency or relevance. This is normal since these programs have not yet completed their first fiscal year of operation. It is expected that the grants program and the other programs making up the multiculturalism policy execution will be reviewed at some point in the near future. Given the lack of an evaluation for the grants program operation, chapter four will attempt to examine some of the reported needs of forty-four cultural community organizations. An analysis of the one hundred or so projects submitted under the grants program should reflect the needs of a number of groups as well. With this, it is hoped we will be able to trace the evolution of the attitudes of the client groups. This evolution can be called ethnic community development.

#### The Responsiveness of Program Execution

Before passing on to an evaluation of the grants program activity in the next chapter, it would be useful to briefly note the responsiveness of the execution structure and processes to local community needs as expressed through project submissions. The execution of the multiculturalism policy, by means of its grants program, was semi-structured at best. Few funding criteria were pre-set, but the mechanisms for their formulation did exist. Thus responsiveness to requirements of local ethnic groups is in line with the objectives of the policy.

One will note that before the inception of the grants program, the Citizenship Branch of the Secretary of State could not fund projects stressing the development of a culture within a Canadian cultural context. Rather only projects for the retention of customs and folklore were eligible. The multiculturalism policy acknowledges the right of the community to claim what is native to it, to urge its originality and to behave as thought it were irreplaceable, all of which makes for its particular enhancement. As in other community development programs, the multiculturalism policy recognizes the cultural rights of a citizen to maintain and develop his own values. Before examining whether the actual funded projects were relevant to economic and social needs of Montreal ethnic groups, one must briefly examine the evolution of the grants program funding "criteria" from January to September 1972, in order to observe an increasing tendency towards funding projects permitting ethnic community development.

The first funding session for multiculturalism grants took place in February 1972. To announce this, the assistant Under-Secretary of State (citizenship) sent out a letter to the heads of some seven hundred ethnic organizations across Canada. In it he explained that project submissions had to meet one or more of the four broad objectives of the policy approved

by Parliament October 8th 1971. Other technical points were mentioned but there was no list or information regarding the types of project which were most likely to be funded, or of the criteria which would be used to judge these. There was discussion of a preference for specific projects and programs rather than for funding of organizations' operating expenses. Under these rubrics, some forty or so projects were submitted for multiculturalism grants from the Montreal area.

By the time the second granting session came up in May 1972, the Secretary of State had devised policy and regulations on grants restrictions concerning a number of points such as capital costs, broadcasting, films, publishing research, museums, archives and libraries, third language teaching, conferences, immigrant orientation, performing arts and visual aids. None of these items was approved by Parliament and there was no possibility of their itemized review. This is an instance of delegated legislation. Lastly, there was no possibility of an appeal to elected responsible officials or courts regarding decisions taken under these criteria.

A third granting session took place in September 1972. Some technical criteria were introduced: 1) normally, only one project per organization could be funded at any one time 2) projects requesting 100% federal financing would be rejected. Aside from these, the previously mentioned restrictions from May 1972 were explained in greater detail and the additional items of surveys, travel and information and referral centers were included for consideration in the grants program. The creation and incorporation of these provisions is largely due to requests implicit in project submissions.

#### **FOOTNOTES**

- 42. J.D. Strick, "Recent Developments in Canadian Financial Administration", in Public Administration, Spring 1970.
- 43. A.W. Johnson, "The Treasury Board of Canada", CJPS, September 1971.
- 44. Idem.
- 45. Idem.
- 46. Idem.
- 47. George Szablowski, "The Optimal Policy-Making System: Implications for the Canadian Political Process" in Thomas Hockin, pg. 143.
- 48. See chapter II section C for the list of consultations taking place in the conclusion process of the Multiculturalism policy.

### CHAPTER IV - COMMUNITY NEED FOR AND RESPONSE TO THE MULTICULTURALISM PROGRAM

By examining the types and sources of grants requests for the first three multiculturalism grants program funding sessions in the Montreal area, it is hoped that one will obtain an idea of the types of needs stated by the groups applying. This in turn will be compared with an analysis of the stated needs and characteristics of a cross section of these groups in part B of this chapter. Thus, we are examining the responsiveness of the multiculturalism grants program to the felt needs of Montreal ethnic groups. This factor is an important aspect in the evaluation of the effectiveness of a community development program. The second part of this chapter will examine, to a limited degree, the representativeness of the general needs expressed by ethnic groups. Accordingly, while in chapter three we analyzed the potential for an effective community development program in the structures and processes of the multiculturalism grants program, chapter four will attempt to evaluate the program after one year of application. This evaluation will consist of an examination of the representativeness of expressed needs, and an examination of the responsiveness of the grants program to these needs.

## A) An Analysis of the Submissions and Responses to the Multiculturalism Grants Program.

#### Source of the Project

First Session - February, 1972

In considering the grants application at this point in time, it must be remembered that several factors worked against adequate preparation of briefs. This caused many of them to be rejected on technical bases, but nevertheless one may contend that the type of project is more likely to represent the groups' needs since very vague criteria for evaluating grant requests existed. Subsequent granting sessions sifted out or rejected most projects not falling within the restrictions. Other factors affecting the grants at this time were first, the very short period of one month, between January twelfth and February fifteenth, allotted for the preparation of briefs. Secondly, very little investigation could take place in this short period of time, that is to say that the citizens and citizens groups concerned had little time to discuss and exchange among themselves information regarding the goals and methods to be set down for multicultural projects. Also, almost no time was provided for the installation of field officers to provide the link between government and the ethnic groups preparing submissions. Accordingly, little, if any, investigation took place for this granting session. The community development program was established on weak foundations at this point in time.

This point can be borne out by an overview of the origins of the projects. Thirty-four (34) grant requests were accepted before the deadline. Twenty-four or 70% of these can be said to have come from
"established" ethnic groups. Despite the difficulty and ambiguity of
defining an "established" ethnic group, one can say that most are Eastern
European groups: three Ukrainian, one Polish, one Estonian, one Hungarian,
one Slovak, one Yugoslav, and three from an East European or Slavic
organization, as well as several from the Jewish community. Several
multicultural or intercultural organizations also submitted requests for
funding. Only ten submissions, or 30%, can be said to have come from
"emerging" ethnic groups, such as Greek, Spanish, Middle Eastern, Portuguese,
Black, Korean and Chinese. The primary distinction between these general
types of groups is the likelihood of contact or information with officials

of the program administration regarding the multiculturalism program. East European Slavic ethnic groups have long pressured for and anticipated the advent of a multiculturalism program. Other groups were almost taken by surprise with the announcement of the program. Another extremely important factor is that most of the "established" ethnic groups have national umbrella organizations which act as information sources, and have long experience in dealing with government. "Emerging" ethnic groups do not have any such co-ordinating bodies. We shall see, in the next section of this chapter, that groups forced to come to Canada for political reasons often form stronger and more dynamic organizations than those groups who come for economic reasons. 49 Finally, "emerging" ethnic groups do not have the expertise in preparing briefs that the "established" groups possess. Given the fact that such a short period of time elapsed between the announcement of the program budget and the first submission deadline, groups which were caught unaware and without expertise were often refused on the grounds or that their submissions were inadequately prepared.

#### 2. Second Session - May, 1972

A great deal of change appears to have occurred in terms of the proportion of projects originating from "established" groups. For the second session, twenty new projects were submitted for consideration.

Seventeen of these, or 85%, can be said to have come from "established" ethnic groups: two Lithuanian, three Ukrainian, three Polish, one Roumanian, five Jewish and three from organizations of a multicultural character. Only three new projects, or 15%, came from "emerging" ethnic groups: one Greek, one Middle Eastern and one Black. It appears that the information grapevine was more effective in ethnic communities which have central coordinating organizations than in communities which do not.

One should add that there were twelve (12) projects, also from the Montreal area, which were asked either to resubmit after evaluation in the first session, or were not considered until the second session. Six of these were from "emerging" groups and six were from "established" ethnic groups. This is a small indication of the poor preparation of the projects by the "emerging" groups. Six of the ten (60%) projects submitted for the first session evaluation by the "emerging" groups were sent back for resubmission, compared to six out of the twenty-four, or 25%, for the "established" groups. When these twelve projects are added to the twenty new projects of the second session, the analysis reveals that twenty-three (23) or 72% were from "established" groups, and nine (9), or 28%, projects were from "emerging" groups.

#### 3. Third Session - September, 1972.

The proportion of applications from "emerging" ethnic groups changed substantially between the second and third granting sessions. Of the forty-six applications considered, two were withdrawn by the groups themselves, and two were resubmissions from the previous granting sessions. Given this then, we see that seventeen, or 40%, out of the remaining forty-two applications originated from "emerging" ethnic groups: four Portuguese, one Chinese, six Black, two Greek, one North African Sephardic and three Middle East. This forty percent compares favorably with the fifteen percent of new projects from the same class of groups, considered in the previous granting session. The remaining 60% of the applications originated from "established" ethnic groups and were distributed as follows: six Jewish, three Ukrainian, three Polish, two Italian, one Latvian, one German, one Czechoslovakian, one Croatian, one Estonian, five from multicultural organizations and one from an East European Slavic organization.

Most, if not all, of the forementioned "established" ethnic groups have national organizations or federations.

If one considers all the projects submitted for this granting session, then twenty-five, or 50%, were from "established" groups and twenty-five, or the remaining 50%, were from "emerging" ethnic groups.

This compares with a 75%-25% split in the previous granting session.

Two Chinese, one Black and one Greek project were withdrawn and resubmitted.

A short table will illustrate the evolution in the frequency of submissions from "emerging" ethnic groups compared with that from "established" ethnic groups. New applications refers to the number of new projects submitted for grants consideration. Total applications refers to the number of new projects plus any projects which were resubmitted for consideration in that session.

Table 1

| New Applications   | First Session |     | Second Session |     | Third Session |     |
|--------------------|---------------|-----|----------------|-----|---------------|-----|
|                    | #             | ક   | #              | 8   | #             | 8   |
| Established        | 24            | 70% | 17             | 85% | 25            | 60% |
| Emerging           | 10            | 30% | 3              | 15% | 21            | 40% |
| Total Applications |               |     |                |     |               |     |
| Established        | 24            | 70% | 23             | 75% | 25            | 50% |
| Emerging           | 10            | 30% | 8              | 25% | 25            | 50% |

Table 1 is rather limited insofar as it spans only three evaluation sessions. Nevertheless, there is a clearly defined upward change in the number of submissions from emerging ethnic groups. This trend can be attributed in part to a number of factors. Firstly, the emerging groups took more time to prepare briefs than did established ethnic groups due to their lack of expertise in this area. Secondly, the availability of

1

(

such a grants program was known later to the emerging group than to the established groups, since the latter are usually structured on a national basis and these national organizations have information channels with the government. Finally, more government field co-ordinators were made available to groups. Because of their lack of expertise, the emerging ethnic groups tended to use these services more than did the established groups.

Before one proceeds to an examination of the actual funding, of the budgets and of the types of projects, one may examine the overall proportion of projects coming from "established" and "emerging" ethnic groups and their distribution.

#### An Examination of the Distribution of Multicultural Grant

#### Applications by Ethnic Origin

Of the total of one hundred (100) applications which were made to the grants program during the three granting sessions, sixty-six (66) originated from "established" ethnic groups. This constitutes 66% of the new applications. Projects either withdrawn or resubmitted are not considered in this total, although organizations submitting more than one application were counted more than once. Thirty-four (34) applications originated from ethnic groups which we have defined as "emerging".

The sixty-six applications from "established" ethnic organizations are distributed as follows: thirteen Jewish, twelve from multicultural or intercultural organizations, two Slovak, seven Polish, nine Ukrainian, two Lithuanian, two Roumanian, two Estonian, one Hungarian, two German, two Yugoslavian, one Latvian, seven Italian, and four from an East European Slavic organization.

The thirty-four applications from the "emerging" ethnic groups are

distributed as follows: five Oriental, five Portuguese, one Spanish, seven Middle East, six Greek, nine Black and one North African Sephardic.

The analysis of this section indicates several tendencies. First,

"established" ethnic groups had twice the number of applications of

"emerging" ethnic groups because of their contacts with governmental

structures and because they are likely to have national umbrella organizations. Secondly, there is a trend toward more applications from the

"emerging" groups and fewer applications originating from the "established"

groups.

The next part of this section will examine the types, budgets and grants given to these groups. By examining the contents and costs of the various projects, we will see that groups which we call "established" are likely to have emigrated to Canada due to political reasons and pressures in their original countries, are likely to have more expensive budgets in their project requests, are less likely to have large grants given to them, and are more likely to have projects which are designed for cultural preservation. "Emerging" groups are likely to have emigrated to Canada for economic reasons or pressures in the original country, are more likely to receive a grant, are less likely to submit projects with expensive budgets, and are likely to present projects congruent with their cultural development and integration as opposed to their cultural differentiation.

# An Examination of the Budgets and Grants Given to Multicultural Projects in the Montreal Area

#### 1. Amounts Requested

The "emerging" ethnic groups made thirty-four new submissions during the three granting sessions requesting funds amounting to \$497,912. This constitutes an average grant request of \$14,644.

of the program administration regarding the multiculturalism program. East European Slavic ethnic groups have long pressured for and anticipated the advent of a multiculturalism program. Other groups were almost taken by surprise with the announcement of the program. Another extremely important factor is that most of the "established" ethnic groups have national umbrella organizations which act as information sources, and have long experience in dealing with government. "Emerging" ethnic groups do not have any such co-ordinating bodies. We shall see, in the next section of this chapter, that groups forced to come to Canada for political reasons often form stronger and more dynamic organizations than those groups who come for economic reasons. 49 Finally, "emerging" ethnic groups do not have the expertise in preparing briefs that the "established" groups possess. Given the fact that such a short period of time elapsed between the announcement of the program budget and the first submission deadline, groups which were caught unaware and without expertise were often refused on the grounds or that their submissions were inadequately prepared.

#### 2. Second Session - May, 1972

A great deal of change appears to have occurred in terms of the proportion of projects originating from "established" groups. For the second session, twenty new projects were submitted for consideration. Seventeen of these, or 85%, can be said to have come from "established" ethnic groups: two Lithuanian, three Ukrainian, three Polish, one Roumanian, five Jewish and three from organizations of a multicultural character. Only three new projects, or 15%, came from "emerging" ethnic groups: one Greek, one Middle Eastern and one Black. It appears that the information grapevine was more effective in ethnic communities which have central coordinating organizations than in communities which do not.

One should add that there were twelve (12) projects, also from the Montreal area, which were asked either to resubmit after evaluation in the first session, or were not considered until the second session. Six of these were from "emerging" groups and six were from "established" ethnic groups. This is a small indication of the poor preparation of the projects by the "emerging" groups. Six of the ten (60%) projects submitted for the first session evaluation by the "emerging" groups were sent back for resubmission, compared to six out of the twenty-four, or 25%, for the "established" groups. When these twelve projects are added to the twenty new projects of the second session, the analysis reveals that twenty-three (23) or 72% were from "established" groups, and nine (9), or 28%, projects were from "emerging" groups.

#### 3. Third Session - September, 1972.

The proportion of applications from "emerging" ethnic groups changed substantially between the second and third granting sessions. Of the forty-six applications considered, two were withdrawn by the groups themselves, and two were resubmissions from the previous granting sessions. Given this then, we see that seventeen, or 40%, out of the remaining forty-two applications originated from "emerging" ethnic groups: four Portuguese, one Chinese, six Black, two Greek, one North African Sephardic and three Middle East. This forty percent compares favorably with the fifteen percent of new projects from the same class of groups, considered in the previous granting session. The remaining 60% of the applications originated from "established" ethnic groups and were distributed as follows: six Jewish, three Ukrainian, three Polish, two Italian, one Latvian, one German, one Czechoslovakian, one Croatian, one Estonian, five from multicultural organizations and one from an East European Slavic organization.

Most, if not all, of the forementioned "established" ethnic groups have national organizations or federations.

If one considers all the projects submitted for this granting session, then twenty-five, or 50%, were from "established" groups and twenty-five, or the remaining 50%, were from "emerging" ethnic groups.

This compares with a 75%-25% split in the previous granting session.

Two Chinese, one Black and one Greek project were withdrawn and resubmitted.

A short table will illustrate the evolution in the frequency of submissions from "emerging" ethnic groups compared with that from "established" ethnic groups. New applications refers to the number of new projects submitted for grants consideration. Total applications refers to the number of new projects plus any projects which were resubmitted for consideration in that session.

Table 1

| New Applications   | First Session |     | Second | Second Session |    | Third Session |  |
|--------------------|---------------|-----|--------|----------------|----|---------------|--|
|                    | #             | કુ  | #      | ક્ર            | #  | 8             |  |
| Established        | 24            | 70% | 17     | 85%            | 25 | 60%           |  |
| Emerging           | 10            | 30% | 3      | 15%            | 21 | 40%           |  |
| Total Applications |               |     |        |                |    |               |  |
| Established        | 24            | 70% | 23     | 75%            | 25 | 50%           |  |
| Emerging           | 10            | 30% | 8      | 25%            | 25 | 50%           |  |

Table 1 is rather limited insofar as it spans only three evaluation sessions. Nevertheless, there is a clearly defined upward change in the number of submissions from emerging ethnic groups. This trend can be attributed in part to a number of factors. Firstly, the emerging groups took more time to prepare briefs than did established ethnic groups due to their lack of expertise in this area. Secondly, the availability of

such a grants program was known later to the emerging group than to the established groups, since the latter are usually structured on a national basis and these national organizations have information channels with the government. Finally, more government field co-ordinators were made available to groups. Because of their lack of expertise, the emerging ethnic groups tended to use these services more than did the established groups.

Before one proceeds to an examination of the actual funding, of the budgets and of the types of projects, one may examine the overall proportion of projects coming from "established" and "emerging" ethnic groups and their distribution.

#### An Examination of the Distribution of Multicultural Grant

#### Applications by Ethnic Origin

Of the total of one hundred (100) applications which were made to the grants program during the three granting sessions, sixty-six (66) originated from "established" ethnic groups. This constitutes 66% of the new applications. Projects either withdrawn or resubmitted are not considered in this total, although organizations submitting more than one application were counted more than once. Thirty-four (34) applications originated from ethnic groups which we have defined as "emerging".

The sixty-six applications from "established" ethnic organizations are distributed as follows: thirteen Jewish, twelve from multicultural or intercultural organizations, two Slovak, seven Polish, nine Ukrainian, two Lithuanian, two Roumanian, two Estonian, one Hungarian, two German, two Yugoslavian, one Latvian, seven Italian, and four from an East European Slavic organization.

The thirty-four applications from the "emerging" ethnic groups are

distributed as follows: five Oriental, five Portuguese, one Spanish, seven Middle East, six Greek, nine Black and one North African Sephardic.

The analysis of this section indicates several tendencies. First,

"established" ethnic groups had twice the number of applications of

"emerging" ethnic groups because of their contacts with governmental

structures and because they are likely to have national umbrella organizations. Secondly, there is a trend toward more applications from the

"emerging" groups and fewer applications originating from the "established"

groups.

The next part of this section will examine the types, budgets and grants given to these groups. By examining the contents and costs of the various projects, we will see that groups which we call "established" are likely to have emigrated to Canada due to political reasons and pressures in their original countries, are likely to have more expensive budgets in their project requests, are less likely to have large grants given to them, and are more likely to have projects which are designed for cultural preservation. "Emerging" groups are likely to have emigrated to Canada for economic reasons or pressures in the original country, are more likely to receive a grant, are less likely to submit projects with expensive budgets, and are likely to present projects congruent with their cultural development and integration as opposed to their cultural differentiation.

### An Examination of the Budgets and Grants Given to Multicultural

#### Projects in the Montreal Area

#### 1. Amounts Requested

The "emerging" ethnic groups made thirty-four new submissions during the three granting sessions requesting funds amounting to \$497,912. This constitutes an average grant request of \$14,644.

Distribution of the grant requests with the average grant, per "emerging" groups is as follows: five Oriental projects requested a total of \$67,842. (average \$13,568); five Portuguese projects requested \$45,040 (average \$9,008); one project of Sephardic origin requested \$7,500; nine projects from Black groups requested \$99,812 (average \$11,090); seven projects of Middle Eastern origin requested a total of \$65,225 (average \$9,460); six projects of Greek origin requested \$189,895 (average \$31,649).

The "established" ethnic groups submitted sixty-six grant applications during the three granting sessions requesting funds totalling to \$1,491,024. This gives an average grant request of \$22,591, some 45% higher than the average grant request from the "emerging" ethnic group.

Distribution of the grant requests, along with the average grant, per "established" ethnic group, is as follows: thirteen projects of Jewish origin requested a total of \$199,441 (average \$15,341); twelve multicultural projects requested \$357,162 (average \$29,763); two Slovak projects requested \$21,000 (average \$10,500); seven Polish projects requested \$31,560 (average \$4,508); nine projects of Ukrainian origin requested a total of \$287,450 (average \$31,938); two Lithuanian requested \$12,300 (average \$6,200); two Roumanian projects requested \$18,200 (average \$9,100); two Estonian projects requested a total of \$15,700 (average \$7,850); four projects from an East European organization requested a total of \$75,350 (average \$18,837); two Yugoslav projects requested \$64,240 (average of \$32,120); one Hungarian requested \$197,226; two German groups requested \$124,040 (average \$62,020); seven Italian organizations requested a total of \$82,780 (average \$11,825); and one Latvian group requested \$4,585.

#### 2. An Analysis of Funds Granted

In the "established" ethnic groups, \$101,490 or 7% of the amount

(

requested, was granted. For the "emerging" ethnic groups, 15%, or \$75,690 of the amount requested was granted over the period of three granting sessions.

The percentage of the funds requested actually granted for the "established" ethnic groups were as follows: the Jewish groups received 13% of the total amount requested; the projects from the multicultural organizations received 7% of their total request; Slovak 4%; Polish 45%; Ukrainian 5%; Lithuanian 20%; Roumanian 19%; Estonian 4%; East European organization 6%; Yugoslav 3%; Humgarian 2%; German 0; Italian 8%; Latvian 0.

The percentage grants were as follows for the "emerging" ethnic groups: oriental received 9% of the total amount requested; Portuguese 51%; Sephardic 66%; Black 23%; Spanish 0; Middle East 6%; Greek 75%. These percentages would seem to indicate a poor preparation, due to lack of information, among other factors, for some projects and better preparation for others. It is difficult to verify this, and accordingly one should examine these percentages in light of the absolute number of projects accepted. This should give some indication both of the preparation of the projects and the priorities of the multiculturalism grants program. The latter will be further examined when we analyze the types of content of the various projects.

#### 3. An Analysis of the Number of Projects Funded

Twenty-five out the sixty-six projects submitted by the "established" ethnic groups were accepted. This is a rate of 37%. Sixteen out of thirty-four submitted by the "emerging" ethnic groups were accepted. This is forty-seven percent of the projects. The acceptance rate of the projects by "established" ethnic groups is as follows: Jewish 38%; Multicultural 16%;

Slovak 50%; Polish 57%; Ukrainian 55%; Lithuanian 50%; Roumanian 50%; Estonian 50%; Eastern European Organization 25%; Hungarian 100%; German 0; Italian 28% and Latvian 0. Some of these appear high since the absolute number of projects submitted is low.

The acceptance rate of projects submitted by "emerging" ethnic groups is distributed as follows: Oriental 40%; Portuguese 80%; Sephardic 100%; Black 40%; Spanish 0; Middle East 28%; Greek 50%.

Again, one must be cautious with these figures since the number of submissions is limited. It would take several more granting sessions to extrapolate conclusive trends from this method of calculation. However, we may note several points. Firstly, there is some appreciable difference in the rate of acceptance of projects. "Emerging" ethnic groups tend to have more of their projects accepted for reasons we shall later explore. Secondly, "established" ethnic groups submit projects with higher budgets than do "emerging" groups. Higher absolute sums of money are granted to "emerging" ethnic groups than to "established" groups. The average grant given to the former is \$4,730 compared to \$4,059 to "established" ethnic organizations. There is a 14% difference between the two. The average grant given to all groups in Canada is \$3,090. The Montreal area appears to be favoured.

#### A Comparison of Grant Applications by Content

It is hoped that the comparison of projects by content will reveal some of the needs of the organizations, and of the ethnic groups they represent. Again, however, it must be taken into consideration that ethnic organizations do not always represent the needs of their organizations, and that it is not necessarily true that they would apply to government for funding under this program if they were aware of their groups' needs and

of methods of approaching and meeting them. Nevertheless, this analysis will indicate the general leanings of organizations' activities either toward "cultural preservation and maintenance" or towards "cultural development" and integration with the local community.

In comparing the contents of the various projects one can divide the requests for funding into seven broad categories. These are:

Publications, which include anthologies, newspapers, histories, journals and periodicals; Media, which includes VTR, cable TV, radio and films;

Conferences; Core Funding which includes capital expenditures, physical renovations or the administrative costs of maintaining a centre; Animators refers to salaries of employees working with the community on its needs and problems; Arts includes drama, theatre, folklore, dance and choirs;

Immigrant Integration, includes language or history courses, Information and Referral centres, etc. Given these seven broad categories we can now analyse the content of the sixty-six requests submitted by the "established" ethnic groups.

The distribution of requests by content was as follows for the "established" ethnic groups; Publications 11, Media 10, Conferences 3, Core Funding 12, Animators 3, Arts 19 and Immigrant Integration 8. From this, one should note several tendencies. Firstly, there is a preponderance (29%) of requests for Arts projects. These normally tend toward cultural preservation and maintenance. Secondly, there are a fair number of requests (18%) for Core Funding. Finally there is a heavy emphasis on the media and the printed word. 33% of the requests are in this area. The distribution of these requests over 7 categories is similar for almost all groups. The following are exceptions. The Jewish projects were heavily in favor of publications. The multicultural projects badly needed core funding and sponsored mostly information and referral projects.

The distribution of requests was as follows for the "emerging" ethnic groups: Publication 2, Media 7, Conferences 3, Core Funding 1, Animation 3, Arts 7, and Information and Referral 11. One should note the heavy emphasis, 33% of the requests, on Information and Referral services for the "emerging" ethnic groups. There is an equal emphasis on the Media and the Arts, 20% each, as means of cultural preservation. Several points should be noted here. Firstly, the Portuguese and Greek communities place heavy emphasis on the use of Information and Referral services. Secondly, "emerging" groups are using the Media as readily as the "established" groups. The total percentage of projects for media and the printed word is 26% of the requests. This is about the same proportion as the 33% for "established" groups.

The following table will illustrate the distribution of projects across these categories and the relative importance of these for each group.

Table 2

|                        | Emerging Groups | Established Groups |
|------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Publications           | 6%              | 17%                |
| Media                  | 20%             | 16%                |
| Conferences            | 9%              | 48                 |
| Core Funding           | 3%              | 18%                |
| Animation              | 9%              | 4%                 |
| Arts                   | 20%             | 29%                |
| Information & Referral | 33%             | 12%                |
|                        |                 |                    |
| Total.                 | 100%            | 100%               |

It is possible to conclude, then, by comparing the preferences of the two groups that the "emerging" groups have more of a need for Immigrant Orientation programs, than do the "established" groups. There is also a significant difference in the need of "established" groups for Core Funding, 18% compared to 3%, for the "emerging" ethnic groups.

#### Funding of Projects

The "established" ethnic groups fared well with the types of applications which they described as their priorities. The distribution is as follows: Publications, three out of eleven granted; Media two out of ten; Conferences two out of three; Core Funding none out of twelve; Animation none out of three; Arts twelve out of nineteen; Information and Referral six out of eight. The most significant point to note here is that no grants were given for Core Funding, which constituted almost 20% of the requests.

The "emerging" ethnic groups fared as well as the "established" groups, but within their own priorities. The distribution is as follows: Publications none out of two; Media two out of seven; Conferences two out of three; Core Funding none for one request; Animation three out of three; Arts two out of seven; Immigrant Integration seven out of eleven. The funding program appears to have considered as serious priorities the requests for Information and Referral Centres as well as for local animators in emerging communities.

The following table will illustrate the relative importance that the government program administrators attached to the groups' priorities:

Table 3

Percentage of Grants Given by Type of Project Across Categories of Groups

| Types of Projects      | Emerging Groups | Established Groups |
|------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Publications           | 0%              | 27%                |
| Media                  | 28%             | 20%                |
| Conferences            | 66%             | 66%                |
| Core Funding           | 0%              | 0%                 |
| Animation              | 100%            | 0%                 |
| Arts                   | 28%             | 63%                |
| Information & Referral | 63%             | 75%                |

The above is not a sufficient means by which to judge the program administration's adherence to the groups' priorities. Accordingly we must examine the distribution of the projects funded, within each type of group. The following table illustrates this.

<u>Table 4</u>

Distribution of Grants Across Categories of Groups

Three Sessions Total

| Types of Projects      | Emerging Groups | Established Groups |
|------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Publications           | 0%              | 12%                |
| Media                  | 12.5%           | 8%                 |
| Conferences            | 12.5%           | 8%                 |
| Core Funding           | 0.0%            | 0%                 |
| Animation              | 18.5%           | 0%                 |
| Arts                   | 12.5%           | 48%                |
| Information & Referral | 44.0%           | 24%                |
|                        |                 | <del></del>        |
| Total                  | 100 %           | 100%               |

The above table demonstrates that the program administration places heavy emphasis on Immigrant Integration programs for "emerging" ethnic

groups, and on Arts projects for "established" groups. This is in accord with the priorities set by the groups themselves as illustrated in Table 1. Thus, it can be safely said that priorities for each group have been observed.

1

(

In order to determine the priorities by type of project, as funded by the program administration, one must observe two tables. The first one, Table 5, illustrates the percentage of requests by type actually funded, but without regard to class of group.

Table 5

Percentage of Grants Given by Type of Project

| Types of Projects      | Percentage of Requests Funded |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Publications           | 23%                           |
| Media                  | 23%                           |
| Conferences            | 66%                           |
| Core Funding           | 0%                            |
| Animation              | 50%                           |
| Arts                   | 53%                           |
| Information & Referral | 68%                           |

From Table 5, one can see that program administrators place heavy emphasis upon Immigrant Integration, funding 13 out of 19 projects submitted, or 68% of the total. Conferences are still favoured with 4 out of 6 and the Media and published word are regarded as experimental with only 7 out of 30 requests funded. The Arts are favoured as well with 14 out of 26 grants assigned.

To offset a partial tendency to fund in quotas by ethnic group, which may affect the percentage of grants accepted, one should also consult table 6. Table 6 presents an overall distribution of grants by type for the

Montreal area over three granting sessions. The forty-one grants were distributed as follows: Publishing 3, Media 4, Conferences 4, Core Funding 0, Animation 3, Arts 14, and Information and Referral 13. Table 6 indicates the percentage in each.

1

Table 6

Distribution of Grants by Type Given to Groups
in Montreal over Three Sessions

| Publications           | <b>7</b> % |
|------------------------|------------|
| Media                  | 10%        |
| Conferences            | 10%        |
| Core Funding           | 0%         |
| Animation              | 7%         |
| Arts                   | 35%        |
| Information & Referral | 31%        |
| Total                  | 100%       |

Both Arts projects, which can be considered "cultural retention", and "immigrant integration" which can be considered "cultural development", are equally accompodated within the multiculturalism grants program. The program administrators seem to have equal priorities and are able to recognize groups' needs as represented by the projects submitted. It would seem then that the prerequisites for an effective community development program, as discussed in Chapter Three, have been met by the various processes and structures of the multiculturalism grants program. However, our evaluation leads us to conclude that the processes of investigation, conclusion and decision were more effective nearer the end of the first year of the grants program rather than an its outset. These three processes can be said to constitute the responsiveness of the grants program to

expressed needs of the ethnic groups in Montreal. Up to this point, the grants program can be said to have become increasingly effective as a community development tool as time has passed.

The second of two parts of our evaluation of the program consists of establishing, to a limited degree, the representativeness of these expressed needs. If the expressed needs are representative of the sentiment of Montreal ethnic groups, and if the grants program is responsive to these needs, then the grants program can be said to be an effective community development mechanism for ethnic groups. Accordingly then, two points remain to be investigated. Firstly, to what extent do the organizations submitting actually represent their ethnic communities in Montreal, and to what extent do these same groups present projects representing their felt needs? It should be established whether or not the multiculturalism grants program induces groups to submit only applications which have a chance to be accepted. That is to say, one must analyse the felt needs of the various ethnic communities in the Montreal area. This is the subject of the next part of this chapter.

B. An Analysis of the Characteristics and Needs of Some of Montreal's

Ethnic Organizations, and the Degree of Congruency with the Multiculturalism Program.

#### The Characteristics of Ethnic Organizations

One must examine the variety and nature of a cross-section of local ethnic organizations and place them in perspective regarding their ethnic community. The Royal Commission study done by Sherwood and Wakefield points out several interesting facts regarding ethnic voluntary associations in Canada.

"1) Immigrants to Canada since 1946 dominate the membership of ethnic associations. 2) Most ethnic associations, including those of the Ukrainian group, are a relatively modern phenomenon, having been founded since 1946. Most associations have some form of affiliation". <sup>50</sup> Of the four groups studied in the forementioned work, the Ukrainian associations were the only ones which consistently pursued "ethnically retentive" or "cultural preservation" types of activities. The overwhelming majority of ethnic associations did not engage in overtly 'integrative' activities, however.

The same study shows that "in general terms then, the philosophy of ethnic associations reflects a pan-Canadianism with a discernable federal bias and embodying a strong sense of minority rights. However, as has been seen, there are differences between the ethnic groups included in the survey and their views of Canada and the problem of minority rights". The Sherwood and Wakefield study concludes with the following points.

"Canada's ethnic associations, in either an overt or latent fashion, are progressing in different directions on a cultural plane to which problems of bilingualism and biculturalism are largely irrelevant. Canada's Ukrainian associations are most concerned with the cultural self-pre-

1

servation of the Ukrainian group. They show overt resistance to bilingualism but respect the rights of French Canadians as a minority group. Canada's German, Italian and Dutch associations are much less concerned with cultural self-preservation. In general, they prefer not to commit themselves on problems of bilingualism and biculturalism. There is evidence to suggest that latent resistance of these ethnic associations to bilingualism and biculturalism increases with their integration into the Canadian community". 52

Thus, it appears that there are culturally retentive-oriented organizations and others tending more toward integrative activities. It should be noted as well that the groups which come to Canada for political reasons, as opposed to economic, are the ones which are solidly "ethnically retentive". Many Eastern European Slavic groups fall into this category. It is important to note that groups tend to homogenize when constant political pressure is exerted upon them. It is not an anomaly then, that groups such as Ukrainians or Poles have formed their own political associations and other organizations to protect and develop their social, cultural, political and other rights and interests.

We may now turn to an examination of the groups on a more local basis.

Forty-six ethnic organizations were selected (see appendix I) for study.

These organizations were selected because of their large membership or because they were alone in representing an ethnic group. Three organizations could not be reached. The remaining forty-three groups represent some twenty-five different ethnic groups in the Montreal area. The diversity within each community and of the size of the communities involved were considered in those selected. All information acquired was through personal interview with one or more members of the group's executive (see appendix II).

The first part of the information collected concerns only background information on the organization. The second part, which will be examined in the next part of this chapter section, concerns the expressed needs and desires of the groups. The final section of the survey concerns the groups' view on the multiculturalism program.

#### 1. Size

The size of the surveyed groups (see table 7) shows that at least two-thirds of the organizations surveyed had over 400 members. This is considered medium in the Sherwood and Wakefield studies, but is large in the Montreal context when one speaks of "active membership". The group number in all tables corresponds to the group's number in appendix I. It should be noted, however, that a few of the organizations are service-oriented and therefore count their clientele among their members. The last third, representing smaller groups, is due either to "established" ethnic groups grouped about small social or cultural clubs, or to the fact that "emerging" groups are facing organizational difficulties. These last then would be in need of community animators of third party coordinators as outlined in the previous chapter.

#### 2. Language Tendency

To the question "With which linguistic milieu have members of the organizations sought to integrate", almost two-thirds of the associations answered anglophone, as outlined in table 8. Seven out forty-three said they had more affinity for the francophone milieu, while nine said that their members used English and/or French. Some organizations were classified in the last category whose members were both bilingual French and unilingual English. Thus, the figure given for the last category is not necessarily an indication of the bilingualism of these groups.

TABLE 7
SIZE OF MEMBERSHIP

| GROUP<br>NUMBER                                                                                                                        | 1-49   | 50–99  | 100-1999 | 200-399 | 400+                       |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|--------|----------|---------|----------------------------|
|                                                                                                                                        | x      | x      |          | x       |                            |
| 1<br>2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15                                                          |        |        |          | x       | x<br>x<br>x<br>x<br>x<br>x |
| 12<br>13<br>14<br>15                                                                                                                   | x      | x      |          | x       | x                          |
| 17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23                                                                                                 | x<br>x |        |          | x       | x<br>x                     |
| 22<br>23<br>24<br>25<br>26<br>27<br>28                                                                                                 |        | x<br>x |          |         | x<br>x<br>x<br>x<br>x      |
| 24<br>25<br>26<br>27<br>28<br>29<br>30<br>31<br>32<br>33<br>34<br>35<br>36<br>37<br>38<br>39<br>40<br>41<br>42<br>43<br>44<br>45<br>46 |        |        |          | x       | x<br>x<br>x<br>x           |
| 35<br>36<br>37<br>38<br>39<br>40                                                                                                       | ·      |        | x        | x       | x<br>x<br>x                |
| 41<br>42<br>43<br>44<br>45                                                                                                             |        |        | x        |         | x<br>x<br>x                |
| TOTAL                                                                                                                                  | 4      | 4      | 2        | 6       | 27                         |

[

TABLE 8
LINGUISTIC MILIEU

| GROUP<br>NUMBER                                                   | ENGLISH    | FRENCH | BILINGUAL |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|--------|-----------|
|                                                                   |            |        |           |
| 1                                                                 |            |        | x         |
| 2                                                                 |            |        | x         |
| 3                                                                 | x          |        |           |
| 4                                                                 | x          |        |           |
| 1<br>2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13 | x          |        |           |
| 6                                                                 | x          |        |           |
| 7                                                                 | x          |        |           |
| 8                                                                 | x          |        |           |
| 9                                                                 |            | x      |           |
| 10                                                                | <b>X</b>   |        |           |
| 17                                                                | X          |        |           |
| 12                                                                | x          |        |           |
| 1.0                                                               | **         | х      |           |
| 14                                                                | x<br>x     |        |           |
| 15<br>16                                                          | x<br>x     |        |           |
| 17                                                                | x<br>X     | 1      |           |
| 18                                                                | x<br>X     |        |           |
| 19                                                                | x          |        |           |
| 20                                                                | x          |        |           |
| 21                                                                | ••         |        | x         |
| 21<br>22                                                          | x          |        |           |
| 23                                                                | x          |        |           |
| 24                                                                |            |        | x         |
| 23<br>24<br>25                                                    |            |        | x         |
| 26                                                                | x          |        |           |
| 27                                                                | x          |        |           |
| 28                                                                | x          | ]      |           |
| 29<br>30                                                          | x          |        |           |
| 30                                                                | x          |        |           |
| 31                                                                | •          | x      |           |
| 31<br>32<br>33<br>34                                              |            | х      |           |
| 33                                                                |            |        | ×         |
| 34                                                                |            |        | x         |
| 35                                                                |            | х      | v         |
| 30                                                                | v          |        | x         |
| 36<br>37<br>38<br>39                                              | x          |        |           |
| 30                                                                | x          |        |           |
| 40                                                                | x<br>X     |        |           |
| 41                                                                | Δ.         |        | x         |
| 41<br>42                                                          | x          |        | ••        |
| 43                                                                |            |        |           |
| 44                                                                |            |        |           |
| 45                                                                |            | x      |           |
| 46                                                                |            | x      |           |
|                                                                   |            |        |           |
| TOTAL                                                             | 27         | 7      | 9         |
| יסינער                                                            | <i>4 1</i> | 1      | •         |
| 1                                                                 |            |        |           |
|                                                                   |            |        |           |
|                                                                   |            |        |           |

#### 3. Length of Residence

This question was asked in order to establish the length of stay of the groups' members, and in an effort to gather some information on a factor influencing the likelihood of a group having either "ethnically retentive" or integrative activities. Accordingly, groups were asked in which of the four categories most of their members fall. As table 9 shows, there were 17 in the 0-10 year category and 15 in the 10-25 year category. These are not absolute figures since it is understood that many of the members of various groups could fall in other categories. It is correct however to say that well over 70% of the organizations have members who established residency in Canada after World War II. It is useful to note this in view of the section on group needs such as counselling and information services as well as immigration.

#### 4. Occupation

and the second of the second second and the second second second second second second second second second second

1

1

Questions eleven and twelve were asked in order to determine the relative economic position of the groups involved. Table 10 shows that eleven or 25% of the organizations have mainly professionals as members. Thirteen groups are working class, five are middle class, and fourteen, or about one third, have members from all walks of life. The information gathered here permits one to establish only an approximate profile of the relative economic position of the group's members. Nevertheless, from this split one can see that the organizations whose members come to Canada primarily for "political" reasons (Czechs, Hungarians, Poles) have members mostly from the professional category and then from all types. Those who come to Canada mostly for "economic" reasons are primarily working class. This will be interesting to bear in mind when considering the expressed needs and desires of the organizations for counselling and information

TABLE 9

LENGTH OF RESIDENCY ( YEARS)

| GROUP<br>NUMBER                                                                                                                           | FROM BIRTH  | 010              | 10-25       | 25+    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|------------------|-------------|--------|
| 1<br>2<br>3<br>4                                                                                                                          |             | x<br>x           | x<br>x      |        |
| 6<br>7<br>8                                                                                                                               | x<br>x<br>x |                  | x           |        |
| 1<br>2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24<br>25 | X           | x<br>x<br>x<br>x | x           |        |
| 14<br>15<br>16<br>17                                                                                                                      | x           | x                | x<br>x      |        |
| 18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22                                                                                                                |             | x<br>x<br>x      | x<br>x      |        |
| 26<br>27                                                                                                                                  | x           | x                | x<br>x<br>x |        |
| 28<br>29<br>30                                                                                                                            | x           | x                | x           |        |
| 31<br>32<br>33<br>34<br>35<br>36                                                                                                          | x           | x<br>x           |             | x      |
| 36<br>37<br>38<br>39<br>40<br>41<br>42<br>43<br>44<br>45                                                                                  |             |                  | x           | x<br>x |
| 42<br>43<br>44<br>45                                                                                                                      |             | x                | x           | ^      |
| 46                                                                                                                                        |             | x                | A           |        |
| TOTAL                                                                                                                                     | 8           | 17               | 15          | 3      |
|                                                                                                                                           | 1           |                  |             |        |

TABLE 10

OCCUPATION OF MEMBERS

| GROUP<br>NUMBER                                          | PROFESSIONAL | WORKING CLASS | MIDDLE CLASS | ALL TYPES |
|----------------------------------------------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|-----------|
|                                                          |              |               |              | х         |
| 1<br>2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9                | x            |               | х            | ^         |
| 5<br>6                                                   | x            | x             |              | x         |
| 7<br>8<br>9                                              |              | x<br>x        |              | x         |
| 10<br>11                                                 | x            | x             |              |           |
| 12<br>13<br>14                                           | x            |               |              | x<br>x    |
| 15<br>16<br>17                                           |              | x             |              | x<br>x    |
| 18<br>19                                                 |              | x             |              |           |
| 20<br>21<br>22                                           | x            |               |              | x<br>x    |
| 23<br>24<br>25                                           | x            | x             |              |           |
| 26<br>27<br>28                                           |              | x             |              | x         |
| 28<br>29<br>30                                           |              |               | x<br>x       | x         |
| 31<br>32<br>33<br>34                                     |              | x             | ×            |           |
| 35                                                       | x            | x             | x            |           |
| 36<br>37<br>38                                           | x            | x             |              |           |
| 39<br>40                                                 | x            |               |              | x<br>x    |
| 42<br>43                                                 | x            |               |              | ı x       |
| 36<br>37<br>38<br>39<br>40<br>41<br>42<br>43<br>44<br>45 | x            |               |              | x         |
|                                                          |              |               |              | **        |
| TOTAL                                                    | 11           | 13            | 5            | 14        |

services on subjects such as workmen's compensation, pensions and unemployment insurance.

#### 5. Central Meeting Place

This question was asked to provide some idea of the organizational difficulties, or absence of them, for groups. A meeting place, or group center includes a church basement or hall as well as buildings owned by the group itself. Table 11 will show that nearly three-quarters of the groups have centers. Conversations with groups also showed that even though accessibility to centers was well distributed between "established" and "emerging" ethnic groups, the former had more centers of the type owned and operated by the group or community rather than the hall or basement type. This explains the large number of requests for Core Funding coming from "established" ethnic groups, as seen in the previous section of this chapter. However, all requests for Core Funding were refused because grants for operations, as oppsed to projects, are ineligible for support.

This section of the characteristics of the organizations is divided into four categories, and concerns the services offered by the organizations.

#### 6. Social Services

In this section we have services to new immigrants, such as information and orientation; charity services; welfare and family assistance; placement and finally general referral services for all other social needs. As table 12 will illustrate, seventeen of the four-three groups answering said they offered services to new immigrants. It should be noted however, that over 70% of these were offered by "emerging" ethnic groups. Charity services were equally distributed between the "established" and "emerging" groups, as were the family services and placement services. Almost all organizations

TABLE 11

#### USE OF A CENTER

| GROUP<br>NUMBER                                                   | YES      | NO  |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-----|
| 1                                                                 | <b>x</b> |     |
| 2                                                                 | x        |     |
| 1<br>2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13 |          | x   |
| 4                                                                 | x        |     |
| 6                                                                 | x<br>x   |     |
| 7                                                                 | x        |     |
| 8                                                                 | x        |     |
| 9                                                                 | x        |     |
| 11                                                                | x<br>x   |     |
| 12                                                                | x        |     |
| 13                                                                | x        |     |
| 14                                                                |          | x   |
| 15<br>16                                                          | x        | ×   |
| 17                                                                |          | x   |
| 18                                                                | x        |     |
| 19<br>20                                                          | x        |     |
| 20                                                                | ×        | x   |
| 22                                                                | <u>"</u> | x   |
| 23                                                                |          | x   |
| 24                                                                |          | x   |
| 25<br>26                                                          | x<br>x   |     |
| 27                                                                | ×        |     |
| 28                                                                |          | x   |
| 29<br>30                                                          | x        |     |
| i 31                                                              | x<br>x   |     |
| 32<br>33<br>34                                                    | x        |     |
| 33                                                                | x        |     |
| 34<br>35                                                          | x<br>x   |     |
| 36                                                                | x        |     |
| 37                                                                |          | x   |
| 38                                                                |          |     |
| 39<br>40                                                          | ×        | x   |
| 41                                                                | x        |     |
| 42                                                                | x        |     |
| 43                                                                |          |     |
| 36<br>37<br>38<br>39<br>40<br>41<br>42<br>43<br>44<br>45          | x        |     |
| 46                                                                | ×        |     |
|                                                                   |          |     |
| TOTAL                                                             | 32       | 11  |
| TOTAL                                                             | 34       | 1   |
|                                                                   | 1        |     |
|                                                                   |          |     |
|                                                                   | 1        | . , |

TABLE 12
SOCIAL SERVICES

| GROUP<br>NUMBER                                                | IMMIGRANT INFORMATION & REFERRAL | CHARITY    | FAMILY<br>PLANNING &<br>WELFARE | PLACEMENT  | REFERRAL<br>SERVICES |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------|---------------------------------|------------|----------------------|
| 1                                                              | x                                |            | v                               |            | ×                    |
|                                                                | 1 ^                              |            | х                               | ×          | ľ                    |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9                           | 1                                |            | j                               |            | x                    |
| 3<br>1                                                         | 1                                | x          |                                 |            | ļ                    |
| 4                                                              |                                  |            |                                 |            |                      |
| 5                                                              |                                  |            |                                 |            | ×                    |
| 7                                                              | x<br>x                           | 7.7        | х                               |            | x<br>x               |
| ν Ω                                                            | x                                | x<br>x     |                                 | ļ <u>.</u> | ^                    |
| a                                                              | ^                                | A          | x                               | x          | x                    |
| חנ                                                             | x                                | x          |                                 | x          | ^                    |
| 11                                                             | x                                | ×          | x<br>x                          | x          | 1                    |
| 11<br>12                                                       | ^                                | <b>A</b>   | ^                               | ^          | ×                    |
| 13                                                             | x                                | ж .        | x                               | x          | x                    |
| 13<br>14                                                       | 1 1                              | <b>A</b> . | ^                               | ^          | x                    |
| 15                                                             | ]                                | x          | x                               |            | "                    |
| 16                                                             | 1                                | <b>-</b>   |                                 | 1          | ]                    |
| 16<br>17                                                       | x                                |            |                                 |            | x                    |
| 18                                                             | x                                | x          | ×                               | x          | x                    |
| 19                                                             | x                                | x          | x                               | x          | · ·                  |
| 20                                                             |                                  |            | -                               | ,          | x                    |
| 21                                                             |                                  |            | İ                               |            |                      |
| 22                                                             | 1                                |            |                                 | }          | x                    |
| 23                                                             | x                                | x          | 1                               | x          | x                    |
| 24                                                             | x                                |            |                                 | x          | x                    |
| 24<br>25                                                       |                                  |            |                                 |            | x                    |
| 26                                                             |                                  |            |                                 | j          |                      |
| 27                                                             | 1                                |            |                                 | 1          | x                    |
| 28                                                             | 1                                |            |                                 |            |                      |
| 29                                                             | x                                | x          | x                               | x          | x                    |
| 30                                                             |                                  | x          | x                               | x          | x                    |
| 31                                                             |                                  |            |                                 |            | x                    |
| 30<br>31<br>32<br>33                                           | x                                |            |                                 | ì          | x                    |
| 33                                                             | 1                                |            | x                               |            | x                    |
| 34                                                             | 1                                |            |                                 |            | x                    |
| 35<br>36                                                       |                                  |            |                                 |            | x                    |
| 36                                                             | x                                | x          | x                               | x          | x                    |
| 3/<br>عو                                                       | 1                                |            |                                 | 1          | x                    |
| აგ<br>აი                                                       |                                  |            |                                 |            | 1                    |
| 39<br>40                                                       |                                  |            |                                 |            | 1                    |
| 4U<br>41                                                       | į į                              |            | 1                               | ×          | ×                    |
| 12<br>4±                                                       | ]                                |            |                                 |            | x<br>x               |
| 12<br>46                                                       |                                  |            |                                 |            | , x                  |
| 43<br>11                                                       | 1                                | •          | 1                               |            | 1                    |
| 4 <del>5</del>                                                 |                                  | v          |                                 | ļ          |                      |
| 34<br>35<br>36<br>37<br>38<br>39<br>40<br>41<br>42<br>43<br>44 | x<br>x                           | x<br>x     | x                               | ×          | x<br>x               |
| <del></del>                                                    | <del></del>                      |            | <u> </u>                        |            | <u> </u>             |
| TOTAL                                                          | 17                               | 15         | 14                              | 14         | 31                   |
|                                                                |                                  |            |                                 |            |                      |

1

offered referral service. This last type is different from an information and referral service for immigrants. The latter actually tries to meet the needs while the former informs a person of the proper service for his needs, one of which can be immigrant information. The low number of services offered of the charity, family planning and placement types is due to the fact that the ethnic organizations have a tendency to recommend to the client the use of existing services, which have no ethnic character. There is little tendency to establish parallel services of these types. The same cannot be said, however, for immigrant or referral services. This point should be further explored in subsequent studies, that is the relationship between the availability or absence of "essential" services within an ethnic community, and the rate of integration or cultural retention of the community. It would seem then, that the large number of requests for grants from the multiculturalism program for immigrant orientation activities and services is based on a general need. It would also appear that the multiculturalism program administrators are funding services which are essential for the development of "emerging" ethnic groups.

#### 7. Cultural Services

The cultural services offered are divided into education, libraries, arts, inter-group encounters, publications, social activities and sports. Table 13 outlines the relative importance of these services for groups. One should note the heavy emphasis placed on the arts services, such as theater, folklore dance, etc. by many of the groups. Sixteen of the twenty-eight groups were "established" ethnic groups. This confirms the grant requests to the multiculturalism program from groups pursuing "ethnically retentive" activities. Over 75% of the groups affirmed that they offered social activities. The groups offering these were split

TABLE 13
CULTURAL SERVICES

| ROUP                                                     | EDUCA    |       | LIBRARY | ARTS        | INTER-<br>GROUP | PUBLI-<br>CATIONS | SOCIAL<br>ACTIVITIES | SPORTS      |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|---------|-------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------------------|-------------|
| UMBER                                                    | YOUTH    | ADULT |         |             | MEETTNGS        | CALLONS           | FCIEVITIA            |             |
| 7                                                        | x        |       |         |             | !               |                   |                      | x           |
| 1<br>2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9                | 1 .      | x     | x       | x           | x               |                   | x                    |             |
| 2                                                        | x        | *     | ^       |             | ^               |                   | x                    |             |
| 3                                                        |          |       |         |             |                 |                   |                      | 37          |
| 4                                                        | j        |       |         | x           | 1               | X                 | x                    | x           |
| 5                                                        | x        | [     | [       | x           | x               | x                 | x                    |             |
| 6                                                        | x        | x     | x       |             |                 | x                 | x                    | X           |
| 7                                                        | х        | İ     | x       | x           | x               |                   | x                    | x           |
| 8                                                        | }        | }     |         | x           | x               |                   | x                    | x           |
| 9                                                        | l l      |       | x       | x           | x               | x                 | x                    | x           |
| 10                                                       | x        | }     |         | x           | x               |                   | x                    | x           |
| 11                                                       | <u> </u> |       |         | x           | •               |                   | x                    | x           |
| 12                                                       |          | ļ.    | x       | <del></del> | x               | x                 | }                    | x           |
| 13                                                       | 1        | l j   | •       | 1           | •               |                   | ļ .                  |             |
| T2                                                       | 1        | 1     |         |             | 1               |                   | .                    |             |
| 14                                                       |          | x     |         |             |                 |                   | X                    | v           |
| 15<br>16                                                 | x        | [     | x       | x           | x               |                   | x                    | x           |
| 16                                                       |          |       |         |             | 1               |                   |                      |             |
| 17                                                       | x        |       |         |             | 1               | x                 | x                    | x           |
| 18                                                       | x        |       | x       | x           | x               |                   | x                    |             |
| 19                                                       | 1        |       |         | x           | x               | ĺ                 | x                    | x           |
| 20                                                       |          |       | x       | x           | I               |                   | x                    |             |
| 21                                                       | x        | [     |         | x           |                 |                   | {                    |             |
| 22                                                       | ^        | ] ]   |         | x           | x               | ]                 | ) x ]                | x           |
| 22                                                       | 1        |       |         | <b>^</b>    | 1               |                   | x                    |             |
| 23                                                       | 1 .      |       |         |             | х               |                   | ] ^                  |             |
| 24                                                       | x        |       |         |             |                 |                   | <u>.</u>             |             |
| 25                                                       |          |       |         | x           | x               | ×                 | х                    |             |
| 26                                                       |          |       |         |             |                 |                   | ] [                  |             |
| 27                                                       |          |       |         | x           | 1               | }                 | x                    | x           |
| 28                                                       |          |       |         |             |                 |                   | x                    |             |
| 29                                                       | x        | x     |         |             | }               | x                 | 1 1                  |             |
| 30                                                       | x        | x     | x       | x           | x               | x                 | x                    | x           |
| 31                                                       | x        | x     | x       | x           | x               | X.                | x                    | x           |
| 33<br>2T                                                 |          |       | ^       | x           | x               | <del></del> .     | x                    |             |
| 32                                                       | ×        | ×     |         | 1           | 1 ^             |                   | *                    | x           |
| 33                                                       | х        | ] [   | X       | X           | l               | .,                | .,                   | x           |
| 34                                                       | x        | ×     | ×       | ×           | x               | x                 | X                    |             |
| 35                                                       | İ        |       | x       | x           |                 |                   | x                    | x           |
| 36                                                       |          |       | x       |             |                 |                   | x                    |             |
| 37                                                       |          | ] ]   |         | x           | 1               |                   | x                    | x           |
| 38                                                       |          |       |         |             | ļ               |                   | į į                  |             |
| 39                                                       | x        |       | x       | ж           | ×               |                   | x                    |             |
| 40                                                       | x        |       |         | x           | x               | x                 | ( x (                | x           |
| 41                                                       | x        | x     | x       | <b>x</b> .  | x               |                   | x                    | x           |
| 36<br>37<br>38<br>39<br>40<br>41<br>42<br>43<br>44<br>45 | _ ^      | ^     | 42      | x           | x               | x                 | x                    | x           |
| 42                                                       |          | † I   |         | ^           | ^               | •                 | **                   |             |
| 45                                                       |          |       |         |             | '               |                   | 1                    |             |
| 44                                                       |          |       |         |             | 1               |                   |                      |             |
| 45                                                       |          |       |         | x           |                 | X                 | ×                    | x           |
| 46                                                       | ĺ        |       | x       | 1           | x               | x                 | }                    |             |
|                                                          |          |       |         |             |                 |                   |                      |             |
| ······································                   |          |       |         |             |                 |                   |                      | <del></del> |
| TOTAL                                                    | 20       | 9     | 17      | 28          | 22              | 15                | 33                   | 24          |
|                                                          |          |       |         |             |                 |                   |                      |             |
|                                                          |          |       |         |             |                 |                   |                      |             |

almost 50%-50% between established and emerging. Ethnic groups place high priority on the use of social meetings and gatherings as either "ethnically retentive" or "integrative" activities, depending upon the type of persons with which the group meets.

### 8. Language

1

1

This section is designed to shed further light on "ethnic retention" and "integration" concerning languages. It was found that almost 50% of the groups offered courses in the third language, that is non-French and non-English. Table 14 will show that twenty out of forty-three groups offer such courses, and usually without using either school commission or government facilities. As well, few of the groups use audio-visual or other equipment. Most of the third language courses are being taught without the benefit of such new methods. This is one of the needs and services which could use some development. The multiculturalism policy recognizes this but as yet has developed no funding program for third language teaching. Only 28% of the groups offer French or English courses. It was found that many groups were not aware of the program, of the provincial Department of Immigration, for funding ethnic groups and their Saturday schools, provided the group agrees to teach two hours of French. The remainder of the Saturday may be devoted to courses in the third language. There is a shortage of teachers, especially younger ones with new methods and equipment. Accordingly, this service or activity tends to be ethnically retentive. The multiculturalism policy recognizes this but as yet is only in the research stage in developing a funding program. It should be noted that among the 28% of groups offering English or French courses, over 75% of them are "emerging" ethnic groups. This definitely reflects an integrative tendency by these groups, but the absolute number

TABLE 14

LANGUAGE SERVICES

|                                                                |                |                  | <b>.</b>           |                                               |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| GROUP                                                          | THIRD LANGUAGE | ENGLISH & FRENCH | USE SCHOOL COMMIS- | AUDIO-VISUAL,                                 |
| NUMBER                                                         | COURSES        | COURSES          | SION OR GOVT.      | FILMS TAPES FIC                               |
|                                                                |                |                  | FACILITIES         |                                               |
| 1                                                              | x              |                  |                    |                                               |
| 1<br>2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10                | x              |                  | x                  |                                               |
| 3                                                              | 1 .            | [                |                    |                                               |
| 4                                                              | x              | Ì                | 1                  |                                               |
| 5                                                              | x              |                  | x                  |                                               |
| 6                                                              |                | x                |                    |                                               |
| 7                                                              | 1              | x                | {                  | x                                             |
| 8                                                              | Í              | Ì                | ŧ                  | x                                             |
| 9                                                              | 1              |                  | x                  |                                               |
| 10                                                             | x              | x                |                    | x                                             |
| 11                                                             | x              | x                | Į.                 | , <u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u> |
| 12                                                             | *              | 1                | 1                  |                                               |
| 13                                                             |                | ł                | x                  |                                               |
| 14                                                             |                | ,                | , **               |                                               |
| 15                                                             |                |                  | [                  |                                               |
| 16                                                             |                | 1                |                    |                                               |
| 17                                                             |                |                  | ] .                |                                               |
| 1/<br>10                                                       | <b></b>        |                  | X                  | w w                                           |
| 18                                                             | X              |                  | x                  | <b>x</b>                                      |
| 19                                                             | x              | x                | x                  |                                               |
| 20                                                             | x              |                  | x                  |                                               |
| 21<br>22                                                       | x              |                  | 1                  |                                               |
| 22                                                             |                |                  | 1                  |                                               |
| 23                                                             |                |                  |                    |                                               |
| 24 .                                                           |                | 1                | x                  | x                                             |
| 25                                                             |                | ļ                | x                  |                                               |
| 26                                                             | x              | x                | {                  |                                               |
| 27                                                             | x              | x                | 1                  |                                               |
| 28                                                             |                |                  | 1                  |                                               |
| 29                                                             |                | x                |                    |                                               |
| 30.                                                            | x              | x                | x                  | x                                             |
| 31                                                             |                | x                |                    | x                                             |
| 32                                                             | 1              |                  | х                  |                                               |
| 33                                                             | x              | ]                | x                  |                                               |
| 34                                                             |                |                  |                    |                                               |
|                                                                | x              |                  | x                  |                                               |
| 36                                                             | x              |                  | x                  | ×                                             |
| 35<br>36<br>37<br>38<br>39<br>40<br>41<br>42<br>43<br>44<br>45 | x<br>x         | 1                |                    | <del>-</del>                                  |
| 38                                                             | -              |                  |                    |                                               |
| 39                                                             |                |                  |                    |                                               |
| 40                                                             |                |                  |                    |                                               |
| <u>4</u> 0                                                     | ×              | x                |                    |                                               |
| <u>4</u> 2                                                     | ^              | x                |                    | ,                                             |
| 12<br>13                                                       |                | ^                |                    |                                               |
| 11<br>11                                                       |                |                  | }                  |                                               |
| 15<br>15                                                       | 1              | }                |                    |                                               |
| 40<br>40                                                       |                |                  |                    |                                               |
| 40                                                             | x              | 1                |                    |                                               |
|                                                                |                |                  |                    |                                               |
| TOTAL                                                          | 20             | 12               | 15                 | 8                                             |
|                                                                |                | 1                | 1                  |                                               |
|                                                                | 1              |                  |                    |                                               |
|                                                                | ļ              |                  |                    |                                               |
|                                                                | · 1            |                  | 1                  |                                               |
|                                                                |                |                  |                    |                                               |

involved is too small to be more conclusive.

## 9. Legal Services

As table 15 illustrates, most organizations seek legal services on the basis of personal references. Only nine, or a little over 20% use legal aid clinics or free legal advice and the same number again have no recourse to legal counsel. There is no discernible difference between the "established" and "emerging" ethnic groups regarding the types or amount of legal service offered, whether they be used for immigration or other purposes.

An overview of the characteristics of the Montreal ethnic organizations surveyed has given us the following picture. 1) Most ethnic organizations are fairly large. The smaller ones have organizational difficulties or limited appeal. 2) More than two thirds of the associations, and the members they represent tend toward the anglophone sector of the Montreal community.

3) Well over 70% of ethnic organizations' members came to Canada since the second World War. Very few who were born in Canada are members of associations. Perhaps this is due to a fear of rejection by other Canadians for participating in "ethnically retentive" organizations. 4) Members of "established" groups have some tendency to belong to professional work categories, and members of the "emerging" ethnic groups have some tendency to be working class. The length of residency is only one factor influencing this mobility. Thus, members of established ethnic groups are more likely to have come to Canada for political reasons and members of emerging groups are more likely to have come for economic reasons.

Accordingly, we have members of "established" ethnic groups in Canada for some 20-25 years, who came here due to political pressures in their original country, who are somewhat likely to be well-off occupationally

TABLE 15

# LEGAL SERVICES

| IROUP<br>IUMBER<br>1<br>2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9 | PERSONAL REFERENCE  x x | LEGAL AID CLINICS OR<br>COUNSEL | MONE        |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------|
| 1<br>2<br>3<br>4                                             |                         |                                 |             |
| 1<br>2<br>3<br>4                                             |                         |                                 |             |
| 2<br>3<br>4                                                  |                         |                                 |             |
| 3<br>4                                                       | 1 22                    | <u> </u>                        |             |
| 4                                                            | x                       | 1                               |             |
| 4                                                            |                         |                                 |             |
| _                                                            | x                       |                                 |             |
| 5                                                            | x                       | i i                             |             |
| 6                                                            |                         | x                               |             |
| 7-                                                           | İ                       | x                               |             |
| 8                                                            | x                       |                                 |             |
| 9                                                            | x                       |                                 |             |
| 10                                                           | x                       | 1                               |             |
| 11                                                           | x                       |                                 |             |
| 12                                                           |                         |                                 |             |
| 12                                                           | x                       | 1                               |             |
| 13                                                           | ×                       |                                 |             |
| 14                                                           | x                       | -                               |             |
| 15                                                           | x                       |                                 |             |
| 16                                                           |                         | ]                               | x           |
| 17                                                           |                         | x                               |             |
| 18                                                           | ×                       | x                               |             |
| 19                                                           |                         | 1                               | x           |
| 20                                                           |                         | x                               | <del></del> |
| 20                                                           | x                       | ^                               | •           |
| 21                                                           |                         | 1                               | x           |
| 22                                                           | x                       |                                 |             |
| 23                                                           |                         | 1                               | x           |
| 24                                                           | x                       |                                 |             |
| 25                                                           | x                       | x                               |             |
| 26                                                           |                         |                                 | x           |
| 27                                                           |                         | 1                               | x           |
| 28                                                           |                         |                                 | x           |
| 20                                                           |                         | 1                               | <b>A</b>    |
| 29                                                           | x                       |                                 |             |
| 30                                                           | ·                       | x                               |             |
| 31                                                           |                         | x                               |             |
| 32                                                           |                         | x                               |             |
| 33<br>34                                                     | x                       |                                 |             |
| 34                                                           | x                       | İ                               |             |
| 35                                                           | x                       | 1                               |             |
|                                                              |                         | 1                               |             |
| 30<br>37                                                     | x                       | J.                              | v           |
| 3/                                                           | ]                       |                                 | x           |
| 36<br>37<br>38<br>39<br>40<br>41<br>42<br>43<br>44<br>45     |                         |                                 |             |
| 39                                                           | x                       |                                 |             |
| 40                                                           | x                       | }                               |             |
| 41                                                           | x                       |                                 |             |
| 42                                                           |                         |                                 | x           |
| 43                                                           |                         | 1                               |             |
| 41                                                           |                         |                                 |             |
| 15<br>15                                                     |                         |                                 |             |
| 45                                                           | x                       |                                 |             |
| 46                                                           | x                       | 1                               |             |
|                                                              |                         | 1                               |             |
| <del></del>                                                  | -                       |                                 |             |
| TOTAL                                                        | 28                      | 9                               | 9           |
|                                                              | 1                       |                                 |             |
|                                                              |                         | 1                               |             |
|                                                              | Į.                      |                                 |             |
|                                                              | 1                       | 1 1                             |             |

**√**>

and who are members of organizations pursuing "ethnically retentive activities". Members of "emerging" ethnic groups came to Canada in the last 10-15 years due to economic pressures in their countries, and they are more likely to be members of working class, pursuing culturally integrative activities.

An overview of the services offered by these groups brings to light several significant points. 1) "Emerging" ethnic groups offer more information and referral services to immigrants 2) Both types of groups place heavy emphasis on the arts 3) "Emerging" ethnic groups have a much greater tendency to offer "culturally integrative" activities in the form of official languages courses, than do "established" ethnic groups. In short the activities of the two types of groups are motivated by their primary needs: cultural and ethnic retention for the "established" ethnic groups, and "cultural integration" leading to economic mobility for the "emerging" ethnic groups. As the conclusion will point out, the multiculturalism policy and more specifically, the grants program is not designed to answer to the full range of these characteristics, or to all of the needs mentioned below. Rather, the grants program objectives are limited, and its effectiveness must be judged in the light of these limitations.

# The Needs and Desires of Ethnic Crganizations

In the interviews and conversations with the organizations, an effort was made to uncover some of what the organizations considered to be their needs or desires. Such needs and desires exist in both the narrow cultural sense, and in the wider social sense, and can range from activities for ethnic retention, a desire for more cooperation from social and governmental institutions, more funds, or better adapted government programs. It is worthwhile to note that the information recorded from each group could

1

represent a need of the community and/or the organization, or a desire of the community and/or the organization. It is difficult to distinguish the two in this study alone. Most organizations will claim that what they desire is to meet the needs of the members of the community or ethnic group which they represent. Since the multiculturalism grants program addresses itself to members of ethnic communities who are organized into groups, then the answers given during the interviews will have to suffice.

In response to the general question "Has your organization recognized or considered certain services or activities which it does not presently offer, but which it considers essential for the well being and development of its community?", seven ethnic groups expressed a desire for assistance in providing increased, or even basic, programming for the aged. Such provisions could include day—outings, visits, social gatherings or a central meeting place. The "established" ethnic groups such as Polish, Roumanian, Hungarian tended to want to establish old folks homes, while members of "emerging" groups such as the Portuguese or Blacks felt their communities could not afford to maintain such homes and that their aged could not afford to live in them. A common desire exists for all the groups, however, and this is to provide appropriate facilities and care so that the aged of their particular cultural group are brought together with their compatriots, and not isolated from further contact, on a group basis, with their ethnicity.

Several organizations expressed a desire for day-care centers. This was noticeable in "emerging" ethnic groups where mothers had to work. This was particularly true for the Greek community. The Blacks and Portuguese wished a publicly-funded medical clinic. The regions of the city which they inhabit have overcrowded facilities. Thus, it should be

noticed that "emerging" ethnic groups have a greater need for essential, and sometimes even parallel, services such as old age homes, day-care centers and medical clinics.

## 1. Language Needs

The question of language needs may be subdivided into three types: official language instruction, non-official language instruction, and other language requirements. In the first category, eight groups indicated a desire of need for such instruction offered locally through their associations and supported federally or provincially through funds for staffing, materials or facilities. Such courses were requested by "emerging" groups, to give the students a working knowledge of the language and to give them some vocational language retraining. Some groups also wished these courses to be directed towards their aged.

Non-official language courses are generally requested by people of "established" ethnic groups who are of second or third generation and who would like their children, or even themselves, to learn the original language as a sign of their cultural distinctiveness. This underlines the trend for return to ethnicity found among the second and third generations of some groups, and discussed in chapter two above.

Other language requirements, mostly for "emerging" groups encompassed improved information concerning language instruction facilities, improved court translations and translations of official federal and other government documents.

#### 2. Cultural Needs

There was a substantial response from thirty-four associations who discussed cultural activities. Twenty-five indicated that they had needs in this area. Groups often spoke of financial support for the creation,

continuation or expansion of their theater and dramatic arts. Some groups regarded these arts activities as essential for their ethnic retention and other regarded it as an essential element to display a part of their culture to other groups, especially French and English Canadian, if a truly integrated society was to exist.

Saturday schools, libraries and travel exchanges with other groups in Canada of the same ethnicity were also requested. Again the purpose of these activities could either be for ethnic retention or integration. Handicrafts, research, sports and international trips or exchanges were also mentioned by some. The ethnic press was also discussed, and few groups were aware of the federal government multiculturalism policy study on this subject. Finally, many groups expressed a desire for standardized third language texts on Canadian topics. This question is still a matter for study by the multiculturalism policy makers.

### 3. Counselling and Information Services

Fourteen organizations discussed the subject of their needs for this type of service. Some wished general information on Canadian social life, geography, history and the political system. This immigrant orientation applies largely to "emerging" ethnic groups. The same applies for requests on Canadian citizenship and immigration regulations. Existing services by government departments and the multiculturalism grants program provide for these needs. "Emerging" groups desired referral services and information about "what was official" by the various government departments and agencies. Counselling needs extend to legal problems, tenants and consumer rights, family planning, budgeting, etc. Most of these are more applicable to "emerging" groups than to "established" ethnic groups.

## 4. Core-Funding

Sixteen of the twenty-five groups responding to this question indicated a need, to varying degrees, for funding. In many instances, there were needs for staff, and a continuation of services depending on personnel available. All organizations seem to lack permanent stable funding. The Black, Greek, Portuguese and Spanish "emerging" groups are all in need of such essential services. By definition, an emerging group does not have the financial or organizational capacity to offset such costs of personnel. On the other hand, established groups also requested Core-funding, but this was primarily for offsetting the administration costs of maintaining centers, including the cultural, educational and library services provided within.

## 5. Immigration

The representatives of most organizations maintain that they need stabilized, long-term funding of reception, integration and counselling services offered on a local basis. As well, there was a desire for increased contacts and more extensive consultations with other groups and departments offering services in the immigrant field. It is at this point that the third structural prerequisite of a third-party coordinator might have some bearing.

Pre-immigration information in all aspects of Canada should be made available. However, others pointed out that this is only a factor and the bulk of the counselling work should be and is done once the immigrant has arrived. One professional in the field says that every community where immigrants settle must establish a full-time or at least a part-time professionally oriented and guided coordinative structure for immigrant integration.

In brief, the immigration needs are for coordinated information sources and facilities, professional social workers on staff and stable core funding for local organizations. Iegal and social service needs are part of information and referral services. It is important to emphasize that "emerging" groups have a significantly greater need for essential services than do the "established" groups, and that, by and large, the requests for funding as examined in the previous section of this chapter seem well-substantiated to the extent that they are based on felt need or expressed desire by local ethnic voluntary associations.

It does seem as if the results of the interviews with the various ethnic organizations substantiated the requests for funds made by ethnic organizations in Montreal. More specifically, the characteristics of the organizations influenced the type services they offered and the types of needs they expressed. The groups interviewed expressed needs which were congruent with those needs expressed by the groups which submitted applications. The interviews with the emerging and established groups demonstrated that the needs expressed by emerging and established groups through requests for funding under the multiculturalism grants program were representative and well founded.

## FOOTNOTES

- 49. For further details, see Sherwood & Wakefield.
- 50. D. Sherwood and A. Wakefield, "Voluntary Associations Among Other Ethnic Groups in Canada". Unpublished Study of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism; Ottawa, pg. 85.
- 51. Ibid. 88
- 52. Ibid. 95

#### CHAPTER V - CONCLUSION

This thesis has attempted to study one aspect of the relationship between a local ethnic group's interests and the response of government to those interests through a policy and programs for community development.

The first chapter of the thesis sought to establish a working concept of community development programs. This was refined to the point of considering only those community development programs which had some involvement by government. It was noted that an effective community development program had to provide a connection between the affected clientele and the government. Given this hypothesis, a particular community and a particular government program were selected for analysis. Montreal's ethnic communities and organizations and the federal government cultural policy and programs for ethnic groups provided a suitable frame of reference for examination. Basically, the statement of the problem consisted of analyzing, by means of a particular local community and by a government program, the characteristics and needs of a particular cultural community, its connection with government, and the adequacy of the response of government to those stated needs. Specifically, one had to establish whether the administration of the multiculturalism programs was a system of rational cooperative action between the government and the communities affected. This would presuppose that the cultural and other needs of local ethnic communities such as those in Montreal, have been represented and answered by the multiculturalism program processes and structures.

In the second part of the thesis, the origin of the government's cultural policy for ethnic groups was traced to the period immediately following World War II. It was important to differentiate between the

(

concepts of a vertical mosaic and an ethnic mosaic. The vertical mosaic has many economic implications while the ethnic mosaic is more culturally oriented. This is pointed out, since the thrust of the multiculturalism policy, as it was analyzed in chapter two, was directed more at attaining cultural rather than economic equality among Canada's ethnic communities. The foundation for the government's multiculturalism policy was based partially on the findings and research of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. However, the Commission's conceptual framework was cultural dualism. Quite clearly then, one may conclude that the Commission's mandate neither permitted it to research nor to make recommendations for an official policy on a multicultural Canada. This position is evident upon examination of the content of the Commission's recommendations. They are very weak and do not compare to those made for the cultural development of the French Canadians.

Immediately upon presentation of the Fourth Volume, the government began a concerted campaign to refute the conceptual basis of cultural dualism, in preparation for the introduction of a policy of multiculturalism. Part of the second chapter was reserved to outline this gradual shift in policy position, as indicated by the speeches of the various ministers. This repudiation was slow before the actual public release of the Commission's recommendations, but was greatly accelerated in the period between the release and the government's policy announcement on the subject. The latter covers a period of roughly eighteen months, from April 1970 to October 1971. During this time, the government was able, by means of various consultations, to formulate a policy and programs in response to the Commission's recommendations. This policy was analyzed along with the content of the programs designed to put it into effect. One particular program, the multiculturalism grants program, was selected from among the policy programs for analysis in

the context of essential processes and structures for effective community development programs.

The pivotal chapter of the thesis attempted to situate the multicultural policy within a framework of rational government administration. Certain processes and structures were set down as being essential elements of the policy execution of rational government community development programs. These processes were outlined as investigation, conclusion, decision, execution and evaluation.

The multiculturalism policy as a whole was considered in terms of this framework in order to establish its potential as an effective community development policy. It was found that the policy had been submitted to the processes of investigation, conclusion, and decision and that it is presently in the state of execution. But there was no lengthy discussion of the policy concerning the evaluation process since there was only a single year of operation and no evaluation had been done at this point in time.

Given the focus of the thesis as being government community development programs, the multiculturalism grants program was selected from among the six multiculturalism programs. This was done because it is the program which, by design, is the most client- or community-oriented. In order to establish the potential of the grants program as an effective community development mechanism, it was applied to the framework of rational government community development programs. Accordingly, the grants program was examined in terms of the processes of investigation, conclusion, decision and execution. This exercise demonstrated that the grants program provided for adequate processes and structures in order to become an effective community development mechanism. At this point, our conclusions were only that the grants program had potential for such a mechanism. Consequently, an evaluation of the operations of such a program was necessary to determine

whether in fact the grants program had conformed to its design.

Chapter four constituted the evaluation, which was undertaken in two steps. The first step of the evaluation was to establish the degree of the responsiveness of the grants program to needs of local ethnic groups as expressed by submissions for grants over a period of a year. It was found that the grants program was increasingly responsive to these needs and thus the program could be called an effective community development mechanism for those groups which made applications.

The second stage of the evaluation consisted of establishing the representativeness of the needs expressed in the grants applications. This was necessary in order to determine whether the grants program was catering only to a select or solicited clientele or whether it could answer to the needs of a cross-section of ethnic groups and thereby be an effective community development program for all ethnic groups. A questionaire was devised and applied to most major ethnic organizations and spokesmen groups in Montreal's ethnic communities. Although not all ethnic organizations were contacted, almost all ethnic groups were reached. The stated needs of the members of the organizations, as well as the characteristics of the organization members closely paralled the needs of ethnic groups as expressed in requests for funding under the multiculturalism program.

Accordingly, we can conclude that the multiculturalism grants program is effective due to its objectives. It has been able to answer and represent a variety of needs of ethnic groups for cultural, information and referral, and immigration counselling services. The multiculturalism policy as a whole is only partially effective. We have seen that it has potential for much more effectiveness as a series of community development programs, but because it has not yet answered to ethnic organizations' needs for core funding on third language instruction and texts, it has limited its

effectiveness. To a certain extent, the policy is an effective community development mechanism because it is responsive to some representative needs of ethnic communities and their individual members. This conclusion differs from a pronouncement on the efficiency and effectiveness of the execution of the individual projects of ethnic groups. It should be the subject of another extensive study to determine and evaluate whether the ethnic groups themselves are effectively meeting the objectives set down by themselves in the scope of funded projects. This thesis study has taken the multiculturalism policy and one of its programs as a case study, and established it as being suited to, and effective as a community development program meeting some of the articulated needs for some of the ethnic communities in Montreal.

#### APPENDIX I

## LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS INTERVIEWED

- 1. Canadian Armenian Congress
- 2. Tekeyan Armenian Cultural Association
- 3. Austrian Society of Montreal
- 4. Montreal Estonian Society
- 5. Lithuanian Canadian Community
- 6. Black Community Association of Côte des Neiges
- 7. Negro Community Centre
- 8. Union Church
- 9. L'Union Nationale Belge de Montréal
- 10. Montreal Chinese Association
- 11. Chinese Service Association (Chinese Catholic Mission)
- 12. Dutch Canadian Association
- 13. Union Nationale Française
- 14. German Benevolent Society
- 15. German Social Centre
- 16. Greek-American Progressive Association
- 17. Association Canadienne des Hellenes d'Egypte
- 18. Hellenic Canadian Community of Montreal
- 19. Cretans Association
- 20. Grand Committee of Hungarian Association of Montreal
- 21. Szechenyi Society Inc.
- 22. India Canada Association of Montreal
- 23. Can-Orient Christian Association of Canada (Montreal Chapter)
- 24. Circolo Sociale Culturale "Giovanni Caboto"
- 25. Order Sons of Italy in Canada
- 26. C.I.D.A., Section Bienfaisance
- 27. Japanese Community Centre
- 28. Société Canada-Japon
- 29. Jewish Immigrant Aid Services
- 30. Allied Jewish Community Services
- 31. Cercle Juif de Langue Française
- 32. Association Sépharade Francophone
- 33. Lebanese-Syrian Canadian Association

- 34. Canadian Polish Congress
- 35. Club Portugal de Montréal
- 36. Communauté des Portugais
- 37. Norwegian Club of Montreal
- 38. Montreal Suomi Association
- 39. L'Union des Organisations Ethniques Russes de la Province de Québec
- 40. Canadian Slovak League
- 41. Ukrainian Canadian Committee
- 42. Canada Korea Cultural Foundation
- 43. Centro Gallego de Montreal
- 44. Federation of Swiss Societies in Eastern Canada
- 45. Eglise Orthodoxe Roumaine de Montréal
- 46. Centre d'Accueil St-Sauveur

# APPENDIX II

## QUESTIONNAIRE

|    | . NAM | <u> </u>                 |                   |                   |                          |                                |
|----|-------|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2  | . ADI | DRESS:                   |                   |                   |                          | ZONE:                          |
| 3  |       | EPHONE:                  | ·                 |                   |                          |                                |
| 4  | . Aff | filiation:<br>Zations, ] | : (In c           | ase of<br>h organ | affiliation<br>izations) | with one or more benevolent or |
| 5  | • How | 7 long has               |                   |                   | tion been ac             | ctive?                         |
| _  |       |                          | year              |                   |                          |                                |
| 6. |       |                          | princip           | al offic          | cers of the              | organization?                  |
|    | a)    | NAME:<br>ADDRESS:        | · · · · · · · · · |                   |                          |                                |
|    |       |                          |                   |                   |                          |                                |
|    |       | TELEPHON                 | E: —              |                   |                          |                                |
|    | b)    | NAME:                    |                   |                   |                          |                                |
|    |       | ADDRESS:                 |                   |                   |                          |                                |
|    |       | TELEPHON                 |                   | •                 |                          |                                |
| 7. |       | many act                 |                   | bers are          | e there at t             | his time?                      |
|    | a)    |                          | 1                 | to                | 49                       |                                |
|    | b)    |                          | 50                | to                | 99                       |                                |
|    | c)    |                          | 100               | to                | 199                      |                                |
|    | ·     |                          |                   | ~                 |                          |                                |
|    | d)    |                          | 200               | to                | 399                      |                                |
|    | e)    |                          | 400 o             | r more            |                          |                                |
| 8. | In    | general,                 | from wh           | at cult           | ural milieu              | come the members of your organ |
|    |       |                          |                   |                   |                          |                                |

PRIMARILY FRENCH

OTHER

ENGLISH AND FRENCH

1

b)

c)

đ)

| T.   | . 10. | How is the member<br>dence in Canada? | rship distribut<br>(in %).       | ced according to | the number of years of resi-           |
|------|-------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------------|
|      |       | a)                                    | SINCE BIRTH                      |                  |                                        |
|      |       | b)                                    | 0 to                             | 10 YEARS         | ક                                      |
|      |       | c)                                    | 10 to                            | 25 YEARS         | <b></b> %                              |
|      |       | d)                                    | 25 or more                       |                  | <b>8</b>                               |
|      |       |                                       |                                  |                  | 100.0                                  |
|      | 11.   | How is the member                     | ahin diatribut                   | od aggording to  | 100 % income brackets? (in %).         |
|      | TT.   | now is the member                     | siip distribut                   | ed according to  | mode brackets? (m s).                  |
|      |       | \$3,000. to                           | \$5,000.                         | \$10,000.        | to \$20,000. \(\frac{\frac{2}{3}}{3}\) |
|      |       | \$5,000. to                           | \$10,000. 2                      | \$20,000.        | and over §                             |
|      | 12.   | How is the member                     | ship distribut                   | ed according to  | occupation? (in %).                    |
|      |       | a) MANAGERS AND                       | PROFESSIONAL W                   | ORK              | - %                                    |
|      |       | b) CLERICAL                           |                                  |                  | %                                      |
|      |       | c) SALES OR SERV                      | TICES                            |                  | <b>8</b>                               |
|      |       | d) Craftsmen and                      | PRODUCTION WO                    | PRKERS           | <b>9</b>                               |
| ;    |       | e) LABOURERS                          |                                  |                  | <b></b> %                              |
| -    |       | f) OTHERS                             |                                  |                  | <b>9</b>                               |
|      |       |                                       |                                  |                  | 100 %                                  |
|      | 13.   | Approximately wha                     | t % of the mem                   | bership          |                                        |
|      |       | a) lives within<br>Centre (if su      | one-half (½) m<br>ch a centre ex |                  | ization 8                              |
|      |       | b) lives in anot                      | her part of me                   | tropolitan Montr | eal?                                   |
|      |       | Which areas?                          |                                  |                  |                                        |
|      |       |                                       |                                  |                  |                                        |
|      |       |                                       |                                  |                  |                                        |
|      | 14.   |                                       | anization own                    | or have the regu | lar use of a group Centre              |
|      |       | or building?                          | ·ma [                            | , TO []          |                                        |
|      |       | L) TE MOC - 1-1-                      | YES                              | NO               | h103                                   |
|      |       | b) If YES, what                       | physical facti                   | ities are availa | pier                                   |
|      |       |                                       |                                  |                  |                                        |
|      |       |                                       |                                  |                  |                                        |
| C.P. |       |                                       | <del></del>                      |                  |                                        |
| -    |       |                                       |                                  | ·                |                                        |

## B) OBJECTIVES AND SERVICES OF THE ORGANIZATION

| W    | at are the objectives of your organization or group?                                     |                   |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
|      |                                                                                          |                   |
| Wł   | ich of these services does your organization provide?                                    |                   |
| a)   | LANGUAGE COURSES (English and/or French)                                                 |                   |
| b)   | OTHER LANGUAGE COURSES                                                                   |                   |
| · c) | IMMIGRATION ASSISTANCE                                                                   |                   |
| d)   | CITIZENSHIP PREPARATION                                                                  |                   |
| e)   | IMMIGRANT ORIENTATION                                                                    | 一                 |
| f)   | LECAL AID                                                                                | 一                 |
| g)   | INFORMATION and/or COUNSELLING ON SOCIAL SERVICES (Welfare, unemployment insurance, etc) |                   |
| h)   | LOCAL CHARITABLE SERVICES                                                                |                   |
| i)   | FAMILY COUNSELLING SERVICES                                                              |                   |
| j)   | CONSUMER PROTECTION                                                                      | $\overline{\Box}$ |
| k)   | TENANT'S COUNSELLING and/or HOUSING INDEX                                                |                   |
| 1)   | EMPLOYMENT PLACEMENT SERVICE                                                             | 一                 |
| m)   | BANKING, TRUST OR CREDIT SERVICES                                                        | ī                 |
| n)   | OTHERS: specify                                                                          |                   |
|      |                                                                                          |                   |
| Wh   | ich of these socio-cultural activities are offered by your                               | organizati        |
| a)   | EDUCATION FOR YOUTH (other than languages)                                               |                   |
| b)   | ADULT EDUCATION (other than languages)                                                   |                   |
| c)   | LIBRARY                                                                                  |                   |
| d)   | PUBLISHING FACILITIES OR SUPPORT                                                         |                   |
| e)   | INTER-GROUP MEETINGS AND EVENTS                                                          |                   |
| f)   | DRAMATIC ARTS (including dance, choral or drama groups)                                  |                   |
| g)   | OTHER ARTS AND LEFTERS                                                                   |                   |
| h)   | CRAFTS FACILITIES and/or INSTRUCTION                                                     |                   |
| i)   | YOUTH CLUBS                                                                              |                   |
| j)   | ADULT SOCIAL ACTIVITIES                                                                  |                   |

|           | k)         | SPORTS ACTIVITIES                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|-----------|------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|           | 1)         | VACATION CAMPS                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|           | m)         | POLITICAL CLUBS OR ASSOCIATIONS                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|           | n)         | OTHERS: specify                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|           |            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|           |            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 4.        | act<br>ess | your organization recognized or considered certain services or ivities which it does not presently offer, but which it considers ential for the well-being and development of its community?  YES NO THE WEST, explain the nature of such requirements and the best means of |
|           | sat        | isfying them in your opinion:                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|           |            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|           |            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|           |            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|           |            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|           |            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|           |            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|           |            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 5.        | Τ.ΔΝ       | GUAGE:                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| <b>J.</b> | a)         | In what surroundings do you believe that your members find the greatest difficulty in using a language other than their mother tongue?                                                                                                                                       |
|           |            | at work                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
|           |            | in general contacts with the public                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|           |            | at home                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
|           | b)         | What efforts have your organization made to attempt to remedy such problems?                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|           |            | LANGUAGE COURSES (provincial funded)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|           |            | LANGUAGE COURSES (privately funded)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|           |            | INTER-CULTURAL MEETINGS AND EVENTS WITH ENGLISH-SPEAKING COMMUNITY                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|           |            | INTER-CULTURAL MEETINGS AND EVENTS WITH FRENCH-SPEAKING COMMUNITY                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|           |            | FILMS ON LANGUAGES, OR TAPES                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|           |            | LIBRARY FACILITIES                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|           |            | OTHERS: specify                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|           |            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |

| -        |      | c)   | What e                   | efforts do you<br>ield?                           | believe t                | he federal                   | governmen                | nt might m             | ake in                              |
|----------|------|------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
|          |      |      |                          |                                                   |                          |                              |                          |                        |                                     |
|          |      | đ)   |                          | nigrants to Mor<br>ater linguistic                |                          |                              |                          |                        | 7, still                            |
|          |      |      | ••• be                   | efore 1960? _                                     |                          |                              |                          |                        |                                     |
|          |      | e)   | Do lin<br>to Mon<br>here | guistic proble<br>treal tend to                   | ms among i<br>diminish d | immigrants o<br>or desappear | of this c<br>r with th   | cultural grae duration | roup coming<br>n of residence<br>NO |
|          |      |      |                          | if English and<br>tion was recei                  |                          |                              |                          |                        |                                     |
|          |      |      |                          | if English and<br>tion was provi                  |                          |                              |                          |                        |                                     |
| <u> </u> |      |      |                          | if the immigra<br>older on his a                  |                          |                              | c                        |                        |                                     |
|          |      | f)   | how lo                   | there has been<br>ng does it tak<br>to Montreal t | e for a ne               | ew immigrant                 | of your                  | cultural               |                                     |
|          |      |      |                          | i)<br>;;)                                         | French<br>English        |                              |                          |                        |                                     |
|          | 6. 3 | IMMI | GRA <b>T</b> ION         | AND CITIZENSH                                     |                          |                              |                          |                        |                                     |
|          | -    | a)   | Does y                   | our organizati<br>of immigrant o<br>YES           | on conside               | —<br>er that it h            |                          |                        |                                     |
|          |      | b)   | If YES                   | , what activit                                    | ies has it               | undertaken                   | to fulf                  | ill these              | needs?                              |
|          |      |      |                          | IMMIGRATION A                                     | SSISTANCE                | WORKERS -                    | FULL-TI<br>or<br>PART-TI |                        |                                     |
|          |      |      |                          | INFORMATION C<br>SERVICES                         | ONCERNING                | COMMUNITY A                  | ND GOVER                 | NMENT                  |                                     |
|          |      |      |                          | HOUSING INDEX<br>IMMIGRANTS                       | and/or PI                | ACEMENT SEF                  | WICE FOR                 | RECENT                 |                                     |
| - V      |      |      |                          | FILMS, EXHIBI<br>AND HABITS                       | TS OR PRES               | SENTATIONS C                 | N CANADI                 | AN LIFE                |                                     |
| ,        |      |      |                          | CIVIC TRAININ<br>political str                    |                          |                              | .aws, his                | tory,                  |                                     |

|   |    |             | CONTACTS WITH DEPARTMENT OF MANPOWER AND IMMIGRATION                                                                                               |
|---|----|-------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| - |    |             | SPECIAL LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION FOR IMMIGRANTS                                                                                                        |
|   |    |             | OTHERS: specify                                                                                                                                    |
|   |    |             |                                                                                                                                                    |
|   |    |             |                                                                                                                                                    |
|   |    |             |                                                                                                                                                    |
|   |    | c)<br>_     | What further projects or services might your organization offer (if funds and personnel were available) to satisfy community needs in these areas? |
|   |    |             |                                                                                                                                                    |
|   | •  |             |                                                                                                                                                    |
|   |    |             |                                                                                                                                                    |
|   |    |             |                                                                                                                                                    |
|   |    |             |                                                                                                                                                    |
|   |    |             |                                                                                                                                                    |
|   | 7. | SOC         | IAL SERVICES                                                                                                                                       |
|   |    | a)          | According to you, what are the principal social needs of newly-arrived                                                                             |
| ğ |    |             | immigrants in Montreal?                                                                                                                            |
|   |    | <del></del> |                                                                                                                                                    |
|   |    | _           |                                                                                                                                                    |
|   |    |             |                                                                                                                                                    |
|   |    | _           |                                                                                                                                                    |
|   |    | -           |                                                                                                                                                    |
|   |    | b) -        | What services are offered by your organization to meet these needs in                                                                              |
|   |    | ,           | the following areas:                                                                                                                               |
|   |    |             | i) local charitable services:                                                                                                                      |
|   |    |             |                                                                                                                                                    |
|   |    |             |                                                                                                                                                    |
|   |    |             | ii) social welfare assistance:                                                                                                                     |
|   |    |             |                                                                                                                                                    |
|   |    |             |                                                                                                                                                    |
|   |    |             | iii) family counselling:                                                                                                                           |
|   |    |             |                                                                                                                                                    |
|   |    |             |                                                                                                                                                    |
| Ì |    |             | iv) tenant's counselling and/or housing index:                                                                                                     |
|   |    |             |                                                                                                                                                    |
|   |    |             |                                                                                                                                                    |
|   |    |             |                                                                                                                                                    |

| ,        |               | v) employment placement service:                                                                                                                 |
|----------|---------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| -        |               |                                                                                                                                                  |
|          |               |                                                                                                                                                  |
|          |               | vi) consumer protection:                                                                                                                         |
|          |               |                                                                                                                                                  |
|          |               |                                                                                                                                                  |
|          |               | vii) others:                                                                                                                                     |
|          |               |                                                                                                                                                  |
|          |               |                                                                                                                                                  |
|          | c)            | Does your organization regularly refer or recommend members existing Montreal to social services and agencies, other than your own organization? |
|          |               | YES NO                                                                                                                                           |
|          |               | If NO, for what reasons?                                                                                                                         |
|          |               |                                                                                                                                                  |
|          |               |                                                                                                                                                  |
|          |               |                                                                                                                                                  |
| Ì        |               | If YES, list the agencies recommended along with the purpose for which that agency is consulted:                                                 |
| •        |               |                                                                                                                                                  |
|          |               |                                                                                                                                                  |
|          |               |                                                                                                                                                  |
|          |               |                                                                                                                                                  |
|          |               |                                                                                                                                                  |
|          | 8. <u>LEX</u> | GAL AID                                                                                                                                          |
|          | a)            | Is there a publicly legal aid clinic in the geographical area where most of your organization's members reside?                                  |
| •        |               | YES NO                                                                                                                                           |
|          | b)            | If YES, does your organization have any links or agreements with such a clinic?                                                                  |
|          |               | YES NO                                                                                                                                           |
|          |               | If YES, describe such links:                                                                                                                     |
|          |               |                                                                                                                                                  |
|          |               | TC NO she water                                                                                                                                  |
| ·        |               | If NO, why not?                                                                                                                                  |
| <b>.</b> |               |                                                                                                                                                  |
|          |               |                                                                                                                                                  |

| T.             |        | c) If no clinic is available, does your organization feel a need in its cultural community for legal counselling services?                                                             |
|----------------|--------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                |        | YES NO                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|                |        | d) In what way might your organization define the need for legal services in its cultural community, and seek to meet this need? (e.g. criminal, civil, immigration law services, etc) |
|                |        |                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|                |        | e) What legal services are presently o-fered by your organization?                                                                                                                     |
|                |        | LEGAL AID OFFICE                                                                                                                                                                       |
|                |        | LAWYER ON STAFF                                                                                                                                                                        |
|                |        | LAWYER REFERENCE SERVICE                                                                                                                                                               |
|                |        | OTHERS: specify                                                                                                                                                                        |
|                |        |                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|                |        |                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|                |        | NONE                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| <del>~</del> { |        |                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|                |        |                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|                | C) FED | ERAL PROGRAMME                                                                                                                                                                         |
|                | 1.     | Are the members of your organization aware of the federal government policy relating to the maintenance and development of multiculturalism in Canada?                                 |
|                |        | YES NO                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|                | 2.     | Are the members aware that the federal government offers grants to organizations under the multiculturalism policy to support various cultural group activities?                       |
|                |        | YES NO                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|                | 3.     | Has your organization already received financial aid from the Citizenship Branch of the Department of the Secretary of State?                                                          |
|                |        | YES NO                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|                |        | from another federal department or agency?                                                                                                                                             |
|                |        | YES NO                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|                |        | If YES, when, how much and what purpose was such aid given?                                                                                                                            |
| ,              |        |                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|                |        |                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|                |        |                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|                | -      |                                                                                                                                                                                        |

| and services to new immigrants?  YES NO                                |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| In your opinion, how might federal services be improved in this field? |
|                                                                        |
|                                                                        |
|                                                                        |
|                                                                        |
|                                                                        |
|                                                                        |
|                                                                        |
|                                                                        |
|                                                                        |
|                                                                        |
|                                                                        |
|                                                                        |
|                                                                        |
|                                                                        |
|                                                                        |
|                                                                        |
|                                                                        |
|                                                                        |
|                                                                        |
|                                                                        |
|                                                                        |
|                                                                        |
| i                                                                      |
|                                                                        |
|                                                                        |
|                                                                        |
|                                                                        |
|                                                                        |
|                                                                        |
|                                                                        |
|                                                                        |

### PRIMARY SOURCES

Applications for Grants from the <u>Multiculturalism Grants Program</u>. February 1t, May 1, September 1, 1972.

Blondin, Michel, <u>Ie Projet St-Henri</u>. Conseil des Oeuvres; Août 1965.

Citizenship Branch, Survey of non-French and non-English Ethnic Groups in the Area of Greater Montreal with

the Exception of the Jewish and Italian Population.

Montreal, October 1970.

Clark, S.D., Movements of Protest in Post-War Canadian Society.

Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, 1970.

Federal Response to Book IV of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. Ottawa; October 8, 1971.

Jaenen, Cornelius, Federal Policy Vis-à-Vis Ethnic Groups. Unpublished paper; Ottawa, 1971.

Lupil, M.R. Some Aspects of Western Education. Paper presented at the Seminar on Comparative Education.

Office of the Prime Minister, Press Release. Statement by the Prime Minister in the House of Commons. October 8, 1971.

Pelletier, Gérard, Notes from a Speech to the Canadian Conference of the Arts. Toronto, September 12, 1970.

Pelletier, Gérard, Vers la Définition d'une Politique Culturelle.

Allocution prononcée devant la Chambre de Commerce de Montréal, Octobre 28, 1968.

Porter, John,

Dilemnas and Contributions of a Multi-Ethnic Society.

Paper presented to Section II of the Royal Society
of Canada; St.Johns, Nfld.; June 8, 1972.

Province of Manitoba, New Cultural Policy, July 16, 1971.

Rocher, Guy

(

Richmond, Anthony, Immigration and Pluralism in Canada. International Migration Review; Fall, 1969.

Les Ambiguités d'un Canada Bilingue et Multi-culturel. Présenté à une session de la réunion annuelle de la Société Canadienne de Sociologie et d'Anthropologie; 30 mai, 1972.

Sanders, Irwin,

The Concept of Community Development. in L.J. Cary,
ed., Community Development as a Process. University
of Missouri Press; U.S.A., 1970.

| Secretary of State, | Guidelines for Grants for Multicultural Projects.<br>January 12, 1972 and April 1972, Ottawa.                                                                                                      |
|---------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Secretary of State, | Press Release. Funds Now Available to Support Federal Multicultural Policy, Ottawa; January 12, 1972.                                                                                              |
| Stanbury, Robert,   | Notes from a Speech to the <u>Canadian Citizenship</u><br><u>Federation</u> . Winnipeg; April 5, 1970.                                                                                             |
| Stanbury, Robert,   | Notes from a Speech to the <u>Canadian Ethnic Press</u><br><u>Federation</u> . Toronto; April 11, 1970.                                                                                            |
| Stanbury, Robert,   | Notes d'une Allocution Prononcée au Colloque International sur les Langues et les Cultures au Sein d'une Société Pluriculturelle. Comité inter-universitaire canadien-slave. Ottawa; 22 mai, 1971. |
| Stanbury, Robert,   | Community Dialogue' 70. Thunder Bay; January 23, 1970.                                                                                                                                             |
| Stanbury, Robert,   | Notes from a Speech at <u>Czechoslovak Day and Sokol</u> <u>Festival</u> . Scarborough; July 5, 1970.                                                                                              |
| Stanbury, Robert,   | Notes from a Speech to the <u>Men's Canadian Club</u> .<br>Vancouver; May 8, 1970.                                                                                                                 |
| Stanbury, Robert,   | Notes d'une Allocution Prononcée à la 5lième Réunion<br>Annuelle des Services Canadiens d'Assistance aux<br>Immigrants Juifs; 4 mai, 1970.                                                         |
| Stanbury, Robert,   | Symposium on National Unity. MacDonald-Cartier Secondary School; Sudbury, February 28, 1970.                                                                                                       |

Agnew, W.H., Historical Review of the Canadian Citizenship Branch. Ottawa, 1967.

Boissevain, Jeremy, The Italians of Montreal. Study # 7 of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism; Ottawa, 1970.

Bourassa, Guy,

Les Relations Ethniques dans la Vie Politique

Montréalaise. Unpublished study of the Royal

Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism.

Cook, Ramsay, The Maple Leaf Forever. Toronto, 1971.

Draper, James, Citizen Participation: Canada. New Press; Toronto, 1971.

Driedger, Elmer, Subordinate Legislation. In Willes and Kernighan (eds),

Public Administration in Canada. Methuen, Toronto, 1968.

Engelman, F.C. and Schwartz, M.A., Political Parties and the Canadian Social Structure. Prentice Hall; Toronto, 1967.

Frankel, Saul, "Political Orientations and Ethnicity in a Bicultural Society". Unpublished Study of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism.

Glazer, Nathan and Beyond the Melting Pot. Second Edition; Cambridge, Moynihan Daniel, U.S.A. 1970.

Gleason, Philip, The Melting Pot: Symbol of Fusion or Confusion?

American Quarterly; Spring, 1964.

Gordon, Milton, <u>Assimilation in American Life.</u> New York, 1964.

Hodgetts, J.E., and Canadian Public Administration. MacMillan & Co.; Toronto, 1960.

Institut Canadien pour Colloque sur <u>L'Information au Gouvernement Fédéral.</u>
1'Education des Adultes 8 janvier 1969.

Kattan, N., Intégration des Immigrants Francophones à la Vie

Canadienne. Unpublished Study of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism.

Kluckhohn and Kroeber, <u>Culture</u>. A. Knopf; New York, 1963.

Kruhlak, O., et al., <u>Canadian Political Process</u>. Toronto, 1970.

Leslie, P.M., The Role of Political Parties in Promoting the Interests of Ethnic Minorities. CJPS vol. 2, # 4, Dec. 1969. Linguistic and Ethnic Segregation in Montreal. Lieberson, S., Unpublished Study of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. Lightbody, James, A Note on the Theory of Nationalism as a Function of Ethnic Demands. CJPS vol. 2, # 3, Sept. 1969. The Structure of Canadian Government. Macmillan Mallory, J.R., Co.; Toronto, 1971. Manitoba Mosaic Congress, Proceedings, October 17, 1970. Citizenship and the Disadvantaged. In James Draper, McEwen, E.R., Citizen Participation: Canada. New Press; Toronto, Petersen, William, "Planned Migration: The Social Determinants of the Dutch-Canadian Movement. Berkeley, 1955. The Vertical Mosaic. University of Toronto Press; Porter, John, Toronto, 1968. Richmond, A.H., Post-War Immigrants in Canada. University of Toronto, Rowat, Donald, The Ombudsman: Citizen's Defender. 2nd Edition, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1968. Sherwood, D. and Voluntary Associations Among Other Ethnic Groups in Wakefield, A., Canada: RCB & B Study, Ottawa. Smith, M.G., Social and Cultural Pluralism. Annals of N.Y. Academy of Sciences. Treasury Board, Planning, Programming and Budgeting Guide. Vallee, Frank, et al. Ethnic Assimilation and Differentiation in Canada. CJEPS; vol. XXIII, no 4. Nov. 1957. Watts, Ronald, Multicultural Societies and Federalism. Study of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism.

Administrative Decentralization. In Willms and

Public Administration in Canada. Methuen, Toronto, 1968.

Kernighan (eds.)

Willms, A.M.,