1

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

CANADIAN THESES
ON MICROFICHE

THÈSES CANADIENNES
SUR MICROFICHE

44409

NAME OF AUTHOR/NOM DE L'AUTEUR

John Jaworsky

TITLE OF THESIS/TITRE DE LA THÈSE

A Case Study of the Canadian
Federal Government's Multiculturalism
Policy

UNIVERSITY/UNIVERSITÉ

Carleton University

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/

GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE

M. A.

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE DEGRÉ

1979

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE

Prof. Bohdan R. Bociurkiw

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF
CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies
of the film.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈ-
QUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et
de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the
thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or other-
wise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la
thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés
ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

DATED/DATE

Sept. 20, 1979

SIGNED/SIGNE

J. Jaworsky

PERMANENT ADDRESS/RÉSIDENCE FIXE

77 Bullock Ave.
Ottawa, Ontario
K1S 1G9

National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

**THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED**

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

**LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE**

A CASE STUDY OF THE CANADIAN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S
MULTICULTURALISM POLICY

by

John Jaworsky, B.Sc.

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of
Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
Department of Political Science

Carleton University

OTTAWA, Ontario

September 10, 1979

8

The undersigned recommend to the Faculty of
Graduate Studies & Research acceptance of the thesis:

"A Case Study of The Canadian Federal Government's
Multiculturalism Policy"

submitted by John S. Jaworsky, B.Sc..

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

.....
Thesis Supervisor

.....
Chairman, Department of Political Science

Carleton University

September 1979

ABSTRACT

The federal government's multiculturalism policy was announced in 1971 in response to increasing activism among Canadian ethnic groups of non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French origin during the middle and late sixties. The thesis briefly examines the historical background to the announcement of the multiculturalism policy, surveys the various debates on the place of the non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups in Canadian society, and describes the implementation of the policy from 1971 to the spring of 1979. Special attention is devoted to the significance of the establishment of "junior" minister of state portfolios for multiculturalism as well as other policy areas such as fitness and amateur sports, small business, etc., and the difficulty of establishing both a theoretical and administrative framework for the multiculturalism policy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am very grateful for the helpful comments and assistance of Professor Bociurkiw and other professors in various departments of Carleton University. I also wish to thank my parents for their patience, advice, and valuable support throughout all stages of preparation of the thesis.

Many civil servants, especially former and present employees of the Citizenship Branch, Department of the Secretary of State, were very generous in giving me their time and advice. Although they shall remain anonymous, their assistance, as well as that of all the other individuals who were interviewed, was greatly appreciated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter	
I. MINISTRIES AND MINISTERS OF STATE	10
The Growth of the Cabinet	10
The Ministries of State for Science and Technology and Urban Affairs	16
The Demise of the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs	19
The Minister of State for Federal-Provincial Relations	21
The Junior Ministers of State	25
II. BACKGROUND TO THE ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE MULTICULTURALISM POLICY	34
Introduction	34
The Early Years	36
1941-1961	38
1962-1971	42
Ethnocultural Pluralism and the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism	45
The Thinkers' Conference on Cultural Rights	54
Innovation in Ottawa	56
The Consultation Stage	63
III. THE DEBATE OVER MULTICULTURALISM	68
Ethnic Pluralism in the United States	68
Ethnic Studies in Canada	73
Ethnic Affiliation, Social Mobility, and Group Rights in Canada	75
Dualism and Multiculturalism	80
Francophones and Multiculturalism	82
What Kind of Multiculturalism?	88
IV. THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MULTICULTURALISM POLICY: 1971-1974	92
The First Programs	92
The Politicization of Multiculturalism?	92
"Ethnic" Politics in Canada	98
The First Minister of State (Multiculturalism)	101
The Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism	103
Expansion of the Multiculturalism Programs	106
New and Old Problems	108

V. THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MULTICULTURALISM POLICY: 1974-1979 112

The Appointment of John Munro	112
Reorientation of the Multiculturalism Policy	114
Reaction to the Reorientation	117
The Reorientation: Problems in the Political and Bureaucratic Arenas	121
The Appointment of Joseph Guay	129
The Appointment of Norman Cafik	130

CONCLUSIONS

Persistent Ambiguities	133
The Coordinating Role of the Multiculturalism Policy and the Minister of State (Multiculturalism)	137
The Future of the Multiculturalism Policy	143

APPENDIX A JUNIOR MINISTERS OF STATE AND MINISTERS WITHOUT PORTFOLIO, AUGUST 1971 TO JUNE 1979	149
---	-----

APPENDIX B SUMMARY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF BOOK 4 OF THE REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	150
--	-----

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	155
-----------------------------	-----

INTRODUCTION

On October 8, 1971 Prime Minister Trudeau announced the federal government's multiculturalism policy in the House of Commons:

...the government has accepted all those recommendations of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism which are contained in Volume IV of its reports directed to federal departments and agencies....

Volume IV examined the whole question of cultural and ethnic pluralism in this country and the status of our various cultures and languages....

It was the view of the royal commission, shared by the government and, I am sure, by all Canadians, that there cannot be one cultural policy for Canadians of British and French origin, another for the original peoples and yet a third for all others. For although there are two official languages, there is no official culture, nor does any ethnic group take precedence over any other. No citizen or group of citizens is other than Canadian, and all should be treated fairly....

A policy of multiculturalism within a bilingual framework commends itself to the government as the most suitable means of assuring the cultural freedom of Canadians...It can form the base of a society which is based on fair play for all....

The policy I am announcing today accepts the contention of the other cultural communities that they, too, are essential elements in Canada and deserve government assistance in order to contribute to regional and national life in ways that derive from their heritage yet are distinctively Canadian.¹

Trudeau stated that the government would implement a policy of multiculturalism by providing support to ethnocultural groups in four ways:

First, resources permitting, the government will seek to assist all Canadian cultural groups that have demonstrated a desire and effort to continue to develop a capacity to grow and contribute to Canada, and a clear need for assistance, the small and weak groups no less than the strong and highly organized.

Second, the government will assist members of all cultural groups to overcome cultural barriers to full participation in

¹Canada, House of Commons, Official Report of Debates, 28th Parliament, 3rd Session, 1971, pp. 8545-46.

Canadian society.

Third, the government will promote creative encounters and interchange among all Canadian cultural groups in the interest of national unity.

Fourth, the government will continue to assist immigrants to acquire at least one of Canada's official languages in order to become full participants in Canadian society.²

The response of the other political parties to the prime minister's statement was unanimous agreement with the policy.³

In short, the federal government's position was that it would not support a "melting pot" approach to the reality of Canada's ethno-cultural diversity, and did not consider assimilation to be a desirable goal for Canadian society. The multiculturalism policy was to promote ethnocultural diversification, greater citizen participation, and a greater concern for basic human rights, with the hope that this would lead to the elimination of discrimination and a reinforcement of national unity.⁴

The announcement of the multiculturalism policy was a response to several trends and tendencies in Canadian society during the sixties. These trends and tendencies will be described in a later chapter; however, some of the factors which were probably instrumental in leading to the announcement of this policy were the increased dynamism and activity of French Canadians both within and outside Quebec and the publicity generated by the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and

²Ibid., p: 8546.

³Ibid., pp. 8546-48.

⁴Canada, Federal Government, "Response to Book 4 of the Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism," Document tabled in the House of Commons, Debates, 28th Parliament, 3rd Session, 1971, pp. 8580-85.

Biculturalism, complaints by representatives of ethnocultural groups of non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French background that the debate on Canada's identity was not taking the contribution of these groups into account, and the enthusiasm for cultural pluralism and "doing your own thing" in North America during the sixties and early seventies reflected in the literature on the "new ethnicity" in the United States. Changes in immigration patterns to Canada during the sixties and the increasing concentration of immigrants (particularly the "visible" minorities--Black and Asian Canadians) in major urban centers, provincial initiatives in promoting ethnocultural diversity, and increasing federal and provincial activism in the field of cultural affairs were also important factors.

From the time of the announcement of the multiculturalism policy to the present day many sociologists, politicians, journalists, and representatives of various ethnocultural groups have seen the policy as being ambiguous, contradictory, and largely symbolic in nature. Skepticism concerning the policy is evident in the titles of a number of journal and newspaper articles dealing with multiculturalism: "Les ambiguïtés d'un Canada bilingue et multiculturel"; "The Unclear Direction of Ottawa's Program for Multiculturalism"; "The Contradictions of Multiculturalism"; and "Sometimes Words Fail, and the Word that's Failed Us Most Is 'Multiculturalism'".⁵

There are a number of reasons why many observers have viewed the idea and policy of multiculturalism with skepticism, and a wide array

⁵ Guy Rocher, Revue de l'Association Canadienne d'éducation de langue française 1 (September 1972): 21-23; Globe and Mail, 11 November 1974; Vancouver Sun, 26 April 1978; Abraham J. Arnold, Maclean's, 24 July 1978, p. 8.

of arguments has been ranged for and against the policy.⁶ Some assimilationists are concerned about the stress placed on group maintenance and belonging as opposed to individual self-development, while pluralists contend that ethnicity can supply a liberating rather than a narrow-minded focus for identity. Many sociologists have argued that a policy of multiculturalism will help maintain a "vertical mosaic," with class cleavages in Canadian society complementing ethnic cleavages to preserve values incompatible with the social and economic mobility of individuals from minority ethnocultural groups, while other sociologists have questioned these arguments. Some critics claim that a policy of multiculturalism threatens to undermine the work of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, since it "distorts" what they believe to be the reality of Canadian life--two primary cultures (anglophone and francophone), tied to the two main language groups in Canada. Multiculturalism is seen as undermining the status of French Canadians, and many francophones within and outside of Quebec have been hostile to this policy.

Scholars and journalists have drawn attention to the ambiguity of the term multiculturalism itself, and sociologists have endlessly debated the meaning and implications of multiculturalism, and the proper use of terminology in this area.⁷ Is Canada a "multicultural" or "multi-ethnic" country? Can one talk of many cultures in Canada, or of two

⁶ For more details and references concerning these arguments see Chapter III below and Howard Palmer, "Reluctant Hosts: Anglo-Canadian Views of Multiculturalism in the Twentieth Century," in Multiculturalism as State Policy: Conference Report, Second Canadian Conference on Multiculturalism, Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism (Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1976), pp. 100-109.

⁷ For a discussion of the ambiguous use of terminology in the

main cultures and a host of minor sub-cultures? Can a culture effectively exist without a language? Is multiculturalism a policy for all Canadians, or only for the non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups? What is the place of the native peoples within the Canadian "mosaic"? Can one talk of a "third force" in Canadian society, or are the backgrounds and aspirations of the numerous ethnocultural groups of non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French origin so disparate that there is little cooperation of any significance among them?

Of course, those responsible for a new area of policy are always faced with numerous difficulties in determining the goals, terms of reference, and scope of the given policy initiatives, choosing the most efficient and humane means of achieving set goals, building up a constituency, and countering criticism. The manner in which the multiculturalism policy has been implemented and the skepticism which it still incurs, however, reflect the difficulties which have been encountered in determining a basic framework for the policy. The problems mentioned above are compounded by a traditional reluctance on the part of the Canadian government to become overly involved in cultural policy,⁸ the ever-present problem of contention over federal-provincial jurisdiction, and the absence of a powerful base of well-articulated public support for the multiculturalism policy.

sociology of ethnic groups, see Joseph R. Manyoni, "Ethnics and Non-Ethnics: Facts and Fads in the Study of Intergroup Relations," in Ethnic Canadians: Culture and Education, ed. Martin L. Kovacs (Regina: Canadian Plains Research Center, University of Regina, 1978), pp. 27-42; Wsewolod W. Isajiw, "Definitions of Ethnicity," Ethnicity 1 (July 1974): 111-124.

⁸ See Bernard Ostry, The Cultural Connection (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1978), for an overall discussion of culture and government policy in Canada.

In addition, even if partisan political considerations played only a minor role in the announcement of the federal multiculturalism policy, an increased awareness of the importance of the "ethnic" vote in a number of key federal ridings, especially in southern Ontario and western Canada, and the ease of extolling the virtues of the Canadian ethnic "mosaic" in eloquent terms, has meant that the policy is liable to considerable political manipulation and has acquired certain symbolic characteristics.⁹

The somewhat ambiguous and symbolic nature of the multiculturalism policy is reflected in the prominence and treatment of the policy in both the executive and bureaucratic arenas. On November 27, 1972 Dr. Stanley Haidasz was appointed Minister of State (Multiculturalism). He was the third "junior" minister of state¹⁰ to be appointed to the Cabinet, and in recent years several additional junior ministers of state (Fitness and Amateur Sport, Small Business, and Environment) have been appointed. Although formally the junior ministers of state are to help an existing departmental minister in regard to a specific purpose for which special coordination is needed,¹¹ this new type of Cabinet portfolio has also served a useful purpose in providing the governing

⁹ See Chapter IV below.

¹⁰ The term "senior" ministers of state will be used to refer to ministers of state for designated purposes, who preside over ministries, while the term "junior" ministers of state will be used to refer to those ministers of state whose function is to assist a departmental minister with his or her responsibilities. In Hansard the following form is used for senior ministers of state: Minister of State for... (written out in full, without brackets). The following form is used for junior ministers of state: Minister of State (...). Thus we find Minister of State for Science and Technology, in contrast to Minister of State (Small Business). See Chapter I and Appendix A below for more details.

¹¹ Debates, 28th Parliament, 3rd Session, 1971, pp. 2771-72.

party with a flexible instrument to highlight (for practical or political reasons) areas which achieve particular prominence at a certain time, and to increase the size of the Cabinet, a matter of concern to a government in power for a considerable length of time with restive backbenchers.

The creation of a separate portfolio for multiculturalism, the background and calibre of the ministers chosen to supervise the implementation of the policy, and the organizational framework within which the Multiculturalism Directorate (the unit within the Department of the Secretary of State responsible for the implementation of the policy) is located, have all had an important influence on the development of the policy. Since the junior ministers of state have attracted little attention to date, the thesis will begin with a consideration of the concept of ministries and ministers of state (Chapter I). A brief survey of the establishment of the junior minister of state portfolios will help to illustrate some of the problems faced by the Minister of State (Multiculturalism) and the Multiculturalism Directorate.

This will be followed by a brief discussion of the historical background which led to an increasing interest in ethnocultural pluralism in Canada during the sixties, and of the steps leading to the actual announcement of the multiculturalism policy in 1971 (Chapter II). Chapter III will describe the various debates concerning the meaning and nature of multicultural policies in Canada, and Chapters IV and V will discuss the profile of the multiculturalism policy in the political, executive, and bureaucratic arenas, followed by the Conclusions.

There have been few attempts to establish a theoretical framework for the discussion of government policies concerning ethnocultural minorities in immigrant societies such as the United States, Australia,

and Canada. Much basic groundwork in this area remains to be done, and a survey of the development and implementation of the multiculturalism policy in Canada should provide a useful case study of government activity in a controversial sector of cultural and social policy.

A Note on Terminology

There is still a great deal of disagreement concerning the most useful definition of an ethnic group, and the extent to which different sociologists stress subjective factors in ethnic group identification as opposed to objective factors varies considerably.¹² However, an ethnic group is usually defined as a collectivity that shares a cultural tradition and also has some degree of consciousness of being different from other such groups, and there is a growing consensus that the source of ethnic group affiliation can best be understood in terms of a "rational" and "non-rational" continuum.¹³

The term "established" ethnic group will be used below to denote an ethnic group (such as the Ukrainian Canadians) whose membership is largely composed of second, third, fourth or subsequent generation descendants of immigrants, in contrast to a group such as the Portuguese Canadians. In the latter case a high proportion of the group's members are immigrants or the children of immigrants to Canada.¹⁴ The term

¹² Isajiw, "Definitions of Ethnicity," pp. 111-124.

¹³ Pierre L. van den Berghe, "Ethnic Pluralism in Industrial Societies: A Special Case?" Ethnicity 3 (September 1976): 242-43.

¹⁴ See W. Roman Petryshyn, "The Ukrainian Canadians in Social Transition," in Ukrainian Canadians, Multiculturalism, and Separatism: An Assessment, ed. M.R. Lupul (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1978), pp. 76-77; Grace M. Anderson, "Spanish- and Portuguese-Speaking Immigrants in Canada," in Two Nations, Many Cultures: Ethnic Groups in Canada, ed. Jean Leonard Elliott (Scarborough: Prentice-Hall, 1979), pp. 213-16.

"ethnicity" will be used in the usual fashion to denote the character, quality, or condition of ethnic group membership.

There is no simple and unambiguous phrase which can be used to denote that part of the population which is of neither Anglo-Saxon nor French origin. Several different expressions have been used in the past: the non-official language groups, the non-charter ethnic groups, the third force (or element), les néo-Canadiens, the "other" ethnic groups, the minority ethnic groups, etc. Most of the terms which have been used either suffer from ambiguity or can be interpreted as being derogatory. The expression "the third force," for example, implies a false unity to the non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups, while the term "ethnic" has often been used as a synonym for "foreign," ignoring the fact that all Canadians belong to some ethnic descent group.

Since no short term is fully satisfactory, for the sake of consistency the somewhat cumbersome term "non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups" will be used throughout much of the thesis. For the sake of variety, "other ethnic groups" will be used as a synonym for "non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups."¹⁸

The thesis will deal with the development of the multiculturalism policy up to and including the spring of 1979.

¹⁸ "Other ethnic groups" is the term used in Book 4 of the Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, entitled The Cultural Contribution of the Other Ethnic Groups (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1970), pp. 8-10.

CHAPTER I

MINISTRIES AND MINISTERS OF STATE

The Growth of the Cabinet

The number of federal Cabinet portfolios in Canada has grown significantly since the late sixties. At the end of Lester B. Pearson's term of office in 1968 there were twenty-seven members of Cabinet with designated portfolios and two ministers without portfolio, whereas by March 1979 there were thirty-five portfolios in Cabinet. This growth has been partially offset, however, by an increasing tendency to pair certain portfolios. In March 1979 three ministers were responsible for two portfolios each, and thus there were thirty-two members of Cabinet. The Cabinet swelled to a record thirty-four members for a short period following the appointment of Gilles Lamontagne as Minister Without Portfolio on January 19, 1978.

The large size of the Canadian federal Cabinet is partly due to the important role it has played throughout history as a body representing the regional and ethnic diversity of the Canadian population.¹ Nonetheless, Canada is one of the few parliamentary democracies which has not clearly differentiated between senior ministers forming a Cabinet, and non-Cabinet ministers. In Britain, for example, during this century the Ministry has become a large and complex hierarchy;

¹W.A. Matheson, The Prime Minister and the Cabinet (Toronto: Methuen, 1976), pp. 22-46.

under Mr. Callaghan the number of ministers rose to one hundred.

The number of ministers in the British Cabinet has averaged twenty in recent years, while the other ministers, who do not speak on policy, remain outside the Cabinet. They are responsible, however, for the activities of the departments with which they are associated.²

In Australia no distinction between the federal Cabinet and Ministry existed until 1956, although differences in the status of ministers were recognized by the use of terms such as "honorary," "assistant," or "without portfolio." In January 1956 Prime Minister Menzies announced that, because of its unwieldy size, the existing Ministry would be divided into a Cabinet of twelve plus ten ministers outside of Cabinet. Although for a short period during the term of office of the Labour Prime Minister Gough Whitlam (1972-75) all ministers became members of Cabinet, otherwise from 1956 on twelve or thirteen ministers have remained in Cabinet while approximately the same number of ministers has remained outside.³

For all practical purpose the Cabinet Committee on Priorities and Planning in Canada performs the role of an inner Cabinet because of its important role in formulating and presenting overall government priorities to full Cabinet.⁴ Other combinations of ministers, such as the newly-created Board of Economic Development, may also serve as inner

² John P. Mackintosh, The British Cabinet, 3rd ed. (London: Stevens and Sons, 1977), pp. 411-12.

³ Solomon Encel, Cabinet Government in Australia, 2nd ed. (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1974), pp. 176-86; Australia, Australian Bureau of Statistics, Official Year Book of Australia, 1975-76 (Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics, 1977), pp. 77-79.

⁴ G. Bruce Doern, "The Cabinet and Central Agencies," in Public Policy in Canada: Organization, Process and Management, eds. G. Bruce Doern and Peter Aucoin (Toronto: Macmillan, 1979), pp. 35-36.

cabinets in certain policy areas. However, all ministers are formally equal in status. The norms of Cabinet collectivity, responsibility, and solidarity have been maintained to the present day, and no clear distinction has been drawn between "senior" and "junior" ministers.⁵

Nonetheless, a certain stratification of Cabinet portfolios has occurred in Canada. The recent increase in the number of portfolios is primarily due to the introduction into the Cabinet of two new kinds of ministers described in the Ministries and Ministers of State Act, part of the Government Organization Bill introduced by Prime Minister Trudeau late in 1970. In addition to the existing departmental ministers and ministers without portfolio, this legislation identified new portfolios to be called "Ministers of State for designated purposes" and "Ministers of State," thus allowing for four categories of ministers of the Crown:

Departmental ministers would occupy an office created by statute to which are attached powers, duties and functions defined by statute; have supervision and control over a portion of the public service known as a department; be limited in number by the number of statutory ministerial offices; have salaries provided for by title in the Salaries Act; and seek appropriations on their own from Parliament to cover the cost of the activities for which they are responsible.

Ministers of state for designated purposes would occupy an office created by proclamation on the advice of the prime minister; be limited in number by statute to five; be charged with responsibilities for developing new and comprehensive policies in areas where the development of such policies is of particular urgency and importance; have a mandate effectively determined by the prime minister which would be of such duration as to enable them to come to grips with the policy problems assigned to them; receive powers, duties and functions and exercise supervision and control of relevant elements of the public service; and seek parliamentary appropriations independently of any minister to cover the cost of their staff and operations. They would have a "secretary" who would have the status and authority of a deputy head for the purpose of the Financial Administration Act and the

⁵ Matheson, The Prime Minister and Cabinet, pp. 65-68.

Public Service Employment Act, and would preside over ministries which would eventually either become parts of new or existing departments or whose existence would be terminated.

Ministers of state would be appointed to assist a departmental minister in the discharge of his responsibilities; receive powers, duties and functions; be limited in number by the appropriations that Parliament is willing to pass to cover their salaries and expenses; and receive the same salary as a minister without portfolio provided for them in the estimates of the minister with whom they were to be associated. Finally, ministers without portfolio would have responsibilities assigned by the prime minister, and would not normally exercise statutory powers, duties and functions.⁶

A study by Aucoin and French published in 1974 and several recent articles⁷ have examined the rationale behind the creation of these new kinds of portfolios. They are seen as demonstrating one aspect of the general preoccupation of Trudeau and his advisors with the need for more rational policy analysis and planning, greater efficiency in the organization of government activities, and greater coordination among the administrative units of government. This preoccupation has been reflected in the development and evolution of the Cabinet committee system, the strengthening of the roles of central agencies such as the Privy Council Office (PCO), Prime Minister's Office (PMO), Federal-Provincial Relations Office (FPRO), and the Treasury Board Secretariat (TBS), and the expansion of a planning, programming, and budgeting system (PPBS) under the Trudeau government.⁸

⁶ Canada, House of Commons, Official Report of Debates, 28th Parliament, 3rd Session, 1971, pp. 2772-73.

⁷ Peter Aucoin and Richard French, Knowledge, Power and Public Policy (Ottawa: Information Canada, 1974); G. Bruce Doern, "Horizontal and Vertical Portfolios in Government," in Issues in Canadian Public Policy, eds. G. Bruce Doern and V. Seymour Wilson (Toronto: Macmillan, 1974), pp. 310-336; and Peter Aucoin, "Portfolio Structures and Policy Coordination," in Public Policy in Canada, eds. Doern and Aucoin, pp. 213-38.

⁸ G. Bruce Doern, "The Policy-Making Philosophy of Prime Minister Trudeau and His Advisors," in Apex of Power: The Prime Minister and Political Leadership in Canada, ed. Thomas A. Hockin (Scarborough:

It was also felt that some form of innovation was necessary which would allow for policy planning and implementation in areas where action was needed, but which did not fall within the jurisdiction of any existing department or agency. Royal Commissions tended to drag on for too long a period and could not be easily influenced by the government, while task forces were ad hoc bodies and did not permit the long-term monitoring or coordination of policy.⁹ A formal, more consistent, but at the same time flexible, administrative structure was seen to be necessary to coordinate the relevant activities of different departments and supply policy and planning expertise in areas where concerted action was needed.

During the early years of the Trudeau administration certain specific responsibilities, such as Information Canada, Citizenship, and the Wheat Board, were given to ministers without portfolio, or, in the case of housing and urban development, to a minister (Paul Hellyer) whose main responsibility lay elsewhere. Ministers without portfolio, however, had traditionally remained free from particular administrative responsibilities, and were expected to act as roving commissioners providing Cabinet colleagues with a source of advice and judgment.¹⁰ This created some confusion, and a minister told the House of Commons that "we thus arrived at a situation where ministers without portfolio

Prentice-Hall, 1977), pp. 189-96; Laurent Dobuzinskis, "Rational Policy-Making: Policy, Politics, and Political Science," in Apex of Power, ed. Hockin, pp. 211-28. For a recent and comprehensive study of the central agencies, see Colin Campbell and George J. Szablowski, The Superbureaucrats: Structure and Behaviour in Central Agencies (Toronto: Macmillan, 1979).

⁹ Aucoin and French, Knowledge, Power and Public Policy, p. 16.

¹⁰ Matheson, The Prime Minister and Cabinet, pp. 64-65.

in fact had portfolios. A complicated situation became further confused."¹¹

The Government Organization Bill submitted to Parliament for first reading on December 9, 1970 therefore proposed the introduction of ministries and ministers of state as described above. Ministers of state and the departments or other units of the civil service whose work they supervised were primarily to develop policy and mechanisms for coordination in specific policy areas, and these departments or other administrative units were not expected to have any sizeable program capabilities. They would be established and disbanded as the need arose or passed away.

The Organization Bill encountered a great deal of opposition in the House, largely because of its omnibus nature (the Bill also dealt with the establishment of a Department of the Environment, an increase in the number of Parliamentary Secretaries, and various other organizational matters). The official Opposition claimed that in its existing form the Bill made it far too easy for the government to create and dissolve departments at will, and that Parliament should be given some concrete means to supervise the establishment of new ministries. The Opposition also maintained that the government was vague about its intentions concerning new ministries and ministers of state; it suspected that a crude attempt was being made to pacify restless Liberal backbenchers by increasing the number of Cabinet portfolios which could accommodate them, thereby strengthening the executive at the expense of the legislature. It was felt that in some cases the appointment of a minister of state to deal with a troublesome issue would serve only as a symbolic gesture, supplanting a genuine concerted effort to deal

¹¹ Debates, 28th Parliament, 3rd Session, 1971, p. 2771.

with the issue in question.

Even if the appointment of a minister of state did reflect genuine concern about an issue, the Opposition pointed out that the government was unclear about how these ministers and the administrative units they supervised would carry out the coordinating "horizontal" role which had been emphasized as one of the most important features of these new portfolios, and that the status of ministers of state would be rather ambiguous.¹² Although Mr. Drury, who supervised the passage of the Organization Bill through the House, denied that an attempt was being made to create a "tiered" Cabinet, Opposition spokesmen argued that the Ministries and Ministers of State Act would result in a system of senior and junior ministers.¹³

The Organization Bill occupied a great deal of time in the House, and received Royal Assent only in June 1971. Although the Bill was passed without major changes, the government did agree, after prolonged negotiations with the Opposition, to an amendment stating that a resolution of the House approving the establishment of a ministry of state was necessary before the passage of an Order in Council authorizing issuance of a proclamation for a ministry of state.¹⁴

The Ministries of State for Science and Technology and Urban Affairs

During the debates in the House on the Organization Bill the government seldom made reference to policy areas for which ministries of state might be established or ministers of state might be appointed;

¹² Ibid., pp. 2783-84, 2872, 3497, 4760, 4785, 4790-91.

¹³ Ibid., pp. 2944, 3005, 6079. ¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 6078-79.

however, for several years preceding the passage of the Bill the fields of science and technology, and urban affairs and housing, had undergone considerable scrutiny (notably in the work of the Federal Task Force on Housing and Urban Development, established in 1968, the Science Council of Canada, established in 1966, and the Senate Special Committee on Science Policy, established in 1968).¹⁵ Some concrete action had to be taken in response to the recommendations of these bodies, especially in view of increasing concern about the problems of rapid urbanization and the consequences of the "scientific-technological revolution."

Although the mechanism of ministries of state may seem to have been somewhat inappropriate for these policy areas since the governing legislation for this variety of ministry emphasized its transitory nature, the flexibility of the ministry of state concept and the stress on the coordinating, cross-departmental role of these bodies seemed to suit the requirements of the fields of science and technology and urban affairs. Aucoin and French point out that the introduction of ministries of state for these policy areas permitted a visible but measured response to important issues while avoiding the risk of creating a full-blown department which might run into problems of conflict over federal-provincial or departmental jurisdiction.¹⁶

The proclamations establishing the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs (MSUA) on June 28, 1971 and the Ministry of State for Science and Technology (MOSST) on June 21, 1971 supplied these ministries with broad mandates but provided little information about their exact

¹⁵ Aucoin and French, Knowledge, Power and Public Policy, pp. 19-26.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 25.

functions and bases of operations.¹⁷ They simply stressed their coordinating role and their responsibilities for carrying out research and formulating policy:

Fundamental to the notion of a ministry of state is the idea that the activities of research and policy analysis can provide an adequate basis for successful policy formulation and coordination. The logic underlying such a ministry derives from the "knowledge is power" hypothesis: i.e., that research, information and analysis will carry the day in Cabinet and Cabinet committees against the traditional sources of political and bureaucratic power.¹⁸

Even before the creation of MOSST several science policy observers had questioned the premises upon which the ministry was founded, and were skeptical whether a central science policy organization could enforce guidelines for the role of science and technology across a range of government departments and agencies, or whether government had made a strong enough commitment to give science policy a high priority.¹⁹ Some of these doubts were justified; MOSST has had considerable difficulty gaining the cooperation of other government departments and agencies, and implementing its "horizontal" coordinating role. Summing up the experience of more than two years of operation of MSUA and MOSST, French and Aucoin concluded that the ministry of state concept might be workable, but that the federal government still operated on traditional "power-program and/or control responsibilities," and that because of a lack of realism about policy machinery and a lack of strong political commitment to their work, the science and urban affairs ministries were being held "hostage" to the power of the major departments,

¹⁷ Debates, 28th Parliament, 3rd Session, 1971, pp. 7207, 7428.

¹⁸ Aucoin and French, Knowledge, Power and Public Policy, p. 12.

¹⁹ Ibid., pp. 34-35.

with their officials frustrated in achieving many of their goals.²⁰

A recent assessment of the work of MOSST and MSUA suggests that they have played a more modest role than originally intended, and that "these two ministries qua ministries have become, at most, support agencies that serve in a process of policy coordination in which they are by no means the key players."²¹ MOSST is still encountering difficulties in attaining internal stability because of frequent reorganizations and a rapid turnover of managerial personnel; ministers for this portfolio have been changed six times in eight years (five different individuals were involved) and the department has had three different deputy ministers.

The Demise of the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs

Proposals for a strong federal role in housing and urban affairs drew criticism long before the establishment of an urban affairs ministry. There were complaints, for example, that the Hellyer Task Force on Housing and Urban Development, authorized by Cabinet on July 17, 1968, disregarded constitutional boundaries, and ignored the opinions of many senior civil servants, voluntary associations, and provincial and municipal governments. Its recommendation that a ministry for housing and urban affairs be established was looked upon with skepticism; as in the case of MOSST, there were doubts whether a horizontal coordinating department without a strong power base would be able to gain sufficient cooperation from other departments and agencies to

²⁰ Ibid., p. 79.

²¹ Aucoin, "Portfolio Structures and Policy Co-ordination," p. 236.

be effective.²²

The sweeping mandate of the proclamation establishing MSUA, accompanied by the absence of means by which it could control the legislative or expenditure proposals of other agencies, the continuous problem of debate over federal-provincial-municipal jurisdiction, and the difficulty of defining an active policy (as opposed to research) role for the ministry, led to confusion within the ministry in its early years and its isolation from other federal departments and agencies.²³ More recently, provincial governments have continued to argue that the federal government has no right intruding in the area of housing and urban affairs, while the Minister of State for Urban Affairs André Ouellet was accused of partisan political interference with the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC).²⁴

What is more important, the Opposition has claimed that the original plans of the ministry to deal with the entire broad field of urban affairs were never fulfilled. A senior interdepartmental committee on urban affairs, which was considered to be an important priority in the early years of MSUA, was rarely convened, and there seemed to be little commitment to long-range research.²⁵ In addition, the ministers of state for urban affairs neglected their broader mandate and devoted increasing attention to CMHC, as ministers responsible for this corporation, since it is involved with important operating programs and

²² David M. Cameron, "Urban Policy," in Issues in Canadian Public Policy, eds. Doern and Wilson, pp. 232-35.

²³ Ibid., pp. 244-50.

²⁴ Winnipeg Free Press, 3 December 1977; Globe and Mail, 17 February 1978.

²⁵ Debates, 30th Parliament, 4th Session, 1978, pp. 1145-46, 1463.

gave their portfolios greater influence and a higher political profile.²⁶

In view of the above, the Opposition claimed that, because of its failure to fulfill its horizontal mandate, the urban affairs ministry performed a largely symbolic role, and the Progressive Conservative (PC) spokesman for housing stated that a PC government would create a less visible but more effective Urban and Housing Secretariat within the corporate structure of CMHC.²⁷

After a long period of strong and consistent criticism of MSUA from Opposition ranks in the house, on November 24, 1978 the government announced that it would phase out MSUA, which officially closed its doors on March 30, 1979.²⁸ Although the closing down of MSUA conforms to the original conception of ministries of state as temporary bodies, MSUA was not disbanded because it had fulfilled its role and could now peacefully leave the scene; on the contrary, MSUA was phased out because it had been unsuccessful in carrying out its original mandate of interdepartmental and intergovernmental coordination and because this portfolio had been liable to increasing political manipulation through CMHC.

The Minister of State for Federal-Provincial Relations

As of March 1979 only three senior minister of state portfolios have been established. On September 17, 1977, Prime Minister Trudeau appointed

²⁶ Doern, "The Cabinet and Central Agencies," pp. 49-50. Similarly, MOSST attempted to supplement its coordinating cross-departmental role by taking on a greater operational role. In the late seventies it requested that responsibility for an important regulatory agency, the Atomic Energy Control Board, be transferred to MOSST from the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources. Doern, "The Cabinet and Central Agencies," p. 50.

²⁷ Debates, 30th Parliament, 4th Session, 1979, pp. 3552-57.

²⁸ Debates, 30th Parliament, 4th Session, 1978, p. 1463; Ottawa Journal, 31 March 1979.

Marc Lalonde to the third and most recent senior minister of state portfolio, as Minister of State for Federal-Provincial Relations.

The most obvious reason for the creation of this new portfolio was the urgency of concerted action by the federal government to counteract the growing threat of Quebec separation after the Parti Québécois election victory of November 1976. Other factors were the increasingly strident demands from all provinces for greater decentralization of government, and the growing scale of federal-provincial interaction in almost all areas of public policy.²⁹ Although Trudeau wanted to deal personally with major policy issues in the area of federal-provincial relations, this was occupying far too much of his time, and he felt that some of his duties should be passed on to another minister.³⁰

Earlier concern about the need for greater policy coordination in the field of federal-provincial affairs was shown by the establishment of the Federal-Provincial Relations Office (FPRO) in January 1975, and of a Cabinet Committee on Federal-Provincial Relations.³¹ The functions of the FPRO had previously been carried out by a PCO secretariat; this secretariat has been transformed into a central agency which is now designated, on a statutory basis, a department of government under the Prime Minister. The main responsibilities of the FPRO are to assist the Prime Minister and the Minister of State for Federal-Provincial Relations

²⁹ V. Seymour Wilson, "Federal-Provincial Relations and Federal Policy Processes," in Doern and Aucoin, Public Policy in Canada, pp. 190-212.

³⁰ Montreal Star, 1 October 1977.

³¹ The Cabinet Committee on Federal-Provincial Relations merged with the Priorities and Planning Committee for all practical purposes in the wake of the Parti Québécois election victory in Quebec. Doern, "The Cabinet and Central Agencies," p. 36.

in their overall responsibilities for federal-provincial relations, to provide Cabinet with assistance in examining issues in this policy area, and to assist in developing federal-provincial consultation on a wide range of policy issues.³²

The FPRO has expanded rapidly because of the preoccupation with national unity in the last few years, and is now a full-fledged central agency with over forty professional staff members. The Secretary to the Cabinet for Federal-Provincial Relations, Gordon Robertson, had previously been Clerk of the PCO for over ten years, and is considered to be the current dean of the Ottawa "mandarins." Robertson is a powerful figure who in his position as head of the FPRO continues to spend a great deal of time on special assignments from the Prime Minister and recommending senior appointments.³³

Therefore, when Lalonde was appointed Minister of State for Federal-Provincial Relations, there was considerable speculation within the central agencies whether Robertson would continue to report directly to the Prime Minister or become, in effect, Lalonde's deputy minister. The situation was not clearly resolved; the FPRO continued to report directly to the Prime Minister, although it was also to work closely with Lalonde.³⁴

Although Lalonde was to help supervise the work of the FPRO, he was not responsible for the FPRO, but rather for a particular task within Cabinet; namely, to:

- develop, in consultation with the Prime Minister, the approach of the federal government to the continuing revision, improvement and adaptation of the Canadian Constitution.
- act as advisor to Cabinet and to the Prime Minister in all

³² Canada, Treasury Board, Organization of the Government of Canada, 1978-79 (Toronto: Macmillan, 1979), pp. 233, 406.

³³ Colin and Szablowski, The Superbureaucrats, pp. 74, 83-84.

³⁴ Toronto Star, 27 September 1977.

matters which might have important implications in the field of federal-provincial relations.

--assist his colleagues in their consultation with the provinces and seek to ensure, in a more permanent fashion, good relations with all of the provincial premiers and ministers responsible for intergovernmental affairs.³⁵

The above mandate allows the Minister of State for Federal-Provincial Relations a role limited to policy advice and formulation, with a vague commitment to policy coordination; however, no mention is made of the Minister's relationship to the FPRO. The situation of this minister is therefore rather unique. There is no "ministry" of federal-provincial relations, and unlike the junior ministers of state the federal-provincial relations minister is not responsible for supervising the work of any administrative unit of government. His status is somewhat ambiguous; in many respects it is similar to that of a minister without portfolio. Few ministers without portfolio, however, have been appointed in recent years, and Lalonde and his successor were probably designated senior ministers of state because of the importance of the national unity debate, and the high profile of the activities in which they are involved.

During Lalonde's term of office potential conflict with FPRO officials and problems of lines of authority were defused by the fact that Lalonde was principal secretary to the Prime Minister from 1968 to 1972. Lalonde is well acquainted with the work of the central agencies, is a close associate of Trudeau, and is often considered to be his alter ego.³⁶ In addition, soon after his appointment Lalonde announced that he did not intend to get deeply involved in all aspects of his portfolio,

³⁵ Canada, Treasury Board, Organization of the Government, p. 233.

³⁶ Colin and Szablowski, The Superbureaucrats, p. 61; Globe and Mail, 14 November 1977.

but would concentrate on constitutional questions and be a "trouble-shooter."³⁷

In fact, the appointment of a Minister of State for Federal-Provincial Relations had almost no effect on the existing structure of the FPRO and internal policy processes.³⁸ The transfer of duties in the field of federal-provincial relations from Trudeau to Lalonde took place on a personal basis, and Lalonde's duties primarily consisted of carrying out the instructions of the Prime Minister. It therefore seems that the appointment of a federal-provincial relations minister was largely a symbolic gesture to underline the importance of the national unity debate, and to provide the Prime Minister with assistance in this area.

It is interesting to note that after John Reid succeeded Lalonde as Minister of State for Federal-Provincial Relations on November 24, 1978, Lalonde continued his activities in the field of federal-provincial constitutional affairs in his new capacity as Minister of Justice, and maintained a more visible role in this area than his successor, who may have been appointed to prevent the campaign on national unity from being dominated by two francophones, Trudeau and Lalonde.³⁹

The Junior Ministers of State

Previous studies dealing with the ministries and ministers of state have focussed on the senior ministers of state and the administrative units for which they are responsible; relatively little attention has been

³⁷ Montreal Star, 1 October 1977.

³⁸ Interview, 24 April 1979.

³⁹ Roy MacGregor, "John Reid: Man on the Move, Finally," Maclean's, 26 February 1979, pp. 4-12. Reid did not have much time to work with his new portfolio before the May 1979 federal election; however, according to one PCO official, he, like Lalonde, also maintained a low profile with respect to the work of the FPRO. Interview, 24 April 1979.

devoted to the junior ministers of state and the programs which they supervise. This is primarily because the senior ministers of state deal with broad subject areas which of late have assumed a great deal of importance. In addition, until recently only one junior minister of state portfolio, multiculturalism, had been occupied for any considerable length of time. As of March 1979, however, two new junior minister of state portfolios established in 1976 (Small Business, and Fitness and Amateur Sport), have been occupied for approximately two-and-a-half years, while a third new portfolio of this sort (Environment) was established in 1977.⁴⁰ It is therefore important to examine the establishment of these new junior minister of state portfolios, if only for the simple reason that the size of Cabinet has increased significantly as a result of their introduction.⁴¹

As of March 1979, there were four junior ministers of state in Cabinet, responsible for multiculturalism, fitness and amateur sports, small business, and the environment. These portfolios deal with policy areas which, in previous years, might have been assigned to ministers without portfolio; as of March 1979 there were no ministers without portfolio in Cabinet, and although this category of ministers was not eliminated with the introduction of ministries and ministers of state, there has been a notable decrease in the number of ministers without portfolio appointed since the passage of the 1970 Government Organization Bill. Only four ministers without portfolio (excluding the Leader of the Government in the Senate) have been appointed to Cabinet since the appointment of the first junior Minister of State (Citizenship) on August 12,

⁴⁰ See Appendix A.

⁴¹ Chapter II will deal with the development of the multiculturalism policy, and the establishment of a multiculturalism portfolio, in more detail.

1971.⁴² This is in contrast to a total of twelve ministers without portfolio appointed to Cabinet in the three years and three months of the Trudeau government before the first junior minister of state appointment.⁴³

In fact, as mentioned previously (p. 14), to a large extent the minister of state concept was adopted to avoid the confusion which resulted when, in the early years of the Trudeau government, ministers without portfolio, who had earlier remained free from specific responsibilities (except for brief periods of time), were assigned duties to deal with problems of a temporary nature not requiring a separate department. Although formally junior ministers of state are to assist departmental ministers by acting as policy coordinators for designated purposes within a given department, and some have considerably raised the profile of the policy areas they are responsible for both within and outside of Cabinet, at times they, like many ministers without portfolio before them,⁴⁴ have been appointed primarily to provide some form of sectional or group representation, to provide entry into Cabinet for an aggressive backbencher, or as a symbolic manifestation of government concern for an issue of current importance.

That the junior ministers of state have a status similar to that of ministers without portfolio is evident in a number of cases. The first junior minister of state, Martin O'Connell, appointed on August 12, 1971, as Minister of State (Citizenship), directly succeeded a minister without portfolio, Robert Stanbury, who had been assigned special

⁴² See Appendix A.

⁴³ Colin Campbell, Canadian Political Facts 1945-76 (Toronto: Methuen, 1977), p. 31.

⁴⁴ Matheson, The Prime Minister and the Cabinet, p. 64.

responsibility for citizenship, and O'Connell's relationship with the Citizenship Branch of the Department of the Secretary of State varied little from Stanbury's. O'Connell was soon transferred to a much more prestigious Cabinet portfolio, labour.⁴⁵ Two of the early junior minister of state appointments ignored the original specification that junior ministers of state were to be assigned to assist a specific departmental minister in discharging his responsibilities; neither Pat Mahoney nor Bryce Mackasey had any specific duties as ministers of state. It is interesting to note that Mahoney was appointed to his portfolio in what was widely considered to be a pre-election shuffle; he was expected to act as a liaison with Alberta oil and gas interests, and Mahoney's appointment as a minister of state was probably intended to increase his chances of re-election in his riding in Alberta, where the Liberals had only four members of Parliament.⁴⁶

In the case of Mackasey, Trudeau stated that he was brought back into the Cabinet, despite earlier disagreements with the Prime Minister, because "he speaks for a particular constituency, and I want to hear from it. I respect him...I appreciate his advice."⁴⁷ Mackasey, who was a dynamic and colorful figure, and had previously established a good working relationship with labour officials, was appointed a Minister of State as a "trouble-shooter" slightly more than one month before the July 8, 1974 federal election. Immediately after this election he was promoted to the position of Postmaster General.

The most confusing example of the use of this type of portfolio concerns the original Department of the Environment. Established in

⁴⁵ Globe and Mail, 12 August 1971, 29 August 1972.

⁴⁶ Globe and Mail, 29 January 1972.

⁴⁷ Globe and Mail, 4 June 1974.

1971 by the Government Organization Bill discussed above, this department was to bring together responsibility for environmental quality and for the protection, enhancement, and promotion of the wise use of renewable resources.⁴⁸ This new department was combined with what was then the Department of Fisheries and Forestry, but after complaints by representatives of fishermen and fishing interests that the status of the fishing industry had been severely downgraded as a result of this step, the title of the Minister of the Environment was changed to Minister of Environment and Minister of Fisheries. Further pressure was exerted on the government to upgrade the status of the fisheries segment of this portfolio, and, after Trudeau promised to appoint a full-time minister of fisheries during the 1974 election campaign, Romeo Leblanc was appointed Minister of State (Fisheries) on August 8, 1974, to assist the Minister of Environment in carrying out the latter's responsibilities as Minister of Fisheries.⁴⁹

In the meantime, two ministers who had been assigned the environment portfolio (Jeanne Sauvé and Jean Marchand) encountered various difficulties, and Leblanc took over the environment portfolio on two occasions (December 5, 1975--January 21, 1976; July 1, 1976--September 14, 1976) as Acting Minister of Environment. An energetic and hard-working minister, Leblanc was ultimately given responsibility for both portfolios on September 15, 1976, when he was appointed Minister of Fisheries and Environment (note the switch in emphasis from Environment to Fisheries). Finally, after complaints that the environment segment of the portfolio had been downgraded, on September 16, 1977, Leonard Marchand was appointed Minister of State (Environment) to assist the Minister of

⁴⁸ Canada, Department of Fisheries and the Environment, Annual Report, 1977-78 (Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1979), pp. 4-5.

⁴⁹ Canada, Department of Environment and Fisheries, Annual Report, 1974-75, pp. 3-4; Debates, 30th Parliament, 4th Session, 1979, pp. 2488-90.

Fisheries in carrying out the latter's responsibilities as Minister of Environment. Marchand, however, was dominated by the more aggressive Leblanc, and on occasion made promises to representatives of the forestry industry which were later overruled by Leblanc and his senior staff.⁵⁰

After the appointment of Marchand steps were taken within the Department of Fisheries and the Environment to separate responsibilities for these two policy areas, and early in 1979 the government introduced Bill C-35, which lays the basis for the establishment of a new Department of Fisheries and Oceans, and a separate Department of the Environment. Bill C-35 was passed by the House of Commons on March 8, 1979, but not before the Opposition criticized the government for bringing attention to this matter at such a late date.⁵¹ Doubts have been expressed whether a new Minister of Environment would have sufficient power to enforce environmental standards and whether he could ensure that other departments follow the objectives set down by his department.⁵²

As for the Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) Iona Campagnolo, no-one would deny that she considerably raised the public profile of the policy area she was responsible for, and Opposition criticism of her work was relatively weak and ineffective.⁵³ Nonetheless, Campagnolo did not have much of a coordinating role to perform for her

⁵⁰ "Romeo Leblanc: A Poor Boy's Crusade for the Fishermen," Saturday Night, May 1979, p. 91; Interview, 22 April 1979.

⁵¹ Bill C-35 is very similar to Bill C-65, which had been hurriedly introduced on the second last sitting day before the previous summer's recess, in anticipation of a fall election call, and was not re-introduced until five months later. Debates, 30th Parliament, 4th Session, 1979, pp. 2466-67, 2469, 2475.

⁵² Ibid., pp. 2488-90, 2531.

⁵³ Bruce Halliday, M.P., "Proposals for a New Era in Amateur Sport" (Notes for a Speech to the Congress '78 and Annual General Meeting of the Sport Federation of Canada, Regina, Sask., 28 January 1978).

policy area within the Department of Health and Welfare. In fact, it is difficult to define a proper federal role in mass sport or recreation beyond mere promotion because of jurisdiction problems with municipalities and the provinces.⁵⁴

It is more likely that Campagnolo was appointed to Cabinet because of assets other than the administrative ability she possesses. She is quick-witted, a good performer in the House of Commons, and an energetic and emotional speaker.⁵⁵ A prestige-conscious grandstander, she was criticized for making few statements before the House, preferring to hold press conferences whenever possible,⁵⁶ and was considered to be a good "vote-getter" in British Columbia, her native province. According to one commentator, the fitness and amateur sport portfolio should be seen as a convenient "envelope" which was created specifically for her after she refused to accept a portfolio giving her responsibility for the status of women. If she had been offered a bona fide department, then fitness and amateur sport would probably have remained in "departmental anonymity."⁵⁷

Liberal policies in the small business sector have been subjected to strong and persistent criticism within and outside the House of Commons for many years, and it is likely that a portfolio for this policy area was created largely in response to this criticism.⁵⁸ During

⁵⁴ A senior official of the Department of National Health and Welfare, the department within which the Fitness and Amateur Sport Branch is located, was of the opinion that Campagnolo's impact on policy development and implementation was rather meagre. Interview, 18 May 1979.

⁵⁵ One Member of Parliament suggested that Campagnolo be called "Minister of Sportness and Amateur Fits," and she has won the grudging respect of Opposition MPs who have tangled with her. Halliday, "Proposals for a New Era," pp. 2-3.

⁵⁶ Winnipeg Free Press, 16 July 1977.

⁵⁷ Vancouver Sun, 13 May 1977; Ottawa Journal, 17 April 1979.

⁵⁸ Aucoin, "Portfolio Structures and Policy Co-ordination," p. 233.

its first year of operation the Small Business Secretariat, the administrative unit within the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce whose work is supervised by the Minister of State (Small Business), was primarily occupied with research studies, and the Opposition complained that far too much attention was being devoted to research rather than to the formulation of concrete policy proposals.⁵⁹ There have also been difficulties in establishing a workable definition of small business, and in carrying out any effective coordinating role either within the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, or with respect to other government departments or agencies. The Opposition claims that the large size of the Industry, Trade and Commerce bureaucracy has contributed to the stifling of initiatives in the small business area, and has stated that, if it forms the government, it would establish a small business secretariat independent of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce as well as other departments. This would be a "one-stop" service center, which would try to prevent small firms requiring assistance from being shunted from department to department.⁶⁰

All of the junior minister of state portfolios apart from multiculturalism have been discussed above; it is evident that the selection of these portfolios, and of ministers to occupy them, has been rather haphazard. The possibility of some confusion in this regard was raised by the Opposition when the Government Organization Bill was being debated;⁶¹ since that time, however, there has been no general criticism of the concept of junior ministers of state, although on occasion the Opposition has drawn attention to the lack of a clear government policy

⁵⁹ Debates, 30th Parliament, 2nd Session, 1977, p. 7918; 30th Parliament, 3rd Session, 1978, p. 5465.

⁶⁰ Debates, 30th Parliament, 3rd Session, 1978, p. 5465.

⁶¹ Debates, ~~29th~~ 29th Parliament, 3rd Session, 1971, pp. 2783-84, 4790-91.

concerning the different varieties of portfolio.⁶²

Despite the importance of the issue areas they are responsible for, even the senior ministries of state have encountered difficulties in helping to coordinate the work of different government departments and agencies. The administrative units supervised by junior ministers of state have much less influence within the government bureaucracy; they rarely have much of a coordinating role to play even within the department they are associated with, and have rarely attempted any interdepartmental or intergovernmental coordination. Nonetheless, the reluctance of the government to clearly delineate the status of the different varieties of portfolio, and thus to bring about a clearly tiered Cabinet, has helped to formally maintain the illusion that all Cabinet ministers are roughly of equal status. Although this is helpful in maintaining the representative nature of Cabinet, it is doubtful, in view of the large and unwieldy size of the Cabinet, whether this illusion can be maintained for long, and whether it is ultimately beneficial. However, the mechanism of junior ministers of state has allowed the government to manipulate Cabinet portfolios in response to concerted criticism from the Opposition or from strong pressure groups, the need for a representative Cabinet, and short-term political exigencies.

⁶² Debates, 30th Parliament, 2nd Session, 1977, p. 6058.

CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND TO THE ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE MULTICULTURALISM POLICY

Introduction

General descriptions of the experience of the non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups in Canada have often tried to draw attention to a tradition of government support for ethnocultural pluralism by quoting isolated (and often rhetorical) statements by various Canadian politicians.¹ Frequently the image of a "mosaic" has been used to compare the situation in Canada to that in the United States, where a "melting-pot" ideology is said to have prevailed.² In fact, although there have been few detailed surveys of immigration policy in Canada, or of government programs for non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French immigrants and their descendants, existing studies show that in many respects Canadian immigration policy and the attitudes of Anglo-Canadians towards immigrants from the "other" ethnic groups have not differed significantly from immigration policies and host society attitudes in countries such as the United States and Australia.³

¹ See various speeches by Senator Paul Yuzyk, e.g., "The Emerging New Force in the Emerging New Canada," paper delivered at the Thinkers' Conference on Cultural Rights, Toronto, 13 December 1978. (Mimeographed.)

² Howard Palmer, "Mosaic Versus Melting Pot?: Immigration and Ethnicity in Canada and the United States," International Journal 31 (Summer 1976): 488-528.

³ For the most comprehensive review of government management of immigration, and the role of voluntary organizations in immigrant integration, 1945-71, see Freda Hawkins, Canada and Immigration: Public

Therefore it is doubtful, despite the rhetoric associated with the use of the mosaic symbol, whether the tendency to portray Canada as a country whose attitude toward immigrants was considerably more enlightened than that of the United States is justified.⁴ This is not to deny that there are important differences in attitudes towards immigration in Canada, Australia, and the United States. Hawkins, for example, has noted the lack of a strong immigration ethos in Canada. Unlike the United States, where immigration was part of a nation-building myth, or Australia, where large-scale immigration after World War II was widely perceived as playing an important role in maintaining economic growth and preventing isolation from the outside world, Canada has not viewed immigration with any great enthusiasm as an area of public policy:

The central problem of French-English relations, the two solitudes, the existence of two founding races each with its own language, culture, and long historical tradition, has pre-empted the place of immigration in national mythology. Even recently, in his 1968 election campaign, Prime Minister Trudeau found it necessary to remind some French Canadians that there were plenty of Canadians whose mother tongue was neither French nor English....

However large the intake of immigrants, it would seem that only when immigration is seen as a positive nation-building force, as it has been in the United States, as it is in Australia, and is now, to some extent, in Quebec, does it acquire a real urgency and high priority among the major sectors of public policy. The

Policy and Public Concern (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1972). An interesting regional study is Howard Palmer's "Nativism and Ethnic Tolerance in Alberta: 1920-1972" (Ph.D. dissertation, York University, 1973). For a useful summary of the changes over time in Anglo-Canadian views of immigration and the place of non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups in Canadian society, see Howard Palmer, "Reluctant Hosts: Anglo-Canadian Views of Multiculturalism in the Twentieth Century," in Multiculturalism as State Policy: Conference Report, Second Canadian Conference on Multiculturalism, Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism (Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1976), pp. 81-118. More references on immigration to Canada can be found in a special issue, devoted to multiculturalism, of Communique: Canadian Studies 3 (October 1976): 8-13.

⁴ Howard Palmer, "Mosaic Versus Melting Pot?" pp. 527-28.

absence of firm conviction about immigration in Canada has led to great uncertainty in its management and considerable difficulty in its operation.⁵

Since the major streams of immigration in this century have flowed to western Canada and Ontario, the below will be restricted to a brief survey of some administrative responses to immigration and immigrant integration in those parts of the country.

The Early Years

Anglo-conformity was the main approach to assimilation in Canada until after World War II. Despite a heavy influx of immigrants from continental Europe in the early part of the century, there was little recognition of ethnic diversity in Canada apart from the British-French duality, and new arrivals to Canada were expected to conform to the existing (WASP) values and institutions of Canadian society. Fears that immigrants who were culturally or racially "inferior" could not be assimilated led to various discriminatory clauses in immigration legislation, similar to those which existed in Australia or the United States.⁶

Although some early groups of settlers, such as the Mennonites, Icelanders, and Ukrainians, were encouraged to settle in blocks, this was not the result of a conscious policy to promote ethnocultural diversity. Temporary concessions leading to a limited form of local autonomy for these settlers in the areas of western Canada where they lived en masse were primarily intended to keep them from leaving the

⁵ Hawkins, Canada and Immigration, pp. 34-35.

⁶ Palmer, "Reluctant Hosts," pp. 84-90; Morris Davis and Joseph F. Krauter, Minority Canadians: Ethnic Groups (Toronto: Methuen, 1978), pp. 60-66, 87-88.

often inhospitable areas they inhabited, and reflected the difficulty of providing government services in isolated areas. Many of these early concessions were soon eliminated. The bilingual school systems which existed in western Canada for Ukrainians, Germans, and Poles during the early part of this century, for example, were all abolished by 1919 as a result of growing pressures for assimilation and a public reaction against "enemy aliens" following the outbreak of World War I.⁷

For the most part the federal government considered that responsibility for the welfare of immigrants ended once they disembarked at their eventual destination. Settlers going to western Canada were often supplied with some simple farm implements and seed, and occasionally received small loans to help them become established. But no government programs were directed specifically towards immigrants, and although some immigration agents showed considerable concern for the welfare of immigrants and their adjustment to life in Canada, this varied greatly and depended largely on personal initiative.⁸ Immigrant affairs did not warrant a separate department; the Department of Agriculture and later, the Department of the Interior, were initially assigned responsibilities for immigration, reflecting the early emphasis on immigration as a means of settling the prairies.⁹

The concept of the "melting pot," whereby a new society would be created incorporating contributions from various ethnic groups, did

⁷ Cornelius J. Jaenen, "Ruthenian Schools in Western Canada, 1897-1919," Paedagogica Historica 10, no. 3 (1970): 517-41.

⁸ For a detailed description of the conditions awaiting early Ukrainian immigrants to Canada, see Vladimir J. Kaye, Early Ukrainian Settlements in Canada: 1895-1900 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964).

⁹ J.E. Hodgetts, The Canadian Public Service: a Physiology of Government (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973), pp. 105-106.

have some advocates in Canada during the twenties and thirties, but for many others the melting pot idea simply provided a convenient veil for anglo-conformity.¹⁰ Government services for immigrants and their children remained practically nil, and although responsibility for immigration was transferred from the Department of the Interior to a new Department of Immigration and Colonization in 1917, this did not represent any significant change of approach to the problems immigrants faced in adjusting to their new country. The association of immigration with land administration was reasserted in 1936, when immigrant affairs were once again transferred to make up one of several branches in the new Department of Mines and Resources.¹¹

1941-1961

Government interest in the activities of the non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups increased during World War II. A Nationalities Branch in the Department of National War Services was established in 1941 to encourage a united war effort among the various ethnic groups in

¹⁰ Palmer, "Reluctant Hosts," pp. 90-96.

¹¹ Hodgetts, The Canadian Public Service, p. 106. Few officials in these departments showed any interest in developments within specific ethnic communities in Canada, despite rapid social and political differentiation within these communities and growing unrest during the thirties. The organization with the most significant, "expertise" regarding internal developments within the more troublesome "other" ethnic groups was the R.C.M.P. This was a result of their contact with, and surveillance of, sects such as the Sons of Freedom (a radical offshoot of the Russian Doukhobors) and left-wing or right-wing radicals among groups, such as the Finns or Ukrainians, who suffered a great deal during the Depression. See the special issue, dealing with ethnic radicals, of Canadian Ethnic Studies 10, no. 2 (1978); George Woodcock and Ivan Avakumovic, The Doukhobors (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1977); Donald Avery, Dangerous Foreigners; European Immigrant Workers and Labor Radicalism in Canada, 1896-1932 (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1979).

Canada,¹² and in 1944 a decision was made to continue its activities beyond the close of hostilities. The government planned to pass a Citizenship Act after the war to give Canadians their own distinctive status, and since it was recognized that there would soon be a substantial flow of immigrants to Canada, it was decided that an administrative unit was needed to deal with the adjustment of immigrants to life in Canada, to aid in their preparation for Canadian citizenship, and to facilitate their acceptance by Canadians as a whole. In 1945 the Nationalities Branch was transferred from the Department of National War Services to the Department of the Secretary of State, and its name was changed to the Canadian Citizenship Branch.¹³

The Citizenship Branch was soon involved in activities such as maintaining contacts with the heads of ethnic organizations, preparing an ethnic press review, collecting documentation on various ethnic groups and organizations in Canada, and encouraging voluntary groups to assist immigrants to adjust to life in Canada. The Citizenship Branch also became involved in setting standards to be used by the courts in examining applicants for citizenship after the passage of the Canadian Citizenship Act by Parliament in June 1946, and field

¹² Several individuals who later worked for the Branch were actually instrumental in bringing together hostile factions of the Ukrainian-Canadian community in Winnipeg in 1940, resulting in the formation of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, a coordinating "umbrella" body of various Ukrainian-Canadian organizations. The Canadian Polish Congress, an umbrella organization for the Poles in Canada, was established with the help of the Nationalities Branch in 1944. See Oleh W. Gerus, "Ethnic Politics in Canada: The Formation of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee," in The Jubilee Collection of the Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences, eds. O.W. Gerus, A. Baran, and J. Rozumnyj (Winnipeg: Trident Press, 1976), pp. 476-78; Palmer, "Reluctant Hosts," p. 97.

¹³ W.H. Agnew, "Historical Review of the Citizenship Branch," Ottawa, 1967, pp. 2-4. (Mimeographed.)

offices were soon established in several cities to help the Branch implement its general goal of promoting citizenship development.¹⁴

Between 1945 and 1961 2,100,000 immigrants came to Canada. Discriminatory clauses remained in immigration legislation until the sixties, and immigrants still encountered strong pressures for conformity; however, economic prosperity and a changing social and intellectual climate created a more favorable atmosphere for the integration of immigrants into Canadian society, and in 1950 the Citizenship Branch of the Secretary of State Department and the Immigration and Indian Affairs Branches of the Department of Mines and Resources were combined to create a new Department of Citizenship and Immigration. Thus the activities designed to help all inhabitants of Canada achieve the status of full citizenship were brought together in one department, reflecting the higher priority which immigration and Indian affairs were assuming in Canadian policy.¹⁵

The Citizenship Branch greatly expanded the scope of its work after this reorganization. Regional offices were set up in all areas of Canada, and the Branch became involved in such policy areas as Indian integration, human rights, adult education, and leadership training. However, the Citizenship Act proclaimed in 1947 was specific only insofar as the function of citizenship registration was concerned, and did not provide a clear framework for the program activities of the Citizenship Branch. Since the Branch was understaffed and the resources allotted to it were limited, the broad scope of the activities of the Branch led it to spread itself far too thinly, and it experienced

¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 4-11.

¹⁵ Palmer, "Reluctant Hosts," pp. 96-100; Agnew, "Historical Review," pp. 12-14.

difficulty in maintaining its ties with ethnocultural organizations and performing an effective role in immigrant integration. It was never closely associated with the fundamental operations of the Immigration Branch; in fact, for more than nine of the fifteen years of existence of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, the two branches were housed in separate buildings, and personnel in the two branches rarely saw eye to eye.¹⁶

Therefore there was considerable confusion regarding the framework within which the integration of the immigrant into Canadian society would take place. On the one hand the Immigration Branch had a large program capability, but was primarily concerned with the process of recruiting and processing immigrants; there was little consideration for providing services to immigrants apart from meeting basic welfare and medical needs for one year after arrival in Canada. On the other hand, the Citizenship Branch had a broad mandate to help immigrants and sensitize the host society to their needs, but possessed few resources to fulfill this mandate and remained a relatively powerless adjunct to the Immigration Branch. The situation was further complicated by the fact that there was little cooperation with the provinces in this field. Since many of the activities associated with immigrant integration were within provincial jurisdiction, the confusion over the locus of primary responsibility for immigrant integration, and insufficient funding for this purpose, resulted in a poor level of services provided to the immigrant.¹⁷

¹⁶ Agnew, "Historical Review," pp. 13-41, 59; Hawkins, Canada and Immigration, pp. 95-98, 118.

¹⁷ Hawkins, Canada and Immigration, pp. 95-98, 178-82.

1962-1971

The sixties and early seventies were a period of considerable change and innovation in Canadian social policy. No attempt will be made to survey the many developments in immigration policy and services for immigrants in detail; they have been fully discussed elsewhere.¹⁸

A major achievement during this period was the elimination of racial discrimination in immigration regulations. In 1962 the system of preferred nationalities was abolished and new regulations emphasized education, training, and skill regardless of the immigrant's country of origin. Residual elements of discrimination were eliminated in 1967, resulting in a substantial increase in the number of non-European immigrants coming to Canada; as a proportion of total immigration to Canada, the Black and Asian groups were approximately 14.6 per cent in 1967 and 36.6 per cent in 1974.¹⁹

The flurry of organizational change resulting from various investigations of government operations by royal commissions, the most important of which was the Glassco Commission, did not bypass the Department of Citizenship and Immigration. During the early sixties there were several internal reorganizations within the department, and

¹⁸ For a summary of developments in a number of areas of social policy during the sixties and seventies, see Shankar A. Yelaja, ed., Canadian Social Policy (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1978), and G. Bruce Doern and B. Seymour Wilson, eds., Issues in Canadian Public Policy (Toronto: Macmillan, 1974). On immigration policy and services for immigrants see Hawkins, Canada and Immigration, Chapter 6; Anthony H. Richmond and G. Lakshmana Rao, "Recent Developments in Immigration to Canada and Australia," International Journal of Comparative Sociology 17 (September-December 1976): 183-205; Grace M. Anderson, "Immigration and Social Policy," in Canadian Social Policy, ed. Yelaja, pp. 107-132.

¹⁹ Richmond and Rao, "Recent Developments in Immigration," p. 188; Anderson, "Immigration and Social Policy," pp. 113-16.

detailed studies of the entire field of immigration were undertaken with a view towards the eventual introduction of a revised Immigration Act. In line with demands that immigration policy be more closely tied to the economic situation in Canada, an important step was taken in 1966 when it was announced that a new Department of Manpower (later renamed Department of Manpower and Immigration) would be created.

This step also involved the transfer of the Citizenship Branch to the Department of the Secretary of State, and although initially there was a tentative agreement that this Branch would no longer be involved in immigrant orientation, it was ultimately decided that responsibility for the social, political, and cultural integration of immigrants would remain with the Citizenship Branch. This included working with the provinces and voluntary organizations in the provision of classes for immigrants in language training and citizenship. Nonetheless, the budgets and manpower of the units of the Citizenship Branch involved with these activities remained woefully small, and were quite inadequate for the duties assigned to these units.²⁰ The role of the Department of Manpower and Immigration in immigrant integration was limited to responsibility for the immediate reception of the individual immigrant worker, for providing family and employment counselling to help his or her early establishment in the community, and for language training for adult immigrants in the work force. No mechanism for regular consultation or collaboration between the Departments of the Secretary of State and Manpower and Immigration was established, and neither department attempted to promote the joint

²⁰ Hawkins, Canada and Immigration, pp. 139-40, 154-55; S. Zybala, "Ethnic Participation Division," Ottawa, 25 June 1970, p. 3 (Mimeographed.)

development of integrated immigration orientation programs.²¹

Gaps in programs for immigrant orientation began to be filled by the provinces, especially Ontario and Quebec, during the middle and late sixties. However, despite the increasing need for joint federal-provincial planning for immigrant services, the federal government made no attempt to initiate major cooperative efforts. Since the provinces were reluctant to cover the whole spectrum of immigrant services, many of these services were left to voluntary organizations, which received little effective guidance from the federal or provincial governments. The voluntary organizations began to receive grants from the two departments discussed above in the late sixties, but often these short-term grants did not allow for a consistent follow-up on important projects.²²

The federal and provincial governments showed even less interest in satisfying any requests for assistance for cultural projects among new immigrant groups, or helping the established non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups retain their linguistic or cultural heritage. Developments in this area in the late sixties came about as a result of the growing assertiveness of the non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups, which found a ready forum in the hearings of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism.

²¹ Ibid., p. 156.

²² Ibid., pp. 177-98, 292-302.

Ethnocultural Pluralism and the Royal Commission on
Bilingualism and Biculturalism

During the fifties the non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups were relatively passive in demanding political power or support for their cultural activities, although there was considerable variation among different groups depending on factors such as time of arrival in Canada, the relative concentration of the group's population, host society prejudices against the group, and desire for group self-assertion. Thus the Ukrainian Canadians were more active in demanding assistance from provincial governments for the maintenance of their language and culture than other established groups such as the German Canadians. The "new" immigrant groups, such as the Portuguese and especially the "visible" minorities (Black and Asian Canadians) were primarily concerned with economic advancement, discrimination, and the continuing immigration of fellow countrymen.²³

Although there were no major changes during the sixties in Anglo-Canadian views of the desirability of further immigration to Canada, this period saw a growing acceptance of pluralist ideas and ethnic diversity. This acceptance was encouraged by a greater concern for individual and group rights throughout North America and by an increasing emphasis on removing institutional restraints on personal freedom.²⁴ The concept of ethnicity gained popularity during this period as it was increasingly seen to provide a foundation for personal

²³ There have been few comparative studies of Canadian ethnic groups. For a selected bibliography dealing with specific groups, see the special issue, dealing with multiculturalism, of Communique: Canadian Studies 3 (October 1976): 34-53.

²⁴ Palmer, "Reluctant Hosts," pp. 97-100.

identity in a materialistic society. Although contemporary technological culture performs an important integrating role in modern society, this same technological culture, which fosters anonymity and impersonal social relationships, has also heightened the need for identity, for which ethnicity has provide a convenient focus. Interest in one's ethnicity received an added impetus from the greater upward social mobility, fueled by the prosperity of the sixties, of many second and third generation Canadians of non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French background. For many of these members of the established "other" ethnic groups, being of a certain ethnic background was no longer necessarily associated with the restricted socio-economic mobility of their parents or grandparents.²⁵

In the United States the catalyst for the development of what is commonly known as the "new ethnicity" was supplied to a considerable extent by the assertion of black pride and Afro-American identity which arose from the civil rights struggle of the sixties. This in turn generated a chain reaction of similar ideological manifestations among Hispanic Americans, native Americans, and ethnic groups of European origin.²⁶ It is widely accepted that in Canada the catalyst for the growing assertiveness of the "other" ethnic groups was the activism during the sixties of French Canadians in and outside of Quebec.²⁷ The most visible response to this activism was the establish-

²⁵ W. Isajiw, "Olga in Wonderland: Ethnicity in a Technological Society," in The Canadian Ethnic Mosaic: A Quest for Identity, ed. Leo Driedger (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1978), pp. 29-39. See also Chapter III below.

²⁶ Palmer, "Mosaic Versus Melting Pot?" p. 518; Robert P. Swierenga, "Ethnicity in Historical Perspective," Social Science 52 (Winter 1977): 31.

²⁷ Bohdan Bociurkiw, "The Federal Policy of Multiculturalism and

ment of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (B & B Commission) in 1963.

If one examines the work of the B & B Commission and the controversies which it raised, it appears that by the end of the sixties the government was almost forced to clarify its position concerning the role of the "other" ethnic groups in Canadian society. This is not to say that these groups would have remained passive if developments in French Canada had taken a different course; something similar to the "new ethnicity" movement²⁸ in the United States probably would have arisen eventually in Canada because of the continuing heavy influx of immigrants, especially the visible minorities, to major urban centers in Canada, and because of the persistent attachment of some groups in the prairie provinces, such as the Ukrainians, to their ethnocultural heritage. The hearings of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, however, provided a convenient and timely forum for certain spokesmen of the "other" ethnic groups to articulate some of their long-felt grievances, especially the lack of attention shown towards them by the government as a result of its overriding preoccupation with the primary (English-French) ethnic cleavage in Canadian society.

the Ukrainian-Canadian Community," in Ukrainian Canadians, Multiculturalism, and Separatism: An Assessment, ed. MR. Lupul (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1978), p. 103; Jean Burnet, "Ethnicity: Canadian Experience and Policy," Sociological Focus 9 (April 1976): 202; Palmer, "Reluctant Hosts," p. 101.

²⁸ The term "movement" may seem to be inappropriate; however, several enthusiasts of the "new ethnicity," including Michael Novak, the well-known author of The Rise of Unmeltable Ethnics: Politics and Culture in the Seventies (New York: Macmillan, 1971), tried vigorously to propagate their ideas and gain public support for them. See A New America, the newsletter of EMPAC! (Ethnic Millions Political Action Committee) edited by Novak. The first issue of this newsletter appeared in 1975.

The non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups did receive some modest recognition in the terms of reference of the B & B Commission, which instructed the Commission

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.²⁹ (Italics mine.)

Nonetheless, the introduction to Book 4 of the Commission's Report, entitled The Cultural Contribution of the Other Ethnic Groups, stressed 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.³⁰ (Italics mine.)

In fact, when Liberal Party leader Lester B. Pearson stated on December 17, 1962 that if elected his government would establish a Royal Commission to deal with bilingualism and biculturalism, Canadians of non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French background were mentioned only as an afterthought at the very end of his speech.³¹

Two of the men appointed to the B & B Commission were immigrants (one of Polish origin, and the other, Ukrainian) who came to Canada following World War II.³² However, according to the research director for Book 4

²⁹ Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, Report, Book 4, The Cultural Contribution of the Other Ethnic Groups (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1970), p. 3.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Canada, House of Commons, Debates, 25th Parliament, 1st Session, 1962, p. 2725.

³² Professors Paul Wyczynski and J.B. Rudnycky.

of the Commission's Report, there was little emphasis on carrying out in-depth research on the "other" ethnic groups:

The extensive research programme of the Commission included little about them: two studies of Italian immigrants, one done in Montreal and one in Edmonton; a small study of attitudes of Montreal Jews towards French-Canadian nationalism and separatism; about a dozen essays on the contribution of particular ethnic groups to the cultural enrichment of Canada; some brief investigations carried out almost surreptitiously by members of the other ethnic groups who had obtained jobs on the research staff, and comparative data gathered incidentally by people focusing on relations between English-French relations [sic].³³

Members of the Jewish-Canadian community were among the first to react to the Commission's terms of reference, criticizing the illogical use of the term "two founding races" to describe the English and French groups in Canada, and claiming that the non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups were being overlooked by the Commission.³⁴ The manner in which the "other" ethnic groups were included in the final terms of reference was clearly unsatisfactory to many spokesmen for these groups; they claimed that Canadians of non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups were being treated as second-class citizens. The Canadian Jewish Congress, for example, expressed its views about the work and findings of the B & B Commission in various ways, and participated in preliminary hearings of the Commission in November 1963, but never submitted a formal brief because of its disagreement with the Commission's approach.³⁵ Representatives of several other ethnic groups met on October 20, 1963 in Montreal and resolved to present their grievances before Parliament.³⁶

³³ Jean Burnet, "Ethnicity; Canadian Experience and Policy," p. 202.

³⁴ Toronto Telegram, 14 June 1963.

³⁵ A.J. Arnold, "How Far Do We Go With Multiculturalism?" address to a seminar on Multiculturalism, Edmonton, 18 September 1970, p. 1. (Mimeographed.); The Canadian Jewish News, 9 April 1965.

³⁶ Ottawa Citizen, 17 March 1964.

As the B & B Commission began to hold formal meetings in the prairie provinces, reaction from the non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups became more vocal. The vehement statements made by some members of the "other" ethnic groups were unexpected, and as a result the Commission's co-chairmen had to postpone some of their formal meetings, and had to slow down the work of the Commission.³⁷

This "backlash" against the B & B Commission received considerable publicity in the English and French language press. Although it was often conceded that the "ethnics" had a point in criticizing their neglect by the Commission, strong opposition was voiced to some of their demands and statements. In an editorial in Le Devoir Claude Ryan appealed for greater understanding for the situation of "les Néo-Canadiens," but criticized the idea that the non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups formed a "third force" in Canadian society. Ryan was particularly upset by a statement made by Dr. Hlynka, a prominent Ukrainian Canadian, in which the latter questioned the need for any special status for French Canadians in western Canada.³⁸

There was little or no coordination among the various "other" ethnic groups in the preparation and presentation of their briefs to the B & B Commission. There was a fairly broad consensus concerning the unsatisfactory nature of the Commission's terms of reference, but even this was not universal. Leaders of Toronto's Italian-Canadian community informed the Commission that they were not submitting a brief since they felt that Canada is officially a bilingual and bicultural country, there should be no attempts to multiply the difficulties...by any suggestion that special

³⁷ Peter Stursberg, "Ottawa Letter," Saturday Night, March 1964, p. 10.

³⁸ Le Devoir, 3 June 1964; Toronto Telegram, 14 June 1963.

treatment be afforded other groups."³⁹

Similarly, the Trans-Canada Alliance of German Canadians also favored the promotion of both bilingualism and biculturalism.⁴⁰ However, two other German-Canadian organizations, the Mennonite Society for the Promotion of the German Language in Canada⁴¹ and the Manitoba Mennonite Trustee Association, which sponsored German and religious instruction in 125 elementary schools, submitted briefs which called for a policy of multiculturalism and federal assistance to ensure that children whose mother tongue was German could study their language in public schools.⁴²

Some submissions called for a symbolic recognition of Canada's diversity; two briefs from Ukrainian-Canadian organizations raised the idea of a Ukrainian Canadian as the next governor-general.⁴³ Nonetheless, despite considerable internal organizational differentiation,⁸ the Ukrainian-Canadian group put forward the most consistent and far-reaching proposals. It submitted thirty-seven briefs to the B & B Commission, the largest number from any non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic group.⁴⁴ According to Bociurkiw, the proposals raised in these briefs, and those of many other ethnic group spokesmen, can be summarized as follows:

- (1) in one, united, and independent Canada, Canadians should

³⁹ Toronto Star, 31 March 1965.

⁴⁰ Winnipeg Free Press, 30 March 1965.

⁴¹ The role of the B & B Commission in stimulating greater activism within various ethnic communities is demonstrated by the fact that this society was established specifically to provide the Mennonites with a more effective voice in dealing with the Commission shortly before its hearings in Winnipeg. Interview, 11 May 1979; Globe and Mail, 19 May 1965.

⁴² Globe and Mail, 19 May 1965.

⁴³ Winnipeg Free Press, 20 May 1965.

⁴⁴ Bociurkiw; "The Federal Policy of Multiculturalism," p. 105.

enjoy effective equality in political and socio-economic rights, irrespective of their ethnic origin, religion, mother tongue, etc.; (2) all ethnic groups, from the Anglo-Celtic and French to the smallest ones, contribute to the Canadian cultural mosaic, and their cultural activities should be given moral and material support by the state in proportion to the group's willingness to survive; (3) within the linguistic provisions of the BNA Act, English should be the lingua franca of all Canadians, but the teaching of, and in, ancestral languages, and their social use, should be encouraged and supported from public funds wherever there is effective demand for them; (4) publicly-supported media should devote appropriate time and resources to ethnic language programs and to the culture and art of minority groups; (5) all levels of government should actively combat discrimination and prejudice directed against ethnic groups.⁴⁵

Because of its contacts with various voluntary and ethnocultural organizations, the Citizenship Branch helped to arrange public meetings across the country to discuss the work of the B & B Commission, and individual Branch officers encouraged these organizations and interested individuals to prepare and present briefs to the Commission. The Branch also provided the Commission with advice on the background and status of the ethnocultural organizations which made submissions to the Commission.⁴⁶

Nonetheless, the Citizenship Branch did not come up with any policy initiatives to respond to the demands of the non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups, and it was unable to significantly influence the direction of discussions concerning the values of ethnocultural pluralism. Officials of the Branch claimed that they had no mandate to become deeply involved in this area. In addition, those sections of the Branch which were responsible for immigrant orientation and contacts with various ethnocultural organizations were poorly staffed and had limited resources.⁴⁷ The situation was further complicated by the breakup in 1966 of the

⁴⁵ Ibid., pp. 102-103.

⁴⁶ Agnew, "Historical Review," pp. 62-63.

⁴⁷ S. Zybal, "Ethnic Participation Division," Ottawa, 25 June 1970, p. 3. (Mimeographed.)

Department of Citizenship and Immigration and the transfer of the Citizenship Branch to the Department of the Secretary of State. As previously mentioned, this move led to some ambiguity concerning the division of responsibilities between the new Department of Manpower and Immigration and the Citizenship Branch in the field of immigrant orientation and liaison with the "other" ethnic groups.

Uncertainty about the role of the Citizenship Branch in influencing or directing the nature of the debate on ethnocultural pluralism was also influenced by the publication in 1965 of The Vertical Mosaic. In this work the well-known sociologist John Porter devoted considerable attention to the way in which mobility opportunities could be restricted by the socio-economic stratification which he felt would result from too great an emphasis on ethnic group affiliation.⁴⁸ Porter's ideas appealed to those officials in the Department of the Secretary of State who placed a high priority on the rapid assimilation of members of the "other" ethnic groups into what Porter called the "charter" groups (the English and French), and who were disturbed by the pluralistic trends in Canadian society.⁴⁹ Shortly after the transfer of the Citizenship Branch to the Secretary of State Department, Porter discussed the implications of his ideas for the work of the Branch at a Citizenship Branch National Staff Training Conference:

Historically, it seems to me, ethnic pluralism has contradicted the principle of equality. It can also interfere with the principle of social efficiency...Continued emphasis on the retention of ethnic cultures can mean the retention within post-modern society of values less favourable

⁴⁸ John Porter, The Vertical Mosaic (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965) pp. 60-103.

⁴⁹ Several former Citizenship Branch officials who were interviewed noted the great popularity of Porter's ideas at this time. Interview, 1 May 1979, 10 May 1979.

to education and upward mobility. The question I raise concerns the value of a policy especially directed to the encouragement and retention of ethnic cultures. There is a problem with children who live behind ethnic barriers! It may be necessary to devise policies to free young people from the restrictive environment of ethnic cultures into the world of opportunity that the present age offers. Thus, providing effective choice for the young may require us to re-examine the values of ethnic pluralism...

The alternative to an ethnic pluralism, which involves the retention of European and other identities, is the idea of a new nation...Dual ethnic loyalties which have characterized Canadians would no longer be appropriate, and government policies directed towards integration, assimilation and ethnic organizations could be more clearly developed without the built in contradictions they now contain.⁵⁰

The Thinkers' Conference on Cultural Rights

The demands for a greater recognition of Canada's ethnocultural diversity, or what was increasingly being called Canada's "multicultural" identity, continued to gain impetus. Exasperated by the absence of any government response to criticism of the idea of official biculturalism by spokesmen of the non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups, the Canadian Folk Arts Council⁵¹ convened the Thinkers' Conference on Cultural Rights in Toronto on December 13-15, 1968 at the initiative of Senator Paul Yuzyk.⁵² Prominent

⁵⁰ Canada, Department of the Secretary of State, Citizenship Branch, "Canadian Society--1967--Social Development: Report of the National Staff Training Conference," Ottawa, 1967, pp. 12-13. (Mimeographed.)

⁵¹ The Canadian Folk Arts Council was established in November 1964 at a conference of ethnic group representatives sponsored by the Citizenship Branch. It played a prominent role in Canadian Centennial celebrations in 1967, and continues to coordinate folkloric activities at various important cultural events across the country. Paul Yuzyk, "Multiculturalism: A Historical Perspective," remarks to the First Canadian Conference on Multiculturalism, Ottawa, 15 October 1973, p.1. (Mimeographed.)

⁵² From the time of his maiden speech in the Senate in 1963, entitled "Canada: A Multicultural Nation," Senator Yuzyk has been a persistent advocate of policies which would reflect Canada's "multicultural" identity. See Paul Yuzyk, For a Better Canada (Toronto: Ukrainian National Association, 1973), pp. 9-176.

speakers at the conference included Walter Tarnopolsky, Dean of Law at Windsor University, William Davis, Ontario's Education Minister, and Claude Ryan, editor of Le Devoir.⁵³

The conference was successful in again raising the profile of demands from the "other" ethnic groups after an initial flurry of activity in connection with the hearings of the B & B Commission, and reports about the conference appeared in a number of newspapers.⁵⁴ The main thrust of the resolutions of the conference reflected the consensus that Canada should adopt a policy of multiculturalism, which would receive guidance from meaningful and representative advisory councils at the federal and provincial levels. In addition, sufficient funds should be made available by the federal and provincial governments to various ethnic groups and inter-ethnic agencies serving these groups for the preservation and development of their cultures and languages as an integral part of Canadian society.⁵⁵

⁵³ The most dominant groups at this conference were the Ukrainians, Poles, and Slovaks; several important groups such as the Germans, Italians, Portuguese, and Greeks were poorly represented. Some government observers regarded the conference as Senator Yuzyk's brainchild, and noted the lack of spontaneity during the conference sessions. Canada, Department of the Secretary of State, Citizenship Branch, Immigrant Participation Division, "Comments on the Thinkers' Conference on Cultural Rights," Ottawa, January 1969. (Mimeographed.) As demonstrated by Bociurkiw, Ukrainian Canadians have been the leading spokesmen for and promoters of a multiculturalism policy for Canada. Bociurkiw, "The Federal Policy of Multiculturalism," p. 122. In fact, some journalists have claimed that the demands for government support of ethnocultural pluralism are primarily due to the agitation of a small elite group of Ukrainian Canadians and other disgruntled or maladjusted Canadians of Eastern European origin. Winnipeg Free Press, 20 May 1965; Montreal Gazette, 5 June 1971; Le Devoir, 5 June 1972. It is interesting to note that the multiculturalism policy was unveiled in the House of Commons just one day before Trudeau spoke at the Tenth Ukrainian Canadian Congress in Winnipeg.

⁵⁴ Canadian Cultural Rights Committee, Concern: A Conference to Study Canada's Multicultural Patterns in the Sixties (Ottawa: Canadian Cultural Rights Committee, 1969), pp. 138-47.

⁵⁵ Ibid., pp. xxi-xxii.

Innovation in Ottawa

During the sixties the Citizenship Branch was uncertain about its role in promoting ethnocultural pluralism, providing little direction to the debate on this topic. There was also a notable lack of effective coordination among representatives of the major non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups in pressing for greater recognition of Canada's "multicultural" identity, and they had difficulty demonstrating grass roots support for their demands. Given this lack of initiative on the part of both the bureaucracy and the "other" ethnic groups, it is doubtful whether the federal government would have made any meaningful concessions to these groups in the short run unless there were partisan political advantages in doing so, or unless there was a significant change in the prevailing circumstances.

It is difficult, of course, to evaluate the importance of partisan political motivations in the eventual announcement of the multiculturalism policy. There have been frequent accusations that it was a cheap symbolic gesture by the Liberal government to secure the "ethnic" vote, and some aspects of the development of the multiculturalism policy since 1971 have given rise to considerable speculation about the sincerity of the government's commitment to support a policy of ethnocultural pluralism.⁵⁶ The government probably did have some hopes that the multiculturalism policy would be popular among voters in those ridings, especially in southern Ontario and western Canada, where a large part of the population is neither of Anglo-Saxon nor French origin. Nonetheless, it is doubtful whether partisan political consideration were the deciding factor leading to the

⁵⁶ Rae Murphy, "The Unmaking of the Minister of Culture," The Last Post, September 1973, pp. 27-31; Student, November 1971; Gloria Montero, "Facing Up to Multiculturalism," Canadian Forum, May 1976, pp. 12-13.

decision to declare a multiculturalism policy. The Liberal Party had a strong majority in the House of Commons during the period 1968-72, and there were no indications that the opposition parties were making any significant effort to cater to voters of non-Anglo-Saxon or non-French background.⁵⁷

The atmosphere of change and innovation in Ottawa during the late sixties was probably more important in influencing the formulation of government policies concerning ethnocultural pluralism than partisan political considerations or piece-meal lobbying efforts by ethnic organizations. This "new mood" in Ottawa was largely the result of Trudeau's ideas concerning the "just society" and the emphasis which he and his advisors placed on fostering national unity, the need for innovative policy-making, and establishing clear goals for government activities.⁵⁸

The influence of this change in atmosphere was most evident in the Department of the Secretary of State. In 1963 the Liberal government under Pearson had decided to give more vigorous support to the arts and other cultural activities, and in the next few years the Department of the Secretary of State was assigned more and more

⁵⁷ This does not mean that the policy was not liable to political manipulation after its announcement. See Chapter IV for more details.

⁵⁸ See pp. 15-16 above. This has not been reflected, however, in the implementation of comprehensive social policies. The Liberal government has traditionally had a pragmatic orientation and is more concerned with electoral, parliamentary, and judicial reforms rather than being committed to fundamental social or economic change. Although the announcement of a multiculturalism policy and other innovative developments within the Department of the Secretary of State may well represent the most idealistic steps taken by the Trudeau government, many of these initiatives were poorly planned and implemented. See John Redekop, "Social Policy: The Role of the Governing Party," in *Canadian Social Policy*, ed. Shankar Yelaja (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1978), pp. 243-60.

responsibilities in this area. The base was slowly being laid for a more comprehensive federal role in cultural policy, but a considerable growth in funds for this purpose was not forthcoming until 1967-68. The increased emphasis on the arts and culture was given additional impetus when a Cabinet Committee on Culture and Information (later renamed Culture, Science, and Information, and now Cultural and Native Affairs) was established in the spring of 1969.⁵⁹

The Secretary of State during the period of the greatest expansion of this department (1968-72) was Gérard Pelletier, a close friend and confidant of Prime Minister Trudeau. An idealist who felt that a broad view of cultural policy was needed at the federal level, Pelletier believed that Canada should follow the example of the European countries in giving generous support to the cultural community.⁶⁰ Buoyed by optimism about the state of the economy and considerable public support for a greater government role in setting cultural policy, there were dramatic increases in funding for all forms of cultural and recreational activities in the late sixties and early seventies,⁶¹ although a large part of the increase in the budget of the Department of the Secretary of State was the result of policies emerging from the newly-created Bilingualism Development Branch, which soon turned out almost two dozen cabinet documents concerning the Official Languages Act and other aspects of official bilingualism.⁶²

⁵⁹ Bernard Ostry, The Cultural Connection (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1978), pp. 100-106.

⁶⁰ Ibid., pp. 115-16.

⁶¹ For details on expenditures across a wide range of cultural activities, see Ostry, The Cultural Connection, pp. 117-34.

⁶² Sandra Gwyn, "Multiculturalism: A Threat and a Promise," Saturday Night, February 1974, p. 17.

At the beginning of Trudeau's term of office, bilingualism and biculturalism were still the catchwords in Ottawa, despite the occasional acknowledgement of the pluralist nature of Canadian society.⁶³ The government was concerned, however, about the backlash, especially in western Canada, against the work of the B & B Commission and official bilingualism policies. According to Bernard Ostry, a senior civil servant who was close to Trudeau and Pelletier and was responsible for the early phase of the implementation of the multiculturalism policy, both Trudeau and Pelletier felt that an overly literal interpretation of the bilingualism and biculturalism formula would ultimately lend support to the "two nations" concept. They hoped that a policy of cultural pluralism, which would accent the theme of "unity in diversity," would provide a counterforce to the potentially unstable dichotomy posed by the concept of bilingualism and biculturalism. In addition, a greater recognition of the role of the non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups in Canada would theoretically ease their suspicions of and hostility to the Official Languages Act and other major concessions to French Canadians.⁶⁴

This concern over public reaction to official bilingualism policies coincided with plans for a major shift in emphasis in the duties and style of operation of the Citizenship Branch. In response

⁶³ Speaking in the House of Commons on the resolution preliminary to the introduction of the Official Languages Bill, Prime Minister Trudeau, for example, mentioned that "we believe in two official languages and in a pluralist society not merely as a political necessity but as an enrichment." Debates, 28th Parliament, 1st Session, 1968, p. 1481. For a survey of developments in bilingualism policy until 1974, see V. Seymour Wilson, "Language Policy," in Issues in Canadian Public Policy, eds. G. Bruce Doern and V. Seymour Wilson (Toronto: Macmillan, 1974), pp. 253-85.

⁶⁴ Interview, 25 April 1979.

to the lack of a definite framework for the activities of the Branch, which was regarded as somewhat of a "backwater" in Ottawa,⁶⁵ Robert Stanbury was appointed Minister Without Portfolio responsible for Citizenship and Information Canada on October 20, 1969, and he began a comprehensive review of citizenship policy and legislation.⁶⁶

Shortly before his appointment as a minister, Stanbury, who was Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State Gérard Pelletier, was described as a hard-working, methodical, and conscientious Member of Parliament,⁶⁷ and he plunged into his new portfolio responsibilities with considerable enthusiasm. Within a few months proposals for a "revitalized program for citizenship" were submitted to Cabinet, and in the spring of 1970 Cabinet approved five broad objectives which were to be the new mandate for the Citizenship Branch:

- a) to reinforce Canadian identity and unity.
- b) to encourage cultural diversity within a bilingual framework.
- c) to preserve human rights and fundamental freedoms.
- d) to increase and improve citizenship participation.
- e) to develop meaningful symbols of Canadian sovereignty.⁶⁸

Since Book 4 of the Report of the B & B Commission, entitled The Cultural Contribution of the Other Ethnic Groups, had been

⁶⁵ Sandra Gwyn, "The Great Ottawa Grant Boom (And How It Grew)," Saturday Night, October 1972, p. 23.

⁶⁶ Hawkins, Canada and Immigration, pp. 364-65.

⁶⁷ Globe and Mail, 16 October 1969.

⁶⁸ Harry Bruce, "'The Branch,' Who Needs It?: A Short History of the Citizenship Branch, the Department of the Secretary of State, in the Government of Canada," Ottawa, 10 March 1972, p. 28. (Mimeographed.)

completed by October 1969, and was being printed for release late in the spring of 1970, the submission concerning the broadened mandate of the Citizenship Branch emphasized the need for Cabinet to begin considering the government's response to the recommendations of this report. Cabinet agreed, and gave the go-ahead to the Citizenship Branch to hold a wide range of public and private consultations to discuss the above objectives, including the encouragement of "cultural diversity within a bilingual framework," and to propose programs to implement these objectives.⁶⁹

Bernard Ostry was appointed Assistant Under Secretary of State for Citizenship in January 1970. One of the few Canadians of Jewish background to break into the senior ranks of the civil service during the sixties, he was a professional historian from western Canada who had earlier directed the Humanities and Social Science Research Councils and was a former chief of the Public Affairs Branch of the CBC. He had a reputation in Ottawa as a skilful power broker with a taste for the flamboyant and controversial, but also had strong convictions about social reform.⁷⁰ As Ostry describes it, he was asked to take this position in order to "shake up" some of the complacent bureaucrats in the Citizenship Branch. He was given a relatively free hand in proposing innovative programs, and was told by Trudeau that the Citizenship Branch would be expected to play an important role in promoting national unity.⁷¹

⁶⁹ Interview, 25 April 1979.

⁷⁰ Gwyn, "The Great Ottawa Grant Boom," p. 23.

⁷¹ Interview, 25 April 1979.

Ostry brought in a number of new senior civil servants to replace senior staff of the Citizenship Branch, and they tackled the broad mandate of the Branch with enthusiasm.⁷² Instead of continuing to hand out small grants to what were regarded as "status quo" voluntary organizations such as the Y.M.C.A., Rotary Clubs and various middle-of-the road church groups, money was disbursed to establish Indian, Métis, and Inuit political, social, and cultural organizations, to set up a women's bureau and the Opportunities For Youth (OFY) program, and to expand travel, exchange, and hostel programs.⁷³ "Participation" was the most fashionable word in the Citizenship Branch at this time, and the euphoric atmosphere was reflected in a discussion paper on citizenship entitled "To Become What We Are," prepared for the Citizenship Branch by the Canadian author and journalist Kildare Dobbs:

Participation, belonging, taking part--this is where citizenship begins...without the consent--and more than the consent, the participation--of the people, symbols are mere shadows....

...in encouraging the self-expression of minority cultures; the Citizenship Branch has worked for participation and against any tyranny of the majority....

Part of the job of the federal government is to encourage ethnic minorities to share their good things with other Canadians. And these include histories, languages and philosophies as well as gefillte fish and Irish stew, arts and religions as well as paper dragons....

⁷² They included: Mike McCabe, former executive assistant to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, Mitchell Sharp; Stewart Goodings, former acting director of the Company of Young Canadians; Robert Nichols; and Jennifer McQueen. Globe and Mail, 29 January 1970. For more details on internal developments within the Citizenship Branch at this time, see Doris Shackleton, Power Town: Democracy Discarded (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1977), pp. 87-90.

⁷³ Bruce, "The Branch, Who Needs it?" pp. 29-34. For developments in youth policy during this period, especially the OFY program, see Robert S. Best, "Youth Policy," in Issues in Canadian Public Policy, eds. Doern and Wilson, pp. 137-65.

...Canada's colours glow with the radiance of promise.
For diversity is the condition of man everywhere. And
everyone who takes part in Canada can be a Canadian citizen.⁷⁴

The Consultation Stage

The initiation of a series of public and private meetings between Minister Without Portfolio Robert Stanbury and his staff, and representatives of the non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups, immediately followed the publication of Book 4 of the Report of the B & B Commission. In fact, these meetings were largely intended to gauge the nature and the strength of opinion among the "other" ethnic groups regarding the sixteen recommendations of Book 4.⁷⁵

Stanbury held several private meetings with community leaders from the non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups during the summer of 1970, and the Citizenship Branch helped to fund a series of public conferences across the country (Thunder Bay, Toronto, Edmonton, Ottawa, Sudbury, Regina) during 1970-71.⁷⁶ Book 4 of the B & B

⁷⁴Kildare Dobbs, "To Become What We Are: Discussion Paper on Citizenship," Ottawa, 1971. (Mimeographed.)

⁷⁵These recommendations are listed in Appendix B.

⁷⁶The initiative in organizing many of the conferences dealing with multiculturalism came from the Ukrainian Canadian Students' Union (SUSK). This organization received a grant of \$10,000 from the Citizenship Branch in 1969 which enabled approximately 200 delegates from across Canada to attend the 10th SUSK Congress. In the eyes of some observers this congress marked the first step towards the development of a genuine Ukrainian-Canadian student movement. At this congress there was a strong emphasis on student involvement in the debate on Canada's identity and on helping to mobilize other ethnic groups to participate in this debate. SUSK later began a consistent campaign to gain public support for the concept of multiculturalism and to stimulate discussion on this topic. See Student, August 1969 and October 1969; Bociurkiw, "The Federal Policy of Multiculturalism," p. 108.

Commission Report and its recommendations were discussed with several prominent social scientists, and advice was solicited concerning certain specific projects such as a research project to investigate the demand for non-official language teaching, and the establishment of a Canadian Ethnic Studies Center.⁷⁷

The Citizenship Branch also began to devote more attention to developments at the provincial level. Groups such as the Ukrainians and Germans had been demanding for several years that the provincial governments recognize the ethnocultural diversity of Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta,⁷⁸ and some of these provinces were slowly beginning to respond to these demands. A "Manitoba Mosaic Congress" was held in Winnipeg on October 7-13, 1970, generating considerable enthusiasm among the "other" ethnic groups of that province. Several observers from the Citizenship Branch attended this Congress, which passed a number of resolutions pertaining to the federal government.⁷⁹

Although the response of the non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups to the publication of Book 4 of the B & B Commission Report was less energetic than the Citizenship Branch had expected,⁸⁰ the recommendations of Book 4 were received favorably by most of these groups. The recommendations were quite far-reaching; it was proposed

⁷⁷ Interview, 24 April 1979.

⁷⁸ Oleh W. Gerus, "The Ukrainian Canadian Committee," in Essays in Ukrainian-Canadian History (tentative title), ed. Manoly R. Lupul (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, forthcoming).

⁷⁹ Ibid.; "Resolutions of the Manitoba Mosaic Congress," Winnipeg, Manitoba, October 1971. (Mimeographed.)

⁸⁰ Gwyn, "Multiculturalism: A Threat and a Promise," p. 17; Interview, 24 April 1979.

that the CBC and CRTC remove their restrictions on the use of other languages in broadcasting, that other cultural agencies such as the National Film Board and the National Museum continue and expand programs to reflect Canada's ethnocultural diversity, and that all provinces adopt a full range of legislation to prevent discrimination based on race, creed, color, nationality, ancestry, or place of origin. Of more importance was the fact that several of the recommendations called for a greater emphasis on the teaching of non-official languages at various levels of the educational system.⁸¹

The most widespread complaint from the "other" groups was that Book 4 still continued to use the term "bicultural" to refer to Canada's cultural makeup. Some representatives of the established non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups also felt that the recommendations of Book 4 did not go far enough in advocating support for the linguistic and cultural heritage of the "other" ethnic groups; there was considerable dissatisfaction that the B & B Commission did not recommend federal financial support for non-official language teaching.⁸²

By the fall of 1970, most of the groundwork for a government statement responding to the recommendations of Book 4 had been completed. The cultural agencies referred to in Book 4 were asked to submit proposals concerning the recommendations which dealt with their sphere of activities, and the establishment of an Ethnic Advisory Committee, and of an Inter-Agency Coordinating Committee to help in

⁸¹ See Appendix B.

⁸² Canada, Department of the Secretary of State, Citizenship Branch, Ethnic Participation Division, "Ethnic Press Reaction to the Publication of the Fourth Volume of the B & B Report," Ottawa, 16 July 1970. (Mimeographed.)

the implementation of the government's response to Book 4, were discussed. The draft of a Cabinet document on multiculturalism was ready by the end of 1970, but government preoccupation with the situation in Quebec resulting from the 1970 October crisis and substantial modifications in the original draft of the Cabinet document resulted in it not being considered by Cabinet until September 1971.⁸³

During 1970-71, pressure for a policy statement by the federal government concerning Book 4 continued to grow. The Alberta Social Credit government announced a provincial multiculturalism policy at an "Alberta Multicultural Conference" on July 16, 1971,⁸⁴ and in September 1971 the Premier of Ontario William Davis announced that Ontario would hold an "Ontario Heritage Conference" in April 1972 to discuss the concept of multiculturalism and its implications in Ontario.⁸⁵ In addition, Parliament's Special Joint Committee on the Constitution of Canada held hearings during 1970-71, and its recommendations in favor of declaring Canada to be a "multicultural" country were already known in the fall of 1971.⁸⁶ In the view of the Joint Committee:

...a new Constitution should recognize in the preamble that Canada is multicultural rather than bicultural or unicultural. As a fact this seems sufficiently obvious to any student of the country, but it is also a point which needs formal emphasis. There neither is, nor should there be, any official culture in Canada...All democracies allow their citizens freedom under law, but many do not go so far as to allow cultural freedom. Canada must continue to do so, but more consciously and more effectively.

⁸³ Interview, 24 April 1979.

⁸⁴ Harry Strom, "A New Cultural Policy for the Province of Alberta," remarks to the Alberta Multicultural Conference, 16 July 1971. (Mimeographed.)

⁸⁵ William Davis, "Statement Announcing the Convening of the Ontario Heritage Congress," Toronto, 9 September 1971. (Mimeographed.)

⁸⁶ Bociurkiw, "The Federal Policy of Multiculturalism," pp. 104, 124.

The Constitution should therefore provide in its section on language rights that Provincial Legislatures may confer rights on other language groups with respect to use in the Legislatures themselves, or in government administration, the courts, and education in publicly-supported schools. The negative phrasing⁸⁷ proposed in Article 19 of the Victoria Charter is not adequate.

There were few questions in the House of Commons concerning the delay in the government response to Book 4 of the B & B Commission Report.⁸⁸ However, in view of the developments noted above, and the fact that Book 4 had been submitted to the federal government in October 1969, it was probably felt that further delay would be unwise. As noted in the Introduction, the federal government tabled its response to the recommendations of Book 4 in the House of Commons on October 8, 1971, and at the same time unveiled its multiculturalism policy. The multiculturalism policy was seen to be an integral element in the broadened mandate of the Citizenship Branch of the Department of the Secretary of State:

The government is concerned with preserving human rights, developing Canadian identity, strengthening citizenship participation, reinforcing Canadian unity and encouraging cultural diversification within a bilingual framework. These objectives can best be served through a policy of multiculturalism.⁸⁹

⁸⁷ Canada, Special Joint Committee of the Senate and of the House of Commons on the Constitution of Canada, Final Report, 28th Parliament, 4th Session, 16 March 1972, p. 25.

⁸⁸ One question specifically referring to Book 4 was raised in the House by Progressive Conservative M.P. Baldwin. Debates, 28th Parliament, 2nd Session, 1970, p. 5931.

⁸⁹ Canada, Federal Government, "Response to Book 4 of the Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism," Document tabled in the House of Commons, Debates, 28th Parliament, 3rd Session, 1971, pp. 8580-85.

CHAPTER III

THE DEBATE OVER MULTICULTURALISM

Ethnic Pluralism in the United States

The sixties witnessed an outbreak of what one author has called "ethnic fever" in the United States.¹ The long-entrenched melting-pot ideology underwent attacks from advocates of a new ideal--ethnic pluralism--and the "white ethnics"--Poles, Italians, Slovaks, and others of European origin--soon began to employ the same terminology used by racial minorities such as the Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Indians, etc. in pointing to the fashion in which pressures from society at large had cut them off from their ethnocultural heritage without necessarily allowing them their "place in the sun."²

Many American scholars who were sympathetic to what was dubbed the "new ethnicity" declared that the nation was undergoing an "ethnic revival," and wrote books with titles such as Beyond the Melting Pot, The Decline of the WASP, and The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics.³ Ethnic studies programs were introduced in many colleges

¹ Stephen Steinberg, "Ethnicity in the United States: A Sociological Perspective," International Journal of Group Tensions 7 (December 1977): 130.

² Robert P. Swierenga, "Ethnicity in Historical Perspective," Social Science 52 (Winter 1977): 31-32.

³ Nathan Glazer and Daniel Moynihan, Beyond the Melting Pot (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1964); P. Schrag, The Decline of the WASP (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1970); Michael Novak, The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics (New York: Macmillan, 1971).

and universities and a growing number of historians rebelled against consensual and class conflict interpretations of American history and devoted more attention to ethnic and religious cleavages in the United States.⁴

The widespread use of the term "ethnicity" and interest in promoting the values of ethnic pluralism is a recent phenomenon. Before the late sixties only a handful of American sociologists, and even fewer political scientists, had written on ethnic groups in the United States, and most postwar scholars predicted the eventual demise of ethnicity in America.⁵ Since functionalism dominated North American sociology and anthropology until the sixties, there was a strong emphasis on assimilation, integration, and amalgamation; the importance of pluralism, separatism, and conflict was played down. Development and modernization theory assumed that ethnic loyalties were obstacles to social planning, and that ethnic groups would fade away with the modernization of the nation-state. In addition, the preoccupation of many social scientists with class as an explanatory tool meant that the role of ethnic factors in shaping stratification systems was often overlooked.⁶

Although some American scholars point to a "revival" of ethnicity, while others contend that only elite perceptions of the significance of ethnic allegiance has changed, most observers agree that there has been a considerable increase in the salience of ethnicity in American domestic affairs. Several arguments have been

⁴ Swierenga, "Ethnicity in Historical Perspective," pp. 39-40.

⁵ Ibid., p. 31.

⁶ William Newman, American Pluralism: A Study of Minority Groups and Social Theory (New York: Harper and Row, 1973), pp. 53-67.

put forward to explain this phenomenon. Modernization, for example, is said to have had several unanticipated consequences. It has led to institutional centralization and bureaucratization, and since expanded organizational networks have seldom attempted to satisfy needs for expressive, identifiable units of belonging, people feel a need for affiliations more enduring and less abstract than legal rights, occupation, and citizenship. Ethnicity often supplies this need, and increased literacy and the spread of information via new media technology have played an unexpected role in this process by helping to spread ethnic symbols, rhetoric, and conflicts.⁷

Daniel Bell has extended this idea further, and points out that it is becoming increasingly difficult to promote claims on behalf of large but loosely aggregated groups such as "workers" or "the national interest." It is easier to make claims for groups small enough to make concessions possible and visible, and appeals to ethnicity combine interest with readily identifiable cultural symbols. Ethnicity has thus become a rallying point much as social class remains a focus for change in industrializing nation-states without major cross-cutting ethnic cleavages.⁸

However, the philosophical basis of the American legal system reflects the primacy of individual rights, as well as the concepts of equality of condition and equality of means. Many critics of the "new ethnicity" in the United States have expressed concern about the shift from an individual to a collective perspective in American society

⁷ Daniel Bell, "Ethnicity and Social Change," in Ethnicity: Theory and Experience, eds. Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975), pp. 158-62.

⁸ Ibid., pp. 169-71.

since this could lead to demands for equality of results, and for direct redistributive public policies that would equalize incomes, living conditions, political participation etc., on a group basis. According to the scenario which some social scientists have advanced, this could result in the imposition of quotas (raising questions about the issues of merit and competence) and in new demands for collective rights, with the mobilization of one group leading to counter mobilization by other groups.⁹

According to van den Berghe, where ethnic groups are concentrated in certain areas, some inequalities could be redressed by reallocating resources for the regional development of the underprivileged areas. Where ethnic groups are territorially dispersed, granting official recognition to disadvantaged ethnic groups with no chances of achieving any significant autonomy would not lead to the redress of inequalities, but to entrenchment of a semi-caste system:

...with a territorial basis and a common and separate cultural tradition, an ethnic group has realistic prospects of establishing a nation-state, and a nationalist strategy can make sense. In the absence of these conditions, ethnic consciousness and separatism on the part of underprivileged groups can lead at best to ghettoization and encapsulation in caste-like occupational niches. Any official recognition of their differences is a retrograde step, since those differences are initially defined by those in power as "problems," deficiencies, or stigmas, however carefully these prejudices are hidden behind an ideological smokescreen of egalitarian announcements. If such groups are to achieve equality, integration on the basis of individual incorporation is the only realistic option. If redressive measures to correct past inequalities are to be taken, they should be based on universalistic class criteria such as income, not on race or ethnicity.¹⁰

Other critics have claimed that the interest in American ethnic

⁹ Pierre van den Berghe, "Ethnic Pluralism in Industrial Societies," Ethnicity (September 1976): 251.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 254.

groups is simply a fad which has resulted in an academic ethnicity industry, and that those who live off this industry "rush the slightest symbols of ethnic distinctiveness into print to prove that we have not really blended into a common pot."¹¹ Parsons considers that what others claim to be major cultural differences are merely peripheral remnants of immigrant ethnicity, and he quotes Schneider as saying that ethnic identity in America is "...conspicuously devoid of 'social content'" and that the cultural markers used to differentiate groups are "empty symbols."¹² In their turn pluralists have accused these critics of the "new ethnicity" of assimilationist biases, and point to the reality of ethnic diversity in America and to the continuing influence of ethnicity on voting behaviour, social stratification, and community life.¹³

The debate in the United States on the nature and significance of ethnic group affiliation continues. The "new ethnicity" movement of the sixties and early seventies, and the rhetoric it spawned, were largely a reaction to the previous emphasis on one-sided theories of assimilation. This reaction in turn has led to a counter-reaction from the "assimilationists," and assimilationist approaches still dominate most serious attempts at theory building in the sociology

¹¹ Richard Basham and David DeGroot, "Current Approaches to the Anthropology of Urban and Complex Societies," American Anthropologist 79 (June 1977): 423.

¹² Talcott Parsons, "Some Theoretical Considerations on the Nature and Trends of Change of Ethnicity," in Ethnicity, eds. Glazer and Moynihan, p. 65. See also Herbert J. Gans, "Symbolic Ethnicity: The Future of Ethnic Groups and Cultures in America," Ethnic and Racial Studies 2 (January 1979): 1-20.

¹³ Andrew M. Greeley and Christian W. Jacobsen, "Editorial Research Note," Ethnicity 5 (March 1978): 1-13.

of ethnic groups. There is no single and distinct theory of social pluralism applicable to the study of ethnic groups; rather, pluralists have used several different approaches to demonstrate that total assimilation is not inevitable and that group diversity is a permanent feature of modern society.¹⁴ Given a greater number of empirical and comparative studies in this area of research, it may be that a "paradigmatic consolidation" will take place in the near future which will permit a more complete delineation of the complex relationships between ethnicity and other fundamental sociological constructs.¹⁵

Ethnic Studies in Canada

The recent increase of academic interest in the history and sociology of the non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups in Canada largely parallels developments in the United States. Prior to World War II research on the "other" ethnic groups was largely prescriptive and dealt with the implications for Canada of accepting immigrants of various ethnic backgrounds, and with the best means of assimilating these immigrants.¹⁶ Research on the non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups expanded after World War II and became more neutral, but work in this area was still conducted by a small number of scholars who lacked a forum for the discussion of ideas and the exchange of information.¹⁷

¹⁴ William M. Newman, "Theoretical Perspectives for the Analysis of Social Pluralism," in The Canadian Ethnic Mosaic: A Quest for Identity, ed. Leo Driedger (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1978), pp. 40-44.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 51.

¹⁶ Howard Palmer, "History and Present State of Ethnic Studies in Canada," in Identities: The Impact of Ethnicity on Canada Society, ed. Wsevolod Isajiw (Toronto: Peter Martin Associates, 1977), pp. 167-72.

¹⁷ Ibid., pp. 172-73.

Ethnic studies in Canada came of age during the late sixties and early seventies. The Inter-University Committee on Canadian Slavs, established in 1965 by the First National Conference on Canadian Slavs, held in Banff, Alberta, began to expand the framework of its activities during the late sixties to include other Canadian ethnic groups, and it was reconstituted and renamed the Canadian Ethnic Studies Association (CESA) in 1971.¹⁸ In the meantime a small Research Centre for Canadian Ethnic Studies had been established at the University of Calgary. It began to publish the journal Canadian Ethnic Studies in 1969, and now publishes this journal for CESA, which also distributes a quarterly Bulletin and organizes major conferences every two years.

The expansion of ethnic studies in Canada is also being slowly reflected in the modification of school curricula to reflect Canada's ethnic diversity. Until recently ethnicity and cultural pluralism had no formal place in school curricula; a study commissioned by the Canadian Ethnic Studies Advisory Committee demonstrated that in the early seventies elementary and secondary school programs across the entire country showed an overwhelming British or French monocultural orientation, and were rife with strong cultural biases, stereotyping, and errors of fact.¹⁹

In recent years a large number of conferences and publications has dealt with the topic of multicultural curricula, and in 1977 the Faculty

¹⁸ Paul Migus, "Preface," in Sounds Canadian: Languages and Cultures in Multi-Ethnic Society, ed. Paul Migus (Toronto: Peter Martin Associates, 1975), pp. viii-ix.

¹⁹ Ted Aoki and Jorgen Dahlie, "Canadian Ethnic/Multicultural Content in Program Guides of Provincial and Territorial Departments of Education report submitted to the Canadian Ethnic Studies Advisory Committee, Ottawa, September 1974, pp. 90-93. See also Ted Aoki, Jorgen Dahlie, and W. Werner, eds., Canadian Ethnicity: The Politics of Meaning (Vancouver: Centre for the Study of Curriculum and Instruction, University of British Columbia, 1978); Howard Palmer and Harold Troper, "Canadian Ethnic Studies: Historical Perspectives and Contemporary Implications," Interchange 4 (October 1973): 15-23.

of Education at the University of Toronto began publishing a journal titled Multiculturalism in cooperation with the Multiculturalism Development Branch of the Ontario Ministry of Culture and Recreation.²⁰

The recent interest in questions of ethnicity and "finding one's roots" is also reflected in the considerable public appeal of books such as All of Baba's Children, a popularized history of Ukrainian life in Western Canada which was a Canadian best-seller for several weeks.²¹

Ethnic Affiliation, Social Mobility, and Group Rights in Canada

The multiculturalism movement²² of the late sixties and early seventies has not given rise to a vigorous assimilationist reaction in Canadian academic circles similar to the academic backlash against the "new ethnicity" in the United States. However, the assimilationist tradition in Canada is a strong one, and the views of the most well-known Canadian representative of the assimilationist approach, sociologist John Porter, are in many respects similar to those of van den Berghe.²³

In his major work The Vertical Mosaic Porter argues that ethnicity has been a principal component of the Canadian class structure, and that over

²⁰ See, for example, the special issue, on multiculturalism in the curriculum, of The History and Social Science Teacher 12 (Fall 1976); Vincent D'Oyley, ed., The Impact of Multi-Ethnicity on Canadian Education, 2nd ed. (Toronto: Urban Alliance on Race Relations, 1977).

²¹ Myrna Kostash, All of Baba's Children (Edmonton: Hurtig, 1977).

²² The term multiculturalism "movement" has been used in several recent articles. See Wsevolod Isajiw, "Olga in Wonderland: Ethnicity in a Technological Society," in The Canadian Ethnic Mosaic, ed. Driedger, p. 37; Raymond Breton, "The Structure of Relationships between Ethnic Communities," in The Canadian Ethnic Mosaic, ed. Driedger, pp. 64-70. Members of the Ukrainian Canadian Students' Union who were active lobbyists for multiculturalism often speak of the multiculturalism "movement." Student, November 1977.

²³ See pp. 70-71 above.

time initial entrance status differentials in the economic positions of immigrant groups can readily harden into a permanent class system. In his view "segregation in social structure, to which the concept of mosaic or multiculturalism must ultimately lead, can become an important aspect of social control by the charter groups."²⁴ Porter's proposition that "ethnically blocked mobility" is especially characteristic of Canada, and is perpetuated by the dominant charter group elites, leads him to recommend that reducing the salience of ethnicity would directly increase social mobility and thus significantly reduce the levels of economic and political inequality in Canada. He contends that the maintenance of ethnic communities and strong feelings of ethnic affiliation will restrict achievement motivations and prevent the full acquisition of the modern technological outlook so necessary to the attainment of individual qualifications, especially education, required for occupational mobility.²⁵

In two recent articles Porter has shown some optimism about the survival of the French language in Canada, but is critical of the government's multiculturalism policy, which he feels will support dying ethnic sub-cultures and prevent their adherents from fully participating in the benefits of a universalistic post-industrial way of life.²⁶ Porter's views on ethnicity and multiculturalism, which are very popular in some Canadian academic circles, have provoked a great deal of controversy. One sociologist has recently engaged in a war of statistics with

²⁴ John Porter, The Vertical Mosaic (Toronto; University of Toronto Press, 1963), pp. 71-72. The "charter groups" is the term Porter uses to refer to the Anglo-Saxon and French ethnic groups in Canada.

²⁵ Ibid., 69-73.

²⁶ "Dilemmas and Contradictions of a Multi-Ethnic Society," Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada 4th ser. 10 (1972): 193-205; "Ethnic Pluralism in Canadian Perspective," in Ethnicity, eds. Glazer and Moynihan, pp. 267-304.

77

Porter, using data from several studies to show that ethnic affiliation is only one factor, and not the most important one, among many variables which influence occupational achievement and income in Canada. In his opinion Porter's emphasis on the central role of ethnicity in social mobility has diverted attention from other, more important sources of the maintenance of class stratification in Canada, such as structural impediments to mobility.²⁷

Two advocates of a pluralist approach, sociologist Jean Burnet and historian Howard Palmer, have sharply criticized Porter's cynicism in proposing that multiculturalism is a deliberate Anglo-Canadian fraud to preserve the vertical mosaic. They claim that the government's multiculturalism policy is intended to improve the self-image of the "other" ethnic groups, to increase their influence on the decision-making process, and to change discriminatory attitudes. In addition, they point out that the policy is strongly supported by the "other" ethnic groups, which would be unlikely if it was perceived as a real threat to their upward mobility. In their view, the way to break down the vertical mosaic is to change elite attitudes, rather than encourage Anglo-conformity.²⁸

However, the "pluralists" have not attempted to create a theoretical framework for the discussion of ethnic pluralism in Canada. Much of their research remains at a descriptive level and can be considered only as groundwork for the possible future elaboration of pluralist theories. Although Breton and Isajiw were commissioned by the Department of the Secretary of State in 1972 to prepare a report on the five new policy

²⁷ A. Gordon Darroch, "Another Look at Ethnicity, Stratification and Social Mobility in Canada," Canadian Journal of Sociology 4 (Winter 1979): 1-25.

²⁸ Jean Burnet, "The Policy of Multiculturalism within a Bilingual Framework: A Stock-taking," Canadian Ethnic Studies 10, no. 2 (1978): 110; Howard Palmer, "Canada: Multicultural or Bicultural?" Canadian Ethnic Studies 3, no. 1 (1971): 115.

objectives of the Citizenship Branch, and they attempted to deal with the question of cultural diversity within the framework of the concept of citizenship participation then in fashion in Ottawa, their treatment of this topic was not very extensive, and has not been followed by further research.²⁹

In a recent article sociologist Roman Petryshyn criticizes both John Porter and the advocates of what he calls "liberal" multiculturalism for their conception of ethnic pluralism in Canada. He largely agrees with Porter's description of the relationship between class and ethnicity in Canada, but, along with other pluralists, disagrees with Porter's lack of recognition of the socially constructive dimensions of ethnicity. Petryshyn believes that "progressive" ethnic consciousness has contributed more to challenging Canada's class and ethnic stratification system and promoting social mobility than has the Anglo-conformism or assimilation recommended by Porter, and that the assimilation of the "other" ethnic groups has in fact served to preserve the status quo.³⁰

Nonetheless, Petryshyn is also harshly critical of the individualist and liberal ideology underlying the federal government's multiculturalism policy. He points out that the government's approach ignores the fact that ethnic identification has both individual and social, voluntary and involuntary components, and he quotes from the announcement of the multiculturalism policy in which Trudeau emphasizes the government's view that "a policy of multiculturalism within a bilingual framework is basically the conscious support of individual freedom of choice. We are free to be

²⁹ Raymond Breton and Wsevolod Isajiw, "Citizenship Goals for Canada: A Report on the Five Policy Objectives of the Citizenship Branch," Ottawa, 1972. (Mimeographed.)

³⁰ Roman Petryshyn, "Minority Rights Versus Multiculturalism," Meta (forthcoming).

ourselves."³¹ Thus, according to Petryshyn, for the "other" ethnic groups ethnicity in Canada

is hereafter defined by this government to exist only at the level of the individual. Group rights are to be the prerogative only of the majority ethnic groups; only the English and French languages are to be state languages. Multiculturalism does not include any minority group rights. "Ethnic" people (i.e., those of neither French nor Anglo-Saxon background) are free to choose to be themselves; this however does not apply to their group, which is not free to choose to be itself as are the English and French groups. It is assumed that all other groups must sooner or later assimilate...This is the major premise for a liberal definition of multiculturalism.³²

Petryshyn quoted Trudeau's statement slightly out of context; Trudeau continued his speech to say that multiculturalism

cannot be left to chance. It must be fostered and pursued actively. If freedom of choice is in danger for some ethnic groups, it is in danger for all. It is the policy of this government to eliminate any such danger and to "safeguard" this freedom.³³

Nonetheless, Petryshyn is correct in pointing out that the government was not prepared to recognize and support a variety of full-fledged ethnic "cultures" in Canada. Although for various reasons (see Chapter II above) the government felt it necessary to acknowledge the ethnic diversity of Canada's population in some fashion, it was assumed that most of the "other" ethnic groups lack a population base or are too highly differentiated to maintain complete, dynamic cultures. Burnet claims that Canada is more correctly described as a multi-ethnic rather than multicultural country, since it is ethnic identities rather than cultures which are being cultivated in Canada by the "other" ethnic groups. These groups

³¹ Canada, House of Commons, Debates, 28th Parliament, 3rd Session, 1971, p. 8546.

³² Petryshyn, "Minority Rights Versus Multiculturalism."

³³ Debates, 28th Parliament, 3rd Session, 1971, p. 8546.

are eager to maintain their distinctive identity through such means as ethnic associations, newspapers, and supplementary schools, while at the same time they participate along with others in Canadian society, working, receiving formal education and government services, and communicating with many of their fellow citizens in English or French. They have certain cultural traits that they cherish as badges of their ethnic identity, but these do not constitute a complete, living and changing culture....

If one may judge by government statements and by budget allocations, the policy of multiculturalism is intended to aid Canadian groups who wish to do so to set up or to maintain their ethnic organizations and their cultural symbols, because preserving one's ethnic identity is considered to be consistent with acquiring a Canadian identity and taking part in Canadian society and culture. It is not intended to enable groups to set up complete institutional systems that could minimize their contacts with other Canadians. The only complete or virtually complete institutional systems envisaged are those related to the English and French languages.³⁴

Dualism and Multiculturalism

Some critics have charged that in announcing a multiculturalism policy the government departed significantly from the spirit of Book 4 of the Report of the B & B Commission, which retained the original terms of reference of the Commission in using the term bicultural to describe the Canadian cultural reality.³⁵ Palmer argues, however, that the B & B Commission had considerable difficulty in dealing with this question, and in effect acknowledges in Book 4 that Canada is both a bicultural and multicultural country.³⁶

Whatever the intentions of the B & B Commission, it has proved difficult to reconcile the concepts of anglophone-francophone dualism and multiculturalism. Cameron points out that the federal government and Prime Minister Trudeau have consistently adhered to a sociological rather than institutional approach to the

³⁴ Jean Burnet, "The Policy of Multiculturalism within a Bilingual Framework: An Interpretation," in Education of Immigrant Students: Issues and Answers, ed. Aaron Wolfgang (Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1975), p. 209.

³⁵ Guy Rocher, "Les ambiguïtés d'un Canada bilingue et multiculturel," Revue de l'Association Canadienne d'éducation de langue française 1 (September 1972): 21-23; R.R.H., "In the Bosom of a Single State," Journal of Canadian Studies 6 (November 1971): 1-2.

³⁶ Palmer, "Canada: Multicultural or Bicultural?" p. 111.

English-French linguistic and cultural cleavage in Canada; in recent years this approach has tended to define Canada's population in terms of language rather than ethnicity, and the B & B Commission concentrated its attention primarily on the anglophone and francophone communities in Canada. This approach assumed that no one province would have special responsibilities for the needs of the francophone community, and that the federal government would take the lead in developing and implementing policies related to the dualistic nature of Canada.³⁷

The regional and ethnocultural diversity found outside Quebec, however, belies this simplistic concept of dualism, and of two founding "races" in Canada. While the presence of a large French-Canadian community created the conditions for the development of cultural pluralism in Canada, the concept of francophone-anglophone dualism, and the reality of regional and ethnocultural differences within English-speaking Canada, have each posed a problem for the other:

If bilingualism and biculturalism are to be the defining concepts for Canadian life, then the possibility of adequate institutional recognition and support of pluralism is markedly diminished. If one is preoccupied with French-English relations, it is difficult to bring into bold relief those social facts and relationships which are neither French nor English....If dualism is the explanatory model that is employed, then concern for and sensitivity to multiculturalism in Canada will necessarily be reduced....

If, to take the opposite position, multiculturalism is accepted as the dominant norm, with English as the de facto lingua franca, then the French-Canadian fact will tend to be assimilated to that theory of pluralism, and French Canadians will tend to be regarded simply as members of the several minority cultures that together compose the Canadian mosaic....The divergent principles of dualism and multiculturalism lie at the center of a good deal of misunderstanding in Canada.³⁸

³⁷ David R. Cameron, "Dualism and the Concept of National Unity," in Approaches to Canadian Politics, ed. John H. Redekop (Scarborough: Prentice-Hall, 1977), pp. 236-42. See also David R. Cameron, Nationalism, Self-Determination and the Quebec Question (Toronto: Macmillan, 1974), pp. 109-112.

³⁸ Cameron, "Dualism and the Concept of National Unity," pp. 242-43. It is interesting to note that apart from the above article and book by Cameron, the literature on Canadian federalism has not devoted much attention to the problem of reconciling anglophone-francophone dualism with Canada's ethnocultural pluralism. Donald Smiley dismisses multiculturalism as a "diversion," while Edwin Black deals with multiculturalism in a superficial manner. See Donald V. Smiley, Canada in Question: Federalism in the Seventies,

Francophones and Multiculturalism

The tension created by the countervailing principles of dualism and multiculturalism is most evident in the arguments of many French and Anglo-Canadian intellectuals that officially recognizing and promoting cultural pluralism in Canada will detract from the status of French Canadians and relativize their position in Canadian society.³⁹ Although some prominent French Canadians have made a sincere effort to conduct a dialogue with members of the "other" ethnic groups,⁴⁰ on the

2nd ed. (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1976), p. 180; Edwin R. Black, Divided Loyalties: Canadian Concepts of Federalism (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1975), pp. 59, 213-14. For a rather superficial examination of the political and constitutional implications of multiculturalism, see Sava D. Bosnitch, "The Neglected Political and Constitutional Implications of the Policy of Multiculturalism," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, Saskatoon, 30 May 1979. (Mimeographed.)

³⁹Rocher, "Les ambiguïtés," pp. 21-23; R.R.H., "In the Bosom of a Single State," pp. 1-2; Gregory Baum, "Perspectives on Multiculturalism," The Grad Post, 30 November 1978, pp. 5-7.

⁴⁰In 1965 Quebec Premier Jean Lesage visited Winnipeg and met with several leaders of the Ukrainian community as well as with representatives of the ethnic press in an attempt to show that the goals of French Canadians and of the non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups are not mutually exclusive. See the Winnipeg Tribune, 4 October 1965 and 5 October 1965. In some of his speeches and editorials Claude Ryan has shown considerable understanding for the situation of the "other" ethnic groups and has encouraged them to retain their identity. See Le Devoir, 3 June 1964; "Public Policy and the Preservation of Multicultural Traditions," in Concern: A Conference to Study Canada's Multicultural Patterns in the Sixties, Canadian Cultural Rights Committee (Ottawa: Canadian Cultural Rights Committee, 1969), pp. 138-47. On the other hand, French Canadians have traditionally been hostile to immigration, and until recently it was widely believed that the federal government had directed and managed immigration policy so as to favor and strengthen English-speaking Canada; some xenophobic tendencies still remain in Francophone Québécois society. See Freda Hawkins, Canada and Immigration: Public Policy and Public Concern (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1972), pp. 180, 216-26; Ivan Myhul, "Ethnic Minorities and the Nationality Policy of the Parti Québécois," in Ukrainian Canadians, Multiculturalism, and Separatism: An Assessment, ed. Manoly R. Lupul (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1978), pp. 37-58. However, the Parti Québécois government is now making numerous overtures to gain more support among the non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups in Quebec. See Camille Laurin, "Statement," in Ukrainian Canadians, ed. Lupul, pp. 11-36; Ottawa Journal, 8 May 1979; Globe and Mail, 9 May 1979.

whole Quebec's francophone leadership has reacted to the concept and policy of multiculturalism with skepticism and occasional hostility. According to sociologist Guy Rocher, multiculturalism has no political meaning for francophones, for they see Canada as a country defined by a twofold culture, anglophone and francophone, and they consider the non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups to be almost exclusively within the orbit of the anglophone community.⁴¹

Francophones have also been suspicious of the distinction which they claim the multiculturalism policy makes between language and culture, since they are very conscious of the close relationship between the two. In their view a policy of multiculturalism which does not provide the "other" ethnic groups with substantial support for their languages is a ploy to attract the "ethnic" vote and to deflect attention from the situation of francophones in Canada. If multiculturalism is to be taken seriously, it would imply greater recognition of languages other than English or French; this would result in the French Canadians being placed on the same footing as other ethnic groups.

In a multicultural country in which the French-speaking community is in danger of becoming smaller, this troublesome Canadian bilingualism will be in jeopardy before long. There will be pressure either to return to unilingualism outside Quebec, or to recognize other official languages besides English and French....

...the new multicultural policy represents a retrograde step, as far as French-Canadians are concerned, although they have not yet realized it. French-Canadians have struggled for generations to have bilingualism accepted--bilingualism defined not simply as the acceptance of French as an official language in Canada but recognition of French-Canadians as partners with the English-speaking community in the country's sociological structure. By separating bilingualism from biculturalism, the

⁴¹ Guy Rocher, "Multiculturalism: The Doubts of a Francophone," in Multiculturalism as State Policy: Conference Report, Second Canadian Conference on Multiculturalism, Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism (Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1976), pp. 48-49.

Trudeau government is betraying all the hopes French-Canadians might have placed in bilingualism, as they conceived it--that is, clearly tied to its symbol and essential condition, biculturalism.

Of the two main cultural and language communities--anglophone and francophone--the latter will obviously be the more adversely affected, and therefore feel threatened, by this new multicultural policy.⁴²

Quebec's political leaders were largely in agreement with each other in their response to the federal government's announcement of the multiculturalism policy. René Lévesque denounced the policy as a "verbal fraud," but also criticized the illusions of the federal government that bilingualism and biculturalism were possible outside of Quebec. In his opinion the multiculturalism policy was obviously an attempt to win votes among the large numbers of people of non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French background in the prairie provinces.⁴³ Camil Samson, of the Creditistes, and Gabriel Loubier, of the Union Nationale, also dismissed the policy as a pre-election gimmick to win support among the "other" ethnic groups, and emphasized the predominance of the French and English cultures in Canada.⁴⁴

Although the Bourassa government did not respond to the policy announcement immediately, when it did respond it expressed some serious misgivings about multiculturalism. The Premier declared that the principle of the multiculturalism policy clearly contradicted the mandate of the B & B Commission, and stated that Quebec did not accept the federal government's approach to the principle of multiculturalism.⁴⁵

⁴²Ibid., pp. 50-52. For a more measured criticism of the concept of multiculturalism, see the editorial by Claude Ryan in Le Devoir, 9 October 1971.

⁴³Le Soleil, 18 November 1971.

⁴⁴Ibid.

⁴⁵Robert Bourassa, "Objections to Multiculturalism," letter to Prime Minister Trudeau, Le Devoir, 17 November 1971. Reprinted in Howard Palmer, ed., Immigration and the Rise of Multiculturalism

Many francophone organizations in western Canada and Ontario have also been critical of the multiculturalism policy. Although on occasion they have cooperated in some ventures with the non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups,⁴⁶ francophones outside Quebec resent being treated in the same fashion as the "other" ethnic groups, and feel that a policy of multiculturalism might institutionalize such an approach. Francophone organizations often use the argument that multiculturalism can only begin to be fostered when bilingualism finally flourishes:

...bilingualism and multiculturalism must not be confused... certain provinces, British Columbia in particular, still refuse to accept the French fact. This lack of tolerance toward bilingualism has all too often been disguised by the excuse of multiculturalism. Such an attitude thwarts any attempts to achieve the desired national unity. Let us abandon multiculturalism and strive to achieve bilingualism on a national scale. When this objection [sic] has been reached, new Canadians will have the support of strong and culturally flourishing francophones in their efforts to obtain respect for their languages and cultures.⁴⁷

Toronto: Copp Clark, 1975), pp. 151-52. Although it is difficult to gauge the general public's attitude towards promoting ethnocultural pluralism, the Majority Attitudes Study, which was carried out on behalf of the Department of the Secretary of State to investigate the attitudes of Canadians towards multiculturalism, reported that although French Canadians did not reject multiculturalism, they consistently showed less support for the concept than did Anglo-Saxon respondents and members of the "other" ethnic groups because of their ethnocentric attitudes. See John Berry, Rudolf Kalin, and Donald M. Taylor, Multiculturalism and Ethnic Attitudes in Canada (Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1977), pp. 171-74.

⁴⁶ Cornelius J. Jaenen, "The Manitoba School Question: An Ethnic Interpretation," in Ethnic Canadians, ed. Martin L. Kovacs (Regina: Canadian Plains Research Center, 1978), pp. 317-29. In a brief to the Parliamentary Committee on the Constitution, the Association Culturelle Franco-Canadienne de la Saskatchewan favored cultural expression for all groups and argued that each province should decide which language or languages should be made official. See Robert Painchaud, "The Franco-Canadians of Western Canada and Multiculturalism," in Conference Report: Second Canadian Conference on Multiculturalism, pp. 33-38.

⁴⁷ "Mémoire de la Fédération des Franco-Colombiens présenté au Groupe du travail sur les minorités de langue française," Vancouver, 26 September 1975, quoted in Painchaud, "The Franco-Canadians," p. 37.

A somewhat more ambivalent approach has been adopted by the Council for Franco-Ontarian Affairs; it acknowledges the ethnocultural diversity of Ontario and agrees that the debate on biculturalism vs. multiculturalism is partly the result of a problem of semantics. The Council considers that a view of biculturalism which does not recognize other cultural groups is too narrow, but that a concept of multiculturalism which puts all cultural groups on the same footing is far too broad:

From a Franco-Ontarian point of view, culture and language are such inseparable concepts that one cannot recognize the two official languages of the country without also recognizing the two cultures which are bound up in them....

When Franco-Ontarians want a special cultural status in Ontario, they do not want to decry, to make a value judgment, on the cultures of other groups....

But in a given country, the cultures of the founding peoples must retain a special status and be supported by public institutions...A naive definition of multiculturalism in Ontario which sometimes is defined that all cultures are equal in this province does not lie well with Franco-Ontarians. They also cringe every time they are referred to as ethnics. I would accept this word if I were to live in another country but not in my homeland.⁴⁸

The insecurity which prevails among the French-speaking minorities is, perhaps best summed up in a recent report prepared by the Federation of Francophones Outside Quebec:

Another threat to the cultural identity and activity of Francophones outside Quebec is the concept of Canada as a bilingual but multicultural country. This federal policy, which has many followers among the provincial governments, pushes us too easily and subtly to the background, to the same level as any other ethnic minority.⁴⁹

Despite the rhetoric on the topic of multiculturalism, few representatives of the "other" ethnic groups and of francophone minorities

⁴⁸ Omer Deslauriers, "Multiculturalism and Franco-Ontarians," in Unity in Diversity, eds. Shiu L. Kong and Riten Ray (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978), p. 50.

⁴⁹ The Federation of Francophones Outside Quebec, The Heirs of Lord Durham: Manifesto of a Vanishing People (Toronto: Burns and MacEachern, 1978), p. 65.

outside Quebec have attempted to conduct a serious dialogue and to bring about a rapprochement on this subject. Some of the arguments used by francophones have been outlined above; too often they have attacked the motives of the federal or provincial governments in announcing multiculturalism policies without considering and addressing the situation and genuine aspirations of the "other" ethnic groups. Similarly, the more aggressive representatives of the non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups have often taken a stubborn and uncompromising stand with respect to their own demands, and have alienated otherwise sympathetic French Canadians.⁵⁰ Few community leaders have demonstrated the understanding shown by the late Professor Painchaud for the legitimate claims of both the "other" ethnic groups and the minority Francophone communities. He believed that bilingualism and multiculturalism were not adversary but complementary policies, and that multiculturalism could only strengthen the existence of the French and assist the cause of bilingualism:

If the francophone collectivities fail to support programs designed to assist other ethno-cultural communities urgently in need of linguistic and cultural "recovery," they will one day find themselves isolated within western Canada. What is worse, they would then face a hostile and unyielding bloc of assimilated groups determined not to extend to the French-speaking element any special privileges. The francophone groups, which more than other groups appreciate the value of diversity as opposed to uniformity, must recognize that they have no monopoly either on culture or on the right to cultural survival. And, while they do enjoy advantages in the area of linguistic rights, they must come to understand that other groups may wish to retain their language for cultural purposes.⁵¹

⁵⁰ Le Devoir, 3 June 1964; Winnipeg Tribune, 23 June 1969.

⁵¹ Painchaud, "The Franco-Canadians," p. 44. For the views of a prominent Ukrainian Canadian who shares the views expressed by Painchaud, see Walter Tarnopolsky, "Multiculturalism--The Basic Issues," in Ukrainian Canadians, ed. Lupul, pp. 141-52.

What Kind of Multiculturalism?

In theory the public of the multiculturalism policy consists of all Canadians, and some of the programs of the Multiculturalism Directorate of the Department of the Secretary of State are aimed at promoting understanding among all ethnocultural groups in Canada, including groups of Anglo-Saxon and French background, as well as the native peoples. All of these groups have received grants from the Directorate for various cultural projects, and the literature produced by the Directorate emphasizes that its programs are intended to benefit Canadians of all origins. Nonetheless, one of the primary reasons for the adoption of the multiculturalism policy was the growing perception in government circles during the late sixties that the contribution of the non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups to Canadian society should be recognized in some fashion, and that government departments and cultural agencies were not sufficiently sensitive to the needs of these groups. For most practical purposes it was considered that the charter groups and native peoples were adequately served by other government programs, and therefore the attention of the multiculturalism policy was to be focussed on the "other" ethnic groups.

However, the concept of the non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups forming a "third force" or "third element" in Canadian society has never gained much credence, and was quickly rejected by the B & B Commission.⁵² Critics of the multiculturalism policy have delighted in pointing to the difficulty of catering in any consistent fashion to the

⁵² Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, Report, Book 4, The Cultural Contribution of the Other Ethnic Groups (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1970), p. 10.

demands of the numerous ethnic groups of various backgrounds which are spread across the country,⁵³ and the large body of historical and sociological research which has been conducted on the "other" ethnic groups in Canada in recent years confirms not only the great degree of diversity among these groups, but also the striking internal differentiation within individual ethnic groups.⁵⁴

It is therefore understandable that there has been a wide range of expectations concerning the role of the multiculturalism policy in supporting the activities of various ethnocultural groups. There have been frequent complaints, for example, that the policy, with its emphasis on cultural preservation, is oriented too much toward the established ethnic groups, and has little to offer new immigrant groups concerned with economic and social adjustment. Hawkins has criticized the Multiculturalism Directorate for not devoting enough attention to the integration of immigrants into Canadian society, and believes that its activities should be more closely integrated with those of the Department of Manpower and Immigration.⁵⁵

⁵³ Montreal Star, 18 May 1973.

⁵⁴ Judith A. Nagata, "One Vine, Many Branches: Internal Differentiation in Canadian Ethnic Groups," in Two Nations, Many Cultures: Ethnic Groups in Canada, ed. Jean Leonard Elliott (Scarborough: Prentice-Hall, 1979), pp. 173-81. It is impossible to survey the many differences among and within the "other" ethnic groups in Canada in a few pages without being extremely superficial. The only work which has attempted to comprehensively discuss the place of the "other" ethnic groups in Canadian society is Book 4 of the Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, entitled The Cultural Contribution of the Other Ethnic Groups (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1970). Recent collections of readings on ethnic groups in Canada include the book by Elliott mentioned above, Leo Driedger, ed., The Canadian Ethnic Mosaic: A Quest for Identity (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1978), and Martin L. Kovacs, ed., Ethnic Canadians: Culture and Education (Regina: Canadian Plains Research Center, 1978).

⁵⁵ Freda Hawkins, "Canadian Immigration: Present Policies, Future

2 2

OF/DE

Burnet has noted that many of the spokesmen who have pressed hardest for a multiculturalism policy are Canadian born, and represent established European groups such as the Ukrainians, who have received very few immigrants in recent years. Groups such as the Italians have shown much less concern for multiculturalism and show more interest in problems associated with immigration, while the "visible" minorities are preoccupied with human rights and discrimination in the job market rather than cultural or linguistic rights.⁵⁶

In turn, representatives of the established non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups have occasionally expressed the view that multiculturalism is too often identified as a policy for immigrants.⁵⁷ Many spokesmen for these groups have strongly opposed suggestions that the primary role of the multiculturalism policy should be to help in immigrant integration and to help combat racial discrimination. They feel that the main responsibility for the above should remain with other units of government, and that multiculturalism programs should concentrate on assisting the "other" ethnic groups to retain their linguistic and cultural heritage. Government initiatives in 1975 to change the main thrust of the multiculturalism policy, allowing for a greater emphasis on inter-group relations and fighting discrimination, drew a strong reaction from representatives of the established ethnic groups. They claimed that these initiatives signified a deliberate attempt by the government to

Options," The Round Table 67 (January 1977): 60-63; Interview, 11 May 1979 (c).

⁵⁶ Jean Burnet, "Multiculturalism, Immigration and Racism: A Comment on the Canadian Immigration and Population Study," Canadian Ethnic Studies 7, no. 1 (1975): 37; Jean Burnet, "The Policy of Multiculturalism within a Bilingual Framework: A Stock-taking," Canadian Ethnic Studies 10, no. 2 (1978): 109.

⁵⁷ Manoly R. Lupul, "The Unorganized Ukrainians in Canada," Ukrainian Canadian Review no. 5 (1974), p. 9.

de-emphasize multiculturalism and to avoid dealing with the persistent demands from the established ethnic groups for a greater financial commitment from the federal government to support ethnocultural pluralism, and notably non-official language teaching.⁵⁸

The debate over multiculturalism continues; few of the issues discussed in this chapter have been resolved in a satisfactory fashion, and numerous conferences and seminars dealing with multiculturalism often seem to end up discussing issues which have been raised countless times before.⁵⁹

The continuing debate on the importance of retaining one's ethnic identity, the dilemma posed by the difficulty of reconciling multiculturalism and anglophone-francophone dualism, and the absence of capable leadership among representatives of the "other" ethnic groups all influenced the formulation and implementation of the federal government's multiculturalism policy. There was little cooperation among representatives of the various "other" groups in presenting concrete demands to the federal government, and no dramatic issues arose which would have mobilized the "other" ethnic groups to exert effective political pressure on the government to influence its multiculturalism policies. A great deal therefore depended on the extent to which policy-makers in both the political and bureaucratic arenas provided strong and consistent leadership in this policy area.

⁵⁸ Ibid.; Bociurkiw, "The Federal Policy of Multiculturalism," pp. 117-19; Student, December 1975. Lupul has criticized the influence which academics such as Jean Burnet have had on the formulation of the multiculturalism policy. In his estimation, the emphasis which she places on the "symbolic" role of the ethnic identity of the "other" ethnic groups in Canadian society, and her contention that only the French and English-speaking communities are large enough and concentrated enough to support viable and dynamic "cultures," have provided the federal government with a convenient rationale for providing the "other" ethnic groups with minimal and largely symbolic support for the retention of their languages and cultures. Manoly R. Lupul, "The Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism: A Progress Report and Some Concerns about the Future," Ukrainian Canadian Review no. 5 (1974), p. 46.

⁵⁹ See a report on the Third Canadian Conference on Multiculturalism, held in Ottawa on October 27-29, 1978, in Student, November 1978; O.M. Kuplowska, "Whither Goeth Multiculturalism," Meta 2 (Winter 1979): 3-5.

CHAPTER IV

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MULTICULTURALISM POLICY: 1971-74

Since the announcement of the federal multiculturalism policy in October 1971, there has been considerable criticism of the manner in which the policy has been implemented by the government. Some of the factors which have hindered the development of a widespread consensus on the need for government policies to reflect Canada's ethnocultural diversity, as well as on the content of these policies, were noted in the previous chapter; this lack of a consensus has been complemented by uncertainty about the place and role of the multiculturalism policy within the bureaucratic and executive arenas, and by the treatment of the policy within the political arena.

The First Programs

The official statement of the government's response to Book 4 of the B & B Commission Report outlined six programs which would be developed to implement the multiculturalism policy.¹

Multicultural Grants Grants would be given to support various activities such as citizenship preparation and immigration orientation programs, conferences, youth activities, cultural exchanges, multicultural centers, and other projects.

¹The following is based on Canada, Federal Government, "Response to Book 4 of the Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism," Document tabled in the House of Commons, Debates, 28th Parliament, 3rd Session, 1971, pp. 8580-85.

Cultural Development Program This program would generate data on the relationship of language to cultural development, and examine existing organizations and facilities including educational institutions, the press, radio and television to determine their actual and potential role in cultural development. Results were expected within approximately one year, and were to provide an information base for future long-range planning by the Citizenship Branch, the cultural agencies, and other government departments. Government initiatives to support non-official language teaching and radio or television broadcasting depended on the results of these studies; the only immediate support for non-official language teaching was to be in the form of modest financial aid for textbooks and audio-visual aids.² No significant funding for projects in cultural or linguistic retention would be forthcoming before this program was completed.

Ethnic Histories A series of volumes would be commissioned to encourage an awareness of the integral part played by various ethnic groups in Canadian history.

Canadian Ethnic Studies A detailed investigation of the problems concerned with the development of a Canadian ethnic studies program or centre was to be undertaken.

Teaching of Official Languages The federal government would negotiate with the provinces to find a mutually acceptable form of federal assistance for teaching the appropriate official language to children entering the public school system without an adequate knowledge of that language.

Programs of the Federal Cultural Agencies The federal cultural agencies would be encouraged to respond to the appropriate recommendations of Book 4. Special

² There was concern that some foreign governments publish textbooks especially designed for schools abroad. These textbooks had no Canadian content and were often unsatisfactory from several points of view. Interview, 24 April 1979.

funds were to be allotted to several cultural agencies (National Museum of Man, National Film Board, National Library, Public Archives), and their activities in this area would be coordinated through an Inter-Agency Coordinating Committee chaired by the Assistant Under Secretary of State for Citizenship.

The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) did not agree with the spirit of the recommendation of Book 4 which called upon it to "recognize the place of languages other than English and French in Canadian life" and to "remove its proscription on the use of other languages in broadcasting."³ However, the Canadian Radio and Television Commission (CRTC) did agree to conduct some studies on the best means by which radio and television could contribute to the maintenance of languages and cultures, and the CBC agreed to cooperate with the CRTC in this regard. These studies were to be carried on within the framework of the major research study on language retention supervised by the Cultural Development Program.

There were hopes that eventually all federal government institutions would become more responsive to the various cultural groups in Canadian society, and that the policies and programs of these institutions would be examined periodically to determine whether or not they would have a special effect on any ethnic community. Thus an Inter-Departmental Committee was to be established to undertake an ongoing review of federal government policies and programs. In addition, the government's response to the recommendations of Book 4 specified that it would continue to consult with various ethno-cultural communities by means of conferences, seminars, and private meetings with ethnic group representatives.

³ Canada, Federal Government, "Response," p. 8584. In fact, it was almost a year before the CBC answered a request from the Citizenship Branch for a response to recommendations nine and ten of Book 4. Interview, 24 April 1979.

Since six of the recommendations of Book 4 were addressed to the provinces, and provincial interest in multiculturalism was growing, cooperation between the two levels of government in this area was seen to be imperative. It was proposed that a federal-provincial meeting of senior officials, possibly followed by a ministerial meeting, be held once results from the Culture Development Program were available.

The announcement of the multiculturalism policy met with a positive reaction from representatives of the established ethnic groups; however, there were complaints that the policy was vague, especially concerning non-official language teaching and broadcasting, and that the meagre resources allotted for the implementation of the policy would result in mere tokenism.⁴ Some critics were quick to compare the sum of three million dollars assigned to implement the above programs from January 1972 to March 31, 1973 with the large sums assigned to the promotion of the French language and culture outside Quebec.⁵

The senior personnel of the Citizenship Branch were also disappointed by the size of the government's financial commitment to the multiculturalism policy, but the general mood within the Branch at this time was a positive one. There was still a feeling of euphoria as a result of recent massive increases in the budget of the Citizenship Branch,⁶ and Secretary of State

⁴ Bohdan Bociurkiw, "The Federal Policy of Multiculturalism and the Ukrainian-Canadian Community," in Ukrainian Canadians, Multiculturalism, and Separatism: An Assessment, ed. Manoly R. Lupul (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1978), pp. 109-112.

⁵ Ibid., p. 113; Andriy Semotiuk, "Multiculturalism: A Three-Dimensional Approach to Canada," Unpublished manuscript, 1971.

⁶ Citizenship Development expenditures rose from \$3,367,077 in 1969-70 to \$6,315,694 in 1970-71, \$16,312,619 in 1971-72, and \$21,490,858 in 1972-73. The above figures, which do not include expenditures on OFY projects or bilingualism development, are from the annual reports of the Department of the Secretary of State for the fiscal years ending in 1970 (p. 40), 1971 (p. 12), 1972 (p. 25), and 1973 (p. 26).

Gérard Pelletier, Under Secretary of State Jules Léger, and Assistant Under Secretary of State for Citizenship Bernard Ostry worked together closely in promoting and implementing the various "participation" programs of the Citizenship Branch.⁷ There were expectations that significant increases in the budget of the Citizens' Cultures Division (now the Multiculturalism Directorate) would soon be forthcoming, particularly when the results of the relevant studies commissioned by the Citizenship Branch became known; in the meantime granting procedures were formalized and steps were taken to implement existing programs.⁸

However, the early plans of the Citizenship Branch soon ran into difficulty. The time frame (one year) for the completion of the major research study on language retention and cultural development was clearly unrealistic; in fact, the survey research for this study, called the Non-Official Languages (NOL) Study, did not begin until spring 1973.⁹ The initial reluctance of the CRTC and CBC to devote much attention to the question of third-language broadcasting was highlighted in December 1972, when it was announced that the private French language radio station CKSB (Winnipeg) would be sold to the CBC.¹⁰ The CBC stated its intention to discontinue several programs in non-official languages which had been

⁷ Doris Shackleton, Power Town: Democracy Discarded (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1977), pp. 87-90; Bernard Ostry, The Cultural Connection (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1978), pp. 114-19; Interview, 25 April 1979.

⁸ Interview, 24 April 1979.

⁹ K.G. O'Bryan, J.G. Reitz, and O.M. Kuplowska, Non-Official Languages: A Study in Canadian Multiculturalism (Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1976), p. 39.

¹⁰ Roland Couture (Manager, CKSB) to Reverend S. Izyk (Ukrainian Catholic Centre), in "Scrapbook: History of the CBC Action," Ukrainian Canadian Students' Union Archival Collection, Public Archives of Canada, Ottawa, pp. 2-3.

37

maintained by local non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups, and justified this decision in a document which explained that the CBC could not provide any services in non-official languages (other than some limited broadcasting in northern Canada in the languages of the native people) until it had met its mandate (according to the current Broadcasting Act) to provide full bilingual (English-French) services across the country:

While the Act does not specifically exclude the CBC from broadcasting in languages other than English and French--it is silent on this point--it does clearly indicate the priorities which the Corporation must follow if it is to carry out the expressed wishes of Parliament.

The development of service in English and French is clearly a priority for the Corporation. It is equally clear that the CBC still has many unfulfilled responsibilities in this area--many places where English and French service is still needed or must be improved--and this requirement is of paramount importance to the Corporation. It must continue to preoccupy CBC until our responsibilities are met....

...the CBC believes that multilingualism is not practical for the national broadcasting service in its present form. The demand on finances, staff, equipment and transmitter time would simply be too great to be absorbed without serious harm to the established English and French services. The CBC therefore believes that at this time the best solution to the problems of ethnic broadcasting is for the ethnic groups to continue to seek time on the local, non-network stations...¹¹

The CBC did agree to take some steps to ensure that Canada's various cultures be reflected in its regular broadcast services, although it had reservations about the extent to which this could be done.¹²

¹¹"CBC Language Policy," Ottawa, 7 February 1973, pp. 1-3. (Mimeographed.)

¹²Ibid., p. 2. The Ukrainian Canadian Students' Union mounted a persistent and well-publicized campaign in 1973 to gain support for an in-depth consideration by the CRTC and CBC of the problems and potential of non-official language broadcasting in Canada. This campaign received additional momentum when CBC Vice-President Lister Sinclair announced that an hour-long CBC weekly music and discussion program, conducted in Gaelic, would be banned because of the CBC ruling prohibiting the use of minority languages. The audience of this program, which was heard through much of Cape Breton Island and along the west coast of Newfoundland, and had been on the air for about two years, protested vigorously. Globe and Mail, 16 August 1973, 22 August 1973, 23 August 1973; "A Chip Off the Old Mosaic," Time, 27 August 1973, p. 12. For relevant articles from newspapers in Nova Scotia, see "Scrapbook," pp. 133-44. See also Debates, 29th Parliament, 1st Session, 1973, pp. 1079, 1081, 1227-28, 1546-47, 2248-49, 2282-83.

The Politicization of Multiculturalism?

"Ethnic" Politics in Canada

There have been almost no systematic studies of the internal political life and organizational activities of the "other" ethnic groups in Canada. Similarly, little attention has been devoted to the involvement of Canadians of non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French background in Canadian municipal, provincial, or federal politics, and to voting trends among the "other" ethnic groups.¹³ Apart from studies dealing with the political behavior of French Canadians, little of what is known on the relevance of ethnicity to politics in Canada has been systematized, and there is no accepted framework for the analysis of this phenomenon.¹⁴

Canada never developed a tradition of "ethnic" politics¹⁵ to the same extent as the United States in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, when American political machines and urban ethnic minorities were

¹³ This did not prevent numerous journalists from making facile (and sometimes patronizing) generalizations about trends in the "ethnic" vote prior to the May 1979 federal election. According to one article, "Ontario voters are divided along racial lines, with Italians and other 'ethnics' opting en masse for Trudeau and the WASPs backing the Conservatives." Ian Urquhart, "Ontario: Key to the Kingdom," *Maclean's*, 21 May 1979, p. 21. Other articles discussed the importance of the "traditional Jewish vote" for the Liberal Party, the "God-father" image of Trudeau among the Italians in Toronto, and the solid Liberal voting pattern of the "ethnics" in Windsor. See the *Ottawa Journal*, 24 April 1979, 1 May 1979, and 7 May 1979.

¹⁴ Some information on voting trends among the "other" ethnic groups is presented in Harold D. Clarke et al., *Political Choice in Canada* (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1979), pp. 104-105. For a brief survey of the literature on ethnicity and politics in Canada, see Bohdan Harasymiw, "Political Life of Ukrainian Canadians Since 1945," in *Essays in Ukrainian-Canadian History* (tentative title), ed. Manoly R. Lupul (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, forthcoming), pp. 1-2, 10-11.

¹⁵ The term "ethnic" politics, when used in a Canadian context, will refer to the political activity of the non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups, and to attempts by political parties to gain the support of these groups.

often closely intertwined.¹⁶ The Canadian analogy closest to the American urban political machinery was the relationship which developed during the early part of this century between the "other" ethnic groups in the prairie provinces, and certain provincial political parties. However, these alliances disintegrated during the twenties and thirties.¹⁷

Although in recent years some provincial political parties have shown a new interest in mobilizing voters from the non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French groups,¹⁸ little information is available concerning the attempts of federal political parties to attract the "ethnic" vote, and it is difficult to assess the importance of "ethnic" politics in recent federal election campaigns.¹⁹

¹⁶ Andrew Parkin, "Ethnic Politics: A Comparative Study of Two Immigrant Societies, Australia and the United States," Journal of Commonwealth and Comparative Politics 15 (March 1977): 22-25. Ethnicity still remains an important political force in the United States, especially in relation to voting patterns and election campaign strategy. See Scott Cummings and Marty D. Price, "Partisan Political Identification Among White Ethnic Groups: An Historical Outline," Sociological Focus 11 (October 1978): 312-14.

¹⁷ David E. Smith, Prairie Liberalism: The Liberal Party in Saskatchewan, 1905-71 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975), pp. 26-28, 109-114, 144-48; Thomas Peterson, "Manitoba: Ethnic and Class Politics," in Canadian Provincial Politics, ed. Martin Robin (Scarborough: Prentice-Hall, 1978), pp. 66-71.

¹⁸ In 1978 Premier Davis of Ontario was criticized for planning a visit to Greece in what was popularly seen as an attempt to attract the political support of Toronto's large Greek community, and similar criticism was levelled at his earlier trips to Italy in 1977 and to Israel in 1974. Toronto Star, 30 March 1978. Not to be left behind, in 1978 the Ontario Liberal Party hired a former ethnic community worker as the full-time director of a special group advising party leader Stuart Smith how to gain political strength in Toronto and area, while NDP activists began to pay more attention to heavily "ethnic" unions in the early seventies and have attracted many young Italians into the party organization. Globe and Mail, 5 September 1978; Ottawa Citizen, 28 January 1974. In Quebec, a competition is now taking place between the Parti Québécois government and the Quebec Liberal Party for the votes of the "other" ethnic groups. Montreal Gazette, 23 February 1979; Ottawa Journal, 8 May 1979; Globe and Mail, 9 May 1979.

¹⁹ See Mildred A. Schwartz, "Political Behaviour and Ethnic Origin," in Papers on the 1962 Election, ed. John Meisel (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964), pp. 264-70. Although much has been made of the fact that Diefenbaker sometimes went out of his way to campaign among the non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups, and he often played on anti-Communist

Topics such as immigration policy, discrimination, and support for ethno-cultural activities have been discussed in some individual ridings with a high concentration of voters of "other" ethnic background, but these issues have not drawn any wider attention.²⁰

There have been accusations, however, that the announcement of the federal multiculturalism policy in 1971 was an example of a cynical move by the Liberal government to attract the "ethnic" vote in Ontario and the western provinces.²¹ Although it is unlikely that partisan political considerations were of primary importance in leading to the announcement of the policy, multiculturalism rapidly achieved a higher political profile than may originally have been intended. Several senior civil servants who worked in the Citizenship Branch of the Department of the Secretary of State in the early seventies were of the opinion that the multiculturalism policy became more "politicized" following the October 1972 federal election, when the number of seats held by the Liberals in Ontario decreased from 64 (1968) to 36.²² Several Conservative and NDP candidates were elected in traditional Liberal ridings in Toronto where a large number of voters were

sentiments among ethnic groups of Eastern European origin, the impact of what one observer called Diefenbaker's "ethnicing" has probably been exaggerated. Peter Regenstreif, The Diefenbaker Prelude: Parties and Voting in Canada (Toronto: Longmans, 1965), pp. 90-91.

²⁰ These issues are not discussed in such standard works on electoral behavior and campaigning in Canada as Clarke et al., Political Choice in Canada; John Meisel, Working Papers on Canadian Politics, 2nd ed. (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1975); Howard R. Penniman, ed., Canada at the Polls: The General Election of 1974 (Washington: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1975).

²¹ Montreal Gazette, 18 May 1973; Le Soleil, 18 November 1971; Douglas Fisher and Charles Lynch, "Bear Pit Session--Presentations," in Multiculturalism as State Policy: Conference Report, Second Canadian Conference on Multiculturalism, Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism (Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1976), pp. 15-21.

²² Interview, 24 April 1979, 25 April 1979, 10 May 1979.

of "other" ethnic origin, and this may have encouraged the Liberal Party to pay more attention to voters of non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French background.²³

The First Minister of State (Multiculturalism)

Several developments following the 1972 federal election contributed to speculation about political manipulation of the multiculturalism policy. The first was the appointment of a Toronto Member of Parliament (Parkdale riding) of Polish origin, Dr. Stanley Haidasz, as the first Minister of State (Multiculturalism) on November 27, 1972. The recent creation of a number of new junior minister of state portfolios was largely motivated by considerations other than a strong need for ministerial guidance in a new area of policy,²⁴ and some events during Haidasz's term of office would lead one to believe that his appointment, like that of other junior ministers of state, was to a large extent a symbolic gesture.

The creation of a multiculturalism portfolio, and the appointment of Haidasz to occupy it, was an unexpected move, and resulted from a last-minute decision by the Prime Minister and his advisors. There was no prior consulta-

²³ Sandra Gwyn, "Multiculturalism: A Threat and a Promise," Saturday Night, February 1974, p. 17. Conservative candidates were elected to the ridings of Trinity, High Park-Humber, and York East for the first time since 1958. According to 1971 census statistics, in 129 federal ridings (1971 boundaries) over ten per cent of the population was of other than Anglo-Saxon or French origin. In 47 of these ridings (23 of them in Ontario) over twenty per cent of the population was of "other" ethnic origin. The Liberals have consistently received a higher level of support in the heavily "ethnic" ridings than in Ontario ridings as a whole. Liberals were elected in 59 per cent of all Ontario ridings during the 1968, 1972, and 1974 elections (averaged over the three elections), whereas 75 per cent was the equivalent figure for those ridings where, according to 1971 census figures, over 20 per cent of the population was of "other" ethnic origin. The above is based on data compiled by the office of the Minister of State (Multiculturalism), using 1971 riding boundaries and 1971 census statistics. In the census ethnic group origin was determined by responses to the question, "to what ethnic or cultural group did you or your ancestor (on the male side) belong on coming to this continent?"

²⁴ See Chapter I above.

tion with officials of the Department of the Secretary of State concerning this initiative, and little thought was given to the complications which might ensue from appointing a minister to supervise the work of a relatively insignificant unit within the Citizenship Branch of the Department of the Secretary of State.²⁵ The ambiguity of Haidasz's position became evident when, shortly after his appointment, he was asked by a reporter to outline his relationship to the Department of the Secretary of State:

I report to...rather I deal with, the Under Secretary of State, Jules Léger, and him (Mr. Ostry). Or rather they report to me. I mean they report to me and I deal through them with my officials here in Ottawa and in the regions.²⁶

This ambiguity was further underlined when Haidasz ran into conflict with Bernard Ostry, the Assistant Under Secretary of State for Citizenship. Ostry, who by then had a reputation as one of the most powerful senior civil servants in Ottawa, resented Haidasz's domineering attitude and his lack of consultation with departmental officials, and did not hesitate to express his dissatisfaction with some of Haidasz's initiatives.²⁷ The conflict between the two became public in June 1973, when the Globe and Mail quoted a memo from Ostry questioning Haidasz's judgment in his demands for \$230,745 to advertise programs supervised by the Multiculturalism Directorate. The memo resulted in "the Ostry banishment from the minister's suite," and Haidasz said it would be very difficult for him and Ostry to continue working

²⁵ Several defeated Liberal candidates from Toronto area ridings, such as Martin O'Connell and John Roberts, joined the PMO after the 1972 election, and influenced the decision to appoint such a minister. Interview, 25 April 1979.

²⁶ Globe and Mail, 22 December 1972.

²⁷ Globe and Mail, 18 June 1973; Sandra Gwyn, "The Great Ottawa Grant Boom (And How It Grew)," Saturday Night, October 1972, pp. 22-23; Interview, 25 May 1979.

together.²⁸ Nonetheless, in answer to speculation that Ostry would be asked to resign or be transferred, Secretary of State Hugh Faulkner denied that such a move was being considered, and Haidasz had to back down from his strong stand.²⁹

This conflict drew considerable attention from the Opposition in the House of Commons. Joe Clark claimed that the way in which Haidasz had been "ordered around" by Ostry showed that Haidasz was regarded as a "second-class minister who has less power than an assistant secretary of state," and that the government was more interested in public relations than in an effective multiculturalism program. The Leader of the Opposition, Robert Stanfield, also criticized the propriety of the existing arrangement, and questioned whether Haidasz could accept responsibility for a multiculturalism program administered by officials who answered to another minister.³⁰

The Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism

Another issue during Haidasz's term of office which gave rise to some speculation about government intentions regarding the multiculturalism policy was the size and composition of the Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism (CCCM). The formation of an ethnic advisory council had been discussed as early as the spring of 1970, immediately following the publication of Book 4 of the B & B Report; initial plans for this body called for a council of 12 to 15 members plus a chairperson. This body was to study policy proposals and to make recommendations for the effective development of multiculturalism in Canada; it was partly seen as a means to foster good public

²⁸ Globe and Mail, 18 June 1973, 19 June 1973.

²⁹ Globe and Mail, 20 June 1973.

³⁰ Debates, 29th Parliament, 1st Session, 1973, pp. 4837, 4882-85, 4942, 5189.

relations, but, more important, it was to give various ethnic groups a real opportunity to participate in choosing an effective program to foster cultural pluralism in Canada.³¹

In May 1972 the Prime Minister announced that the government would solicit opinions from various groups concerning the composition of this council, and letters of inquiry were sent to a number of ethnocultural organizations; by this time senior officials in the Citizenship Branch were recommending that the size of the council be increased to 25-35 individuals.³²

However, these original figures were changed after the 1972 election under pressure from the Liberal caucus and the PMO, and when the membership of the CCCM was finally announced in May 1973, it had grown to 101 persons.³³ The Opposition immediately charged that the recommendations of ethnocultural organizations had been ignored in selecting members of the council, and that no provision had been made for the CCCM to have a real input into the policy-making process in regard to multiculturalism.³⁴ Since that time there have been numerous complaints that because of its large size the CCCM is hardly a viable or effective body; in addition, it has been pointed out that a disproportionate number of its members are dedicated Liberal Party workers.³⁵

However, the government has also appointed a number of critics of the government's approach to multiculturalism to the CCCM, and their appointment

³¹ Interview, 24 April 1979.

³² Ibid.; Debates, 28th Parliament, 4th Session, 1972, p. 2595.

³³ Debates, 29th Parliament, 1st Session, 1973, p. 3863; Interview, 24 April 1979.

³⁴ Debates, 29th Parliament, 1st Session, 1973, p. 3864.

³⁵ Freda Hawkins, "Canadian Immigration: Present Policies, Future Options," The Round Table 67 (January 1977): 62; Manoly R. Lupul, "Canada's Options in a Time of Political Crisis and Their Implications for Multiculturalism," in

has not necessarily hampered these critics from forcefully expressing their views on certain aspects of the multiculturalism policy. In fact, the CCCM itself has criticized the large gap between the policy of multiculturalism and its realization in practice, as well as the lack of government initiatives in many areas of concern to some of the "other" ethnic groups, such as greater support from the federal government for the teaching of non-official languages in the public school systems.³⁶

The CCCM has performed a useful function in bringing together representatives of many different ethnocultural groups to allow for an exchange of ideas and information. The concrete work of the CCCM, however, has been carried out by small committees composed of members of the CCCM executive and certain regional representatives; full meetings of the CCCM have not proved to be effective.³⁷

It is also important to note that the major ethnocultural organizations in Canada have been unable to convene any sizeable national inter-group

Ukrainian Canadians, ed. Lupul, p. 158. At the first conference of the CCCM in October 1973, Senator Paul Yuzuk claimed that government officials had "hand-picked" all the members of the CCCM and all delegates to the conference, and had frustrated his efforts to democratize the selection procedure. He did not consider the conference to be representative of the views of Canadian ethnocultural groups, and threatened to convene a Second Thinkers' Conference on Multiculturalism. Paul Yuzyk, "Multiculturalism: A Historical Perspective," remarks to the First Canadian Conference on Multiculturalism, Ottawa, 15 October 1973. (Mimeographed.) Senator Yuzyk's proposed conference never took place.

³⁶ Manoly R. Lupul, "The Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism: A Progress Report and Some Concerns about the Future," Ukrainian Canadian Review, no. 5 (1974), pp. 45-47; Canada, Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism, Report--1977 (Ottawa, 1977), pp. 5, 7-10.

³⁷ Interview, 10 July 1979; Gloria Montero, "Facing Up to Multiculturalism," Canadian Forum, May 1976, pp. 12-13; Student, November 1978. A similar advisory body in Australia, the Australian Ethnic Affairs Council (AEAC), had a membership of 23 as of September 1978. According to Prof. Hawkins, who has observed and studied the work of both advisory councils, AEAC is considerably more effective than the CCCM. Interview, 11 May 1979 (c); Australia, Australian Ethnic Affairs Council, Australia As a Multicultural Society, 2nd ed. (Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1978).

seminars or conferences without the help of government officials and considerable financial assistance. This lack of an autonomous inter-group forum has hampered efforts by the "other" ethnic groups to exert any concerted pressure on the federal government.³⁸ Individual ethnocultural groups have only begun to establish an effective presence in Ottawa. The National Congress of Italian Canadians (NCIC), established in 1974, has funded a small office with a full-time national director in Ottawa since 1977.³⁹ The National Association of Canadians of Origin in India (NACOI), which was established in 1977, has set up a part-time national secretariat in Ottawa, and is now raising funds to operate a full-fledged secretariat with a full-time Executive Director.⁴⁰

Expansion of the Multiculturalism Programs: 1973-74

In May 1973 Haidasz announced the introduction of several new multiculturalism programs and the expansion of existing programs. This growth was

³⁸ The first step towards creating such a forum was taken in March 1979, when the heads of several major national ethnocultural coordinating bodies met in Toronto to discuss questions of common interest, and resolved to continue meeting on an ad hoc basis. Several major organizations were not present; those present were the National Congress of Italian Canadians, the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, The National Association of Canadians of Origin in India, the Canadian Polish Congress, the Japanese Canadian Citizens' Association, and the National Black Coalition of Canada. Svoboda, 9 May 1979.

³⁹ National Congress of Italian Canadians, "What Is the NCIC," Toronto, 1978.

⁴⁰ NACOI Forum, January 1979, pp. 1, 6. The Canadian Jewish Congress maintains contacts with officials in Ottawa through its offices in Montreal and Toronto, and has mounted several strong and well-coordinated campaigns to influence officials at the federal or provincial levels. David Thomas, "The PQ Government and the Myth of Anti-Semitism," Maclean's, 11 June 1979, p. 8. Despite numerous resolutions on this topic, neither the Ukrainian Canadian Committee nor the Ukrainian Canadian Professional and Business Federation has managed to set up a permanent office in Ottawa. Oleh W. Gerus, "The Ukrainian Canadian Committee," in Essays in Ukrainian-Canadian History, ed. Lupul, pp. 30-35.

a logical result of initiatives taken during the first year and a half following the announcement of the multiculturalism policy, and did not represent any major innovations or changes in policy. Even modest growth, however, was difficult to achieve in view of increasing financial stringency within the Secretary of State Department and the federal government as a whole.⁴¹

In addition to the establishment of the CCCM, Haidasz announced seven new or expanded programs.⁴²

Multicultural Grants Program A further \$1,100,000 were to be added to the funds available for multiculturalism grants to satisfy increasing demands. New grant criteria were to be established.

Multicultural Centres Program The small developmental program in this area initiated in 1972 was to be expanded, with an increased allocation of funds.

Canadian Identities Program Increased support would be available for projects in the area of culture and the arts to strengthen the cultural identity of the non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups and to increase their sense of self-worth. This program was also intended to "sensitize" the Anglo-Saxon and French ethnic groups to the cultures of the "other" ethnic groups.

Multicultural Studies Program Additional funds would be made available to stimulate academic activity in fields related to multiculturalism. Some

⁴¹The total budget of the Multiculturalism Directorate (excluding funds for multiculturalism projects handled by the cultural agencies) grew from \$2,179,000 in 1971-72 to \$3,256,000 in 1972-73 to \$5,659,000 in 1973-74. Debates, 30th Parliament, 3rd Session, 1978, p. 6624. For a somewhat over-dramatized account of financial cutbacks within the Secretary of State Department in 1973, see Ostry, The Cultural Connection, p. 118. In actual fact Citizenship Development expenditures rose from \$21,490,858 in 1972-73 to \$29,224,602 in 1973-74, and only began to level off in 1974-75. The above figures are from the annual reports of the Department of the Secretary of State for the fiscal years ending in 1973 (p. 26), 1974 (p. 29), and 1975 (p. 52).

⁴²The following is based on Debates, 29th Parliament, 1st Session, 1973, pp. 3863-64.

projects which were envisaged were the establishment of a Canadian Ethnic Studies Advisory Committee (CESAC) to advise the Department of the Secretary of State on the development of ethnic studies in Canada; and funding visiting professors in ethnic studies at Canadian universities.⁴³ A Majority Attitudes Study would be undertaken to gauge the extent to which the majority groups were willing to tolerate, accept, and promote ethnic diversity, since there was some concern about a possible backlash against the multiculturalism policy from the Anglo-Saxon and French ethnic groups.

Multicultural Communications More funds would be made available for placing advertising from various government departments in the "ethnic" press, and for an expanded publicity and information campaign covering all multiculturalism programs.

Canadian Multicultural Conference A national conference of ethnic organizations would be convened in the autumn of 1973 in collaboration with the CCCM.

Third Language Teaching Aids As a result of positive responses from the provinces on the need for non-official language teaching aids, additional funds would be made available for such aids.

New and Old Problems

Many of these new or expanded programs soon encountered numerous difficulties. Although Haidasz was popular among many of the established non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups, he was ineffectual in raising

⁴³ CESAC, with a membership of seven, was appointed in November 1973. It advises the Citizenship Branch on the development of ethnic studies and the administration of the Visiting Professors of Ethnic Studies Program, is consulted on studies relating to multiculturalism commissioned by the Branch, and draws upon the expertise of individual members in responding to various publication and research proposals submitted to the Branch for funding support.

the status of the multiculturalism policy within the government bureaucracy, and had little influence on fellow cabinet ministers or the heads of the cultural agencies. The Inter-Departmental Committee which was to review the impact of all federal departmental programs on various ethnocultural groups was never established, and after a few meetings the Inter-Agency Coordinating Committee ceased to function. Further contacts with the cultural agencies took place on an ad hoc basis.⁴⁴

Attempts to increase the scope of activity of the Multiculturalism Directorate met with little success. Some officials in the Citizenship Branch believed that the multiculturalism policy would carry more bureaucratic "clout" if it assumed some of the responsibilities for immigrant integration which were within the purview of the Department of Manpower and Immigration. However, despite lengthy negotiations, the status quo did not change; the Department of Manpower and Immigration continued to retain responsibility for the reception of immigrants, their immediate needs, and their settling into the community, while the Department of the Secretary of State remained responsible for the longer-term socio-cultural aspects of immigrant integration.⁴⁵

Haidasz's emphasis on the granting function of the Multiculturalism Directorate, and his strong interest in promoting increased government advertising in the "ethnic" press, also led to some controversy. Haidasz was accused of favoritism and personal bias in handling certain multiculturalism grants and appointments, and was criticized for the way in which he chose firms to run government advertising campaigns in the "ethnic"

⁴⁴ Interview, 25 April 1979, 1 May 1979, 27 June 1979.

⁴⁵ Interview, 10 May 1979, 27 June 1979.

press.⁴⁶

The above controversies, and Haidasz's well-publicized conflict with Bernard Ostry, led to poor morale within the Multiculturalism Directorate, and greatly contributed to perceptions of the multiculturalism policy as a token gesture aimed at the "ethnic" electorate.⁴⁷ Morale within the Citizenship Branch and the Department of the Secretary of State Department as a whole deteriorated throughout 1973 and 1974 as a result of various personnel changes. Hugh Faulkner, who did not share Pelletier's idealism and was less inclined to support "participatory" citizenship policies, was appointed Secretary of State after the October 1972 election, and Jean Boucher, who was a more pragmatic administrator than Léger, became Under Secretary of State soon afterwards. One of Boucher's tasks was to bring about greater financial accountability among the various new citizenship programs introduced in the period 1969-72.⁴⁸

Boucher had served as Director of the Citizenship Branch from 1956 to 1964, and was considered to have an "old-fashioned" approach to citizenship policies. The heady atmosphere of the previous few years in the Citizenship

⁴⁶ Rae Murphy, "The Unmaking of the Minister of Culture," Last Post, September 1973, pp. 28-29; Debates, 29th Parliament, 1st Session, 1973, pp. 3368, 4837, 4885, 5515, 7338-39; Interview, 24 April 1979. Mel McInnis, executive assistant to Haidasz, often provided the minister with controversial recommendations, and was partly responsible for the poor relations between the minister's office and the Citizenship Branch bureaucracy. McInnis had acquired a reputation as a troublemaker before he became part of Haidasz's staff; he left this position after accusations that he pressured the United States parent company of ITT to overrule the decision of their Canadian subsidiary, which refused to contribute funds to the Liberal federal election campaign. Debates, 29th Parliament, 1st Session, 1973, p. 5585; Interview, 25 April 1979; Globe and Mail, 31 January 1972.

⁴⁷ Interview, 24 April 1979, 25 April 1979, 10 May 1979.

⁴⁸ Doris Shackleton, Power Town, pp. 90-91; Interview, 25 April 1979, 27 June 1979.

Branch evaporated. Ostry and many of the senior civil servants under his supervision had a poor rapport with the new Under Secretary of State, and by early 1974 many of the more energetic senior staff had left the Citizenship Branch.⁴⁹

⁴⁹ Bernard Ostry became Secretary General of the National Museums of Canada and later Deputy Minister, Department of Communications; Jennifer McQueen transferred to National Museums of Canada and later to the PCO. Michael McCabe transferred to CMHC and later to Consumer and Corporate Affairs; he is now the executive director of the Canadian Film Development Corporation. Ostry, The Cultural Connection, pp. xii-xiii; Shackleton, Power Town, pp. 90-91; Peter Newman, "The Lively Roadrunner in a Safari Jacket: Mike McCabe Hustles His Cinematic Creed," Maclean's, 13 August 1979, p. 3.

CHAPTER V

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MULTICULTURALISM POLICY: 1974-79

The Appointment of John Munro

John Munro was appointed Minister of State (Multiculturalism) after the July 1974 federal election in which the Liberals regained a majority of the seats in Parliament; he was to hold this portfolio concurrently with the labor portfolio which he had occupied since November 1972. Many observers expressed concern that this step represented a "downgrading" of multiculturalism. They felt that Munro could hardly be expected to devote much time to his new duties in view of the taxing demands of his labor portfolio, and there were accusations that multiculturalism was given a separate portfolio in Cabinet only when it was politically expedient to do so.¹

There was also criticism that an "ethnic" Member of Parliament was not chosen for this portfolio. However, it was recognized that the choice of Munro might help to dispel the notion that multiculturalism was a policy only for the "other" ethnic groups rather than for all Canadians. In addition, some observers believed that, as a senior minister who had been in Cabinet since 1968 (including Minister of Health and Welfare, 1968-72), Munro would have more credibility than Haidasz, and would be able to exert greater influence on fellow Cabinet ministers on behalf of the multiculturalism policy.²

¹ Bohdan Bociurkiw, "The Federal Policy of Multiculturalism and the Ukrainian-Canadian Community," in Ukrainian Canadians, Multiculturalism and Separatism: An Assessment, ed. Manoly R. Lupul (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1978), p. 116; Canada, House of Commons, Debates, 30th Parliament, 1st Session, 1974, pp. 33, 39, 1521, 1554-55, 2002-2003, 5584, 6998, 9498.

² Globe and Mail, 9 November 1974; Debates, 30th Parliament, 1st Session, 1974, pp. 33, 2003.

Despite his heavy labor responsibilities, Munro, who had a reputation as a hard-working and conscientious minister,³ devoted as much time as he could spare to the multiculturalism portfolio. Nonetheless, his efforts were often sporadic. Overwhelmed by a wide variety of labor problems, Munro was rarely able to devote his full attention to the multiculturalism portfolio for more than a brief period of time. Occasionally he tried to compensate for this by spending long evenings with his advisors and Citizenship Branch staff trying to catch up with developments in this field.⁴

During his first year as Minister of State (Multiculturalism) Munro did not undertake any significant initiatives, since he was preoccupied with labor matters and wanted time to acquaint himself with the work and staff of the Citizenship Branch.⁵ However, by mid-1975 there was a clear need for a new policy statement on multiculturalism. The effectiveness of the multiculturalism programs was to be reviewed towards the end of the five-year period following the announcement of the policy in 1971, the CCCM presented Munro with its first annual report in December 1974, and preliminary results were available from both the Non-Official Languages (NOL) and Majority Attitudes Studies. In addition, the Liberal caucus and several Cabinet ministers indicated that they were interested in seeing some modifications to the existing programs of the Multiculturalism Directorate. Concern was growing, for example, over a rise in inter-ethnic tensions and racial discrimination, particularly in major urban areas such as Toronto and Vancouver.⁶

³ Lawrence Martin, "The Social Conscience of John Munro," Maclean's, May 1972, pp. 36-39.

⁴ Interview, 10 May 1979, 27 June 1979.

⁵ Interview, 2 August 1979.

⁶ Ibid. For a review of several recent studies on racial tension in Canada see A.M. Anderson, "Racism in Toronto," Canadian Ethnic Studies 10, no. 2 (1978): 141-48. See also Doreen M. Indra, "South Asian Stereotypes in the Vancouver Press," Ethnic and Racial Studies 2 (April 1979): 181-89.

Reorientation of the Multiculturalism Policy

In the autumn of 1975 a review and evaluation of the work of the Multiculturalism Directorate and other government departments and agencies associated with the multiculturalism policy was carried out by an outside advisor, Jameson Bond. The review was completed in December 1975, and prepared the way for an attempt to significantly change the orientation of the multiculturalism policy late in 1975. This "reorientation" proved to be the most controversial aspect of the development of the policy during Munro's term of office.

The original announcement of the policy specified that the federal government would provide support to ethnocultural groups in four ways:

First, resources permitting, the government will seek to assist all Canadian cultural groups that have demonstrated a desire and effort to continue to develop a capacity to grow and contribute to Canada, and a clear need for assistance, the small and weak groups no less than the strong and highly organized.

Second, the government will assist members of all cultural groups to overcome cultural barriers to full participation in Canadian society.

Third, the government will promote creative encounters and interchange among all Canadian cultural groups in the interest of national unity.

Fourth, the government will continue to assist immigrants to acquire at least one of Canada's official languages in order to become full participants in Canadian society.⁷

In his first public summary of the plans to modify the multiculturalism policy,⁸ and in later statements and interviews, Munro explained that there

⁷ Debates, 28th Parliament, 3rd Session, 1971, p. 8546.

⁸ Globe and Mail, 26 November 1975. The below description of the plans for a reorientation of the multiculturalism policy is based on the above article and a number of other sources, including the Globe and Mail, 1 December 1975; Montreal Star, 3 January 1976, 23 January 1976, 16 February 1976; Toronto Star, 29 January 1976; Munro's address to the Second Canadian Conference on Multiculturalism, in Multiculturalism as State Policy: Conference Report,

had been too great an emphasis on the first element of the policy--government support for multicultural activities. In his opinion, too many of the grants for cultural development activities were funding colorful but repetitive folkloric celebrations. Munro and his advisors believed that the grants program of the Multiculturalism Directorate had attracted excessive attention, while other multiculturalism programs maintained a relatively low profile. As more and more organizations received consecutive grants to carry out essentially the same activities year after year, the danger arose that they might lose their vitality and creativity as they became dependent on government funding.

Munro considered that there was insufficient emphasis on the second and third elements of the multiculturalism policy--namely overcoming cultural barriers and promoting interchange among ethnocultural groups. He proposed that support for traditional folkloric activities continue, but that there be a requirement that ethnocultural groups obtain an increasing proportion of financial support for such activities from non-federal sources, and that there be a decrease in grant support for activities involving only one ethnic group in favor of activities involving encounters among various ethnocultural groups.

Munro and his advisors also felt that certain established and well-organized groups (such as the Ukrainians) had developed a certain expertise in dealing with the Multiculturalism Directorate which allowed them to benefit more fully from its programs than did the less established groups.

Second Canadian Conference on Multiculturalism, Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism (Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1976), pp. 119-28; and interviews with Munro and several senior civil servants, 1 May 1979, 10 May 1979, 27 June 1979, 2 August 1979. Munro took a strong personal interest in the reorientation plans, and helped to draw up the proposals for the reorientation. Interview, 2 August 1979.

Munro proposed that the Directorate place a higher priority on support for the visible minorities and disadvantaged groups who did not possess a well-developed organizational infrastructure, and who were particularly likely to be the victims of discrimination. This could be done by helping to generate a climate of tolerance and understanding in the community at large, stimulating intergroup understanding, and ensuring these groups ready access to full involvement in the social, economic, and cultural life of Canada.

In view of existing fiscal restraints, Munro felt that any shifts in policy emphasis would have to rely on internal reallocations of funds rather than on an increase in the budget of the Multiculturalism Directorate. In addition, he believed that excessive reliance on the delivery of funding and services for the "other" ethnic groups through multiculturalism programs would discourage other federal departments and agencies from considering legitimate requests from these groups, since these departments and agencies would immediately channel such requests to the Multiculturalism Directorate. This could result in a "ghettoization" of the multiculturalism policy.

Munro hoped that all relevant government activities would eventually become more sensitive to the needs of all Canadian ethnocultural groups, and placed considerable emphasis on the cross-departmental or horizontal coordinating role of the multiculturalism policy. He therefore suggested that a new interdepartmental coordinating structure replace the existing (but inactive) Inter-Agency Coordinating Committee, and the Interdepartmental Coordinating Committee which had never been established. Other plans to accent the horizontal coordinating role of the multiculturalism policy included a proposal that a senior officer be appointed to the appropriate division of the PCO to ensure that multicultural concerns receive suitable attention in policy and planning initiatives throughout the federal government, and the

initiation of discussions with provincial governments to identify common interests, prevent overlap in services, and develop coordinated approaches to common problems.

Munro expected that a greater stress on the horizontal coordinating function of the multiculturalism policy, coupled to a vigorous reassertment of the policy by the Prime Minister and strong support from other ministers, would more than compensate for a freeze on increased funding for multiculturalism programs.⁹

Reaction to the Reorientation

Although Munro claimed that he had discussed some aspects of the multiculturalism policy review and its recommendations at regional meetings of the COCM and with representatives of individual ethnic groups,¹⁰ Julius Koteles, the national chairman of the CCCM, expressed shock when he heard of the views put forward by Munro, and stated that "what the minister has said is incompatible with the multiculturalism program."¹¹ Many other representatives of the established non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups also attacked Munro's proposals for a reorientation of the multiculturalism policy. Much of the criticism was not very specific; however, some of these representatives resented the implication that folkloric activities were not important, and considered that fighting the inequalities faced by immigrants and the visible minorities could best be left to other government programs, while

⁹Whereas the total budget of the Multiculturalism Directorate (excluding funds for multiculturalism projects handled by the cultural agencies) increased from \$3,256,000 in 1972-73 to \$5,659,000 in 1973-74, the budget actually decreased to \$5,513,000 in 1974-75, to \$5,294,000 in 1975-76, and to \$5,175,000 in 1976-77. Debates, 30th Parliament, 3rd Session, 1978, p. 6624.

¹⁰Debates, 30th Parliament, 1st Session, 1975, pp. 9542, 10047.

¹¹Globe and Mail, 26 November 1975.

multiculturalism programs should concentrate on cultural development activities. They felt that the multiculturalism policy was not sufficiently established to undergo a major reorientation, that nothing would come of talk about the horizontal coordinating role of the multiculturalism policy, and that the budget of the Multiculturalism Directorate should be significantly increased.¹² An editorial in the Globe and Mail accused the minister of vagueness, and claimed that the reorientation simply represented an attempt to pare the already small budget of the Multiculturalism Directorate.¹³

There were some valid grounds for criticizing the way in which Munro presented his proposals. He had touched upon some of his plans on earlier occasions, but did not inform the CCCM and the various ethnocultural communities of the scope and significance of the reorientation in any detail before his interview with the Globe and Mail. In addition, Munro had difficulty articulating his ideas, and his explanations of the main thrust of the reorientation often consisted of vague generalities.

Munro was also heavily criticized because his statements concerning the policy reorientation gave little indication of a decisive response by the government to the findings of the Non-official Languages (NOL) Study, which was the most important element in the Cultural Development Program announced in 1971. The NOL Study was completed in June 1975; the nature of government initiatives in support of non-official language instruction and broadcasting depended upon the results of this study, and large-scale funding for projects in cultural and linguistic retention had been withheld pending its completion. There had already been complaints that delays in releasing the NOL Study were

¹² Bociurkiw, "The Federal Policy of Multiculturalism," pp. 118-19; Toronto Star, 29 January 1976; Montreal Star, 23 January 1976.

¹³ Globe and Mail, 12 December 1975.

due to procrastination on the part of the government, and in its first annual report submitted to Munro in December 1974 the CCCM called for the highest priority to be placed on federal backing for the teaching of languages other than English or French.¹⁴

In his reorientation plans Munro had rejected the possibility of large-scale funding for third-language instruction; however, he advocated increased support for non-official language instruction through voluntary organizations, and working to ensure appropriate consultation and coordination with provincial governments. Representatives of those ethnic groups who had strong feelings about the importance of language retention were understandably quite disappointed that the new plans for the multiculturalism policy did not promise a large increase in federal government support for third-language teaching, and seemed to ignore the massive support among the "other" ethnic groups for third-language teaching which had been demonstrated by the NOL Study.

Much of the criticism of the policy reorientation, however, was intemperate and exaggerated, and may partly have been an overreaction to Munro's outspoken manner. Munro had a blunt and forthright style, and enjoyed speaking his mind and making strong statements; thus he probably put too much emphasis on the dramatic nature of proposed changes in the multiculturalism

¹⁴ Globe and Mail, 26 November 1975; Debates, 30th Parliament, 1st Session, 1975, pp. 3707, 10047. The NOL Study showed that there was a great deal of variation among the various "other" ethnic groups surveyed in terms of degree of language retention and use, and that generational transition was a very powerful force in language loss. However, there was almost uniformly strong support for the retention of non-official languages among all the metropolitan ethnic groups surveyed. Overall, language loss was mentioned most often as the most serious problem facing the ethnic groups, by comparison with problems such as job discrimination or educational opportunities. In addition, although support for language retention did decline somewhat in the second and third generations, this decline was much less marked than the decline in actual language knowledge and use, and many who reported total loss of the ancestral language expressed firmly positive views on supporting its preservation. K.G. O'Bryan, J.G. Reitz, and O.M. Kuplowska, Non-Official Languages: A Study in Canadian Multiculturalism (Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1976), pp. 164-77.

policy rather than pointing to continuities with past policy. Certainly, the article in the Globe and Mail which provoked the furore over the policy reorientation seemed to overemphasize the radical nature of changes in the policy, and did little to reassure representatives of the "other" ethnic groups about the future of the policy.¹⁵

The controversy was exacerbated as a result of the emotional behavior of Julius Koteles, the national chairman of the CCCM. Koteles became very upset by Munro's lack of consultation with the CCCM, his plans to de-emphasize the folkloric aspect of the multiculturalism policy, and the lack of a government commitment to increase funding for multiculturalism programs. However, instead of discussing these problems with Munro, he publicly denounced the Minister on a number of occasions, accusing him of "cruel, thoughtless, insensitive flippancy," and of attempting to "do away" with the multiculturalism policy. Munro asked Koteles to resign from his position in November 1976.¹⁶ Like Koteles, most representatives of the established "other" ethnic groups had little sympathy for the thrust of Munro's reorientation proposals. They correctly pointed out that their interests were different from those of the new immigrant groups, especially the visible minorities, but often showed a remarkable lack of sensitivity for the concerns of these disadvantaged groups.¹⁷

¹⁵ Globe and Mail, 26 November 1975.

¹⁶ Ibid., Richard Osicki, "The Agony of Julius Koteles," Weekend Magazine, 5 March 1977, pp. 14-17.

¹⁷ Although there is no evidence to indicate that a conflict between "white ethnic" groups and the visible minorities is developing in Canada, such a polarization has occurred in some American cities, and the potential for such a conflict exists in Canada. At a recent conference in Ottawa of the ethnic press which was heavily dominated by representatives of ethnic groups of east and south European background, some statements by these representatives were openly racist in character. Student, May 1978. A recent study in Toronto has shown that Canadians of south and east European origin are overrepresented in the racist categories and underrepresented in the tolerant categories, in comparison to the population as a whole. A.B. Anderson, "Racism in Toronto," Canadian Ethnic Studies 10, no. 2 (1978): 144.

In addition, most of the representatives of the "other" ethnic groups who persistently demanded greater federal government support for third-language teaching showed little knowledge of the complex jurisdictional problems associated with such support, and had unrealistic expectations about the role the federal government could play in this area. Even if the federal government had shown a greater interest in promoting third-language education, the experience of English-Ukrainian bilingual programs in the prairie provinces has demonstrated the difficulties of gaining the support of parents and local or provincial education officials for such initiatives.¹⁸

Munro also received little support for his reorientation plans from the visible minorities and new immigrant groups who would have benefitted the most from his proposals. The spokesmen for these groups, which lacked a well-developed organizational infrastructure, still often remained wary of a policy which they felt had been designed for, and continued to be dominated by, "white ethnics."¹⁹

Despite criticism from representatives of the established "other" ethnic groups, and a lack of support from the visible minorities and new immigrant groups, Munro pressed ahead with plans for reorienting the multiculturalism policy. However, he severely overestimated the support his proposals would receive in both the bureaucratic and political arenas.

The Reorientation: Problems in the Political and Bureaucratic Arenas

Initially Trudeau and his advisors may have had an intellectual interest in the multiculturalism policy, hoping that it would provide a constructive

¹⁸ Manoly R. Lupul, "The Ukrainians and Public Education," in Essays in Ukrainian-Canadian History (tentative title), ed. Manoly R. Lupul (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, forthcoming).

¹⁹ Gloria Montero, "Facing Up to Multiculturalism," Canadian Forum, May 1976, pp. 12-13.

alternative to the potentially divisive dichotomy posed by a policy of bilingualism and biculturalism.²⁰ It appears, however, that they soon lost interest in the policy; during Munro's term of office neither Trudeau nor any other senior Cabinet minister felt it necessary to discuss multiculturalism in a prominent public forum.²¹

The opposition parties also showed relatively little interest in the multiculturalism policy. The Progressive Conservative Party appointed a multiculturalism critic, Dr. Paul Yewchuk, in 1973, and a general meeting of the Progressive Conservative Party in Ottawa on March 17-19, 1974 adopted a comprehensive position paper on multiculturalism.²² Nevertheless, criticism of the government's multiculturalism policy by the official Opposition was sporadic, ineffectual, and received little publicity; like the Liberals, the Conservatives were concerned about the possibility of a reaction by French Canadians against strong initiatives in this area.²³

²⁰ See p. 59 above.

²¹ This lack of interest was partly due to concern about a "backlash" in Quebec against the multiculturalism policy if it were given a high profile. Most Liberal MPs from Quebec had little interest in the policy, and a few were vigorously opposed to any attempts to increase its scope and significance. Sandra Gwyn, "Multiculturalism: A Threat and a Promise," Saturday Night, February 1974, p. 17; Interview, 12 March 1979 (b).

²² "The Progressive Conservative Program for Multiculturalism," Background Paper No. 11, May 1974. (Mimeographed.)

²³ Interview, 20 March 1979 (b). Scepticism about the attitude of the Conservatives towards multiculturalism remains. In December 1977 Clark stated in an interview that he "would take a hard look at abolishing the Departments of Fitness and Amateur Sport; Multiculturalism; and Urban Affairs." Toronto Star, 30 December 1977. Clark, Mitges, and Paproski attempted to mollify the negative reaction of various ethnocultural groups to this statement, but did not succeed in substantially clarifying the Conservative position on multiculturalism. For some reactions in the non-official language press, see the Toronto Sun, 2 February 1978; Ukrains'kyi Holos, 22 February 1978, Canadian-Indian Times, 19 January 1978. Clark further confused the situation when he made an ambiguous distinction between "European" and "North American" Canadians in a later interview. Tim Heald, "The Making of Joe Clark," Weekend Magazine, 18 February 1978, p. 7. Scepticism increased when a team of federal

A new policy paper on multiculturalism was prepared by the office of Gus Mitges (who replaced Yewchuk as the PC multiculturalism critic in 1976) prior to the May 1979 federal election; however, it was not approved in time to be widely used during the election campaign.²⁴

The federal New Democratic Party has shown even less interest in the multiculturalism policy. Broadbent and several other NDP MPs have participated in debates on multiculturalism, have shown considerable concern for the material needs of recent immigrants, and have spoken out strongly against discriminatory practices directed at the visible minorities. However, the NDP has not formulated a comprehensive policy on multiculturalism, and has devoted little attention to the concerns of the established non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups.²⁵

Since Munro could devote his full attention to multiculturalism only sporadically, and as there was no significant pressure for concrete activity in the field of multiculturalism from Cabinet or the opposition parties, a great deal depended on the personal initiative of senior civil servants in the Citizenship Branch. However, as many of the more energetic senior staff members had left the Branch during 1973-74, Munro had to deal with a number of new senior administrators who had little previous experience with the multiculturalism policy. In addition, the atmosphere of euphoria and camaraderie which existed in the Branch during the period 1970-72 had evaporated;

Conservative MPs met with ethnic community leaders in Toronto to discuss the party's multiculturalism policy. The community representatives expected to be asked for their views, and were upset at being presented with copies of a completed policy paper. Gus Mitges did not allay suspicions when he admitted to a newspaper reporter that the group of MPs was there "mainly to round up votes," and was concentrating on Toronto because "this is where the ethnic vote is." Toronto Star, 18 April 1978.

²⁴ Interview, 20 March 1979 (a), (b); 4 May 1979.

²⁵ Ed Broadbent, "Canadian Economic Justice," notes for a speech at the Independence Day Celebrations sponsored by the Indo-Canadian Association,

due to a decrease in the rate of growth of the Citizenship Branch budget, competition among the various programs of the Branch for funds had increased dramatically.²⁶

Since there was a widespread feeling in government circles that the various "participation" programs of the Citizenship Branch were falling out of favor with the public,²⁷ and in the absence of strong incentives to do otherwise, the new senior administrators in the Department of the Secretary of State who dealt with the multiculturalism policy accorded it a low priority. Senior officials of French-Canadian origin showed particularly little interest in the policy.²⁸

The absence of a senior official such as the former Assistant Under Secretary of State for Citizenship, Bernard Ostry, was especially noticeable. Ostry had a strong interest in the concerns of the "other" ethnic groups, and was a dynamic figure who had many personal contacts with senior officials in the central agencies, the cultural agencies, and various government departments.²⁹ During his term of office as Assistant Under Secretary of State he ensured that initiatives from the Citizenship Branch were thoroughly discussed and major points of contention resolved, in consultation with the appropriate officials in the central agencies and other branches of government, before

Toronto, 12 August 1978. (Mimeographed); Debates, 30th Parliament, 1st Session, 1975, pp. 9456-57. After the May 1979 election the NDP appointed a multi-cultural critic (Simon De Jong) for the first time. Student, June-August 1979.

²⁶ Interview, 10 May 1979, 27 June 1979. Expenditures within the Citizenship Branch (including Citizenship Registration) increased from \$35,911,313 in 1973-74 to \$43,495,300 in 1974-75, and to \$48,038,013 in 1975-76. In the next two years expenditures were \$48,191,018 (1976-77) and \$51,111,089 (1977-78). The above figures are from the annual reports of the Department of the Secretary of State for the fiscal years ending in 1974 (p. 29), 1975 (p. 52), 1976 (p. 58), 1977 (p. 78), and 1978 (p. 30).

²⁷ Doris Shackleton, Power Town: Democracy Discarded (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1977), pp. 89-91; Interview, 10 May 1979, 27 June 1979.

²⁸ Interview, 10 May 1979, 27 June 1979.

²⁹ Globe and Mail, 29 January 1972.

being submitted to Cabinet for approval.³⁰

Only limited groundwork of this sort was conducted before Munro's plans for the multiculturalism policy were presented to Cabinet. Thus, although the Cabinet document dealing with the reorientation was approved early in 1976 by the Cabinet Committee on Science, Culture and Information, several officials in the PCO expressed strong reservations concerning the reorientation. They felt that it assumed too great a social role for the multiculturalism policy, and were of the opinion that multiculturalism should remain more within the realm of federal cultural policy (in the narrow sense of culture). These officials were also concerned about the relationship between the government's multiculturalism and bilingualism policies. Paradoxically, although representatives of the established ethnic groups had criticized Munro for not placing enough emphasis on government support for third-language teaching, francophone officials in the PCO feared that even the minimal expansion of support for non-official languages suggested by Munro would detract from official bilingualism policies and lead to increased demands from the "other" ethnic groups. Munro and some Citizenship Branch officials attempted to resolve these and other questions raised by PCO officials during the spring and early summer of 1976; however, the document dealing with the reorientation of the multiculturalism policy was never placed before full Cabinet.³¹

Munro still tried to carry out certain aspects of the policy reorientation. However, the fact that the document dealing with this question was not submitted to full Cabinet for approval reflected the low priority which the government placed on the policy. In addition, Munro

³⁰ Interview, 24 April 1979, 10 May 1979.

³¹ Interview, 20 May 1979, 27 June 1979.

continued to be hampered by a lack of effective support from senior civil servants in the Department of the Secretary of State. At one point, frustrated by the procrastination of senior officials in the department, Munro even considered transferring the Multiculturalism Directorate to the Department of Labor.³²

However, despite strong opposition from some francophone Cabinet ministers, Munro finally did persuade Cabinet to accept a modest program of financial assistance to the voluntary sector for the development of non-official languages. This assistance, which was approved during the term of office of Joe Guay, Munro's successor as Minister of State (Multiculturalism), applied only to private part-time courses and supplementary schools set up by the "other" ethnic groups. The program was allotted \$1,200,000 for 1977-78, which included funding for supplementary schools and teacher improvement, and expansion of an existing program for the development of teaching aids for non-official languages.³³

Despite the modest nature of this assistance, special care was taken to refer to the object of this assistance as "cultural enrichment" rather than "language training" or "language retention"; this euphemism was deliberately used to avoid any indication that an attempt was being made to detract from official bilingualism policies.³⁴

Early in 1977, near the end of Munro's term of office, he proposed several new multiculturalism programs which incorporated many of the ideas included in the earlier reorientation plans. These new programs were not

³² Interview, 20 May 1979.

³³ Interview, 12 March 1979 (b), 10 May 1979; Minister of State (Multiculturalism), "General Criteria for Multicultural Assistance Programs," Ottawa, 1978; Debates, 30th Parliament, 3rd Session, 1978, pp. 584, 3979-80.

³⁴ Interview, 4 May 1979, 20 May 1979.

approved by Cabinet until the term of office of Joe Guay, and were not implemented until the spring of 1978; however, Munro was the driving force behind the following proposals:³⁵

Intercultural Communications Program This program was to replace the Multiculturalism Centres Program and would provide funds to organizations actively and effectively working towards increased cultural sharing and understanding in the interests of national unity.³⁶

Immigrant Orientation Program This program would aid in developing and funding activities for immigrants (with special attention to problems of mothers with young children) undertaken by ethnocultural groups and by community organizations, including preparation for Canadian citizenship.

Operational Assistance to Ethnocultural Organizations Some funds would be made available to assist in the growth and development of representative ethnocultural organizations capable of reaching as many members of the community as possible. The emphasis would be on assistance to new and emerging communities.

Multicultural Resource Development Program To further understanding and appreciation of cultural pluralism in Canada, the Multiculturalism Directorate would support the development and promotion of resource materials for society at large and the educational sector in particular by: hiring an education

³⁵ Interview, 20 May 1979. The information on the new programs proposed by Munro is based on Minister of State (Multiculturalism), "General Criteria for Multicultural Assistance Programs," Ottawa, 1978; Minister of State (Multiculturalism), News Release 78-14 and 78-15, 21 March 1978.

³⁶ Some of the "other" ethnic groups had objected to the idea of multicultural centres, claiming that they led to excessive integration and inter-mixing of various cultures and therefore resulted in the disintegration of ethnocultural communities. Bociurkiw, "The Federal Policy of Multiculturalism," p. 128.

specialist to identify and analyze current activity within and outside government related to the development of multicultural resource materials, and to design an overall strategy and guidelines as to the means by which the Directorate could best lend support in this area; allocating funds and resources to provide for an analysis of existing multicultural resources and the development of further materials as necessary (e.g. audio-visual materials, bibliographies, literary works, educational kits, and teachers' guides); producing popular editions of the ethnic history series and audio-visual aids or other related materials based on the ethnic history series; etc.

To avoid the problems which the original reorientation plans had encountered, the proposals for the above programs were couched in modest and somewhat ambiguous terms; they were to promote "cultural pluralism" and "cultural integration," and little mention was made of a broader social role for the multiculturalism policy, or of a horizontal coordinating role for the policy. It was emphasized that this increased assistance to the "other" ethnic groups would ease their hostility to official bilingualism policies, and would help to promote national unity.³⁷

The attempt to change the orientation of the multiculturalism policy, and the controversies which it raised, provide an excellent illustration of the ambiguity surrounding the purposes of this policy and the means by which it should be implemented. No other development in this policy area has provoked as much controversy, although it is too early to fully evaluate events during the terms of office of Munro's successors. However, the appointment of two new ministers to the multiculturalism portfolio in one year, 1977, and some developments since that time, throw additional light on the status of the multiculturalism policy in the bureaucratic and executive

³⁷ Interview, 4 May 1979, 20 May 1979.

arènes.³⁸

The Appointment of Joseph Guay

Joseph Guay (MP for St. Boniface, Manitoba) was appointed Minister of State (Multiculturalism) in April 1977. He had been appointed a minister without portfolio on November 3, 1976, just three weeks after James Richardson, at that time Trudeau's only Cabinet minister from Manitoba, resigned his office. Guay was not assigned any specific responsibilities; rather, he was simply to represent the interests and point of view of Manitoba, and the prairie provinces in general. However, by this time it was rare for ministers without portfolio to be appointed without specific responsibilities, and Guay was repeatedly questioned in the House concerning his functions within Cabinet.³⁹

Guay had been a colorful figure as a backbencher in the House and, according to some newspapers, had a reputation as somewhat of a "clown."⁴⁰ As Williams has pointed out, he was clearly not Cabinet material,⁴¹ and he had difficulty performing in his role as a spokesman in Cabinet for the prairie provinces. Since the persistent questioning about Guay's performance in Cabinet soon became embarrassing, he was "promoted" to a position where it was probably felt that he would have a low profile and could do little harm. On April 21, 1977, the day that Jack Horner (MP for Crowfoot,

³⁸ For an interesting study dealing with the high fluidity which characterized Trudeau cabinets, see Blair Williams, "The Transformation of the Federal Cabinet under P.E. Trudeau," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, Saskatoon, 30 May 1979, pp. 6-8. (Mimeographed.)

³⁹ Debates, 30th Parliament, 2nd Session, 1976, pp. 755-56, 840-41, 1813; Debates, 30th Parliament, 2nd Session, 1977, pp. 2275, 2974, 3182, 4785.

⁴⁰ Toronto Star, 10 February 1977; Ottawa Journal, 7 June 1977.

⁴¹ Williams, "The Transformation of the Federal Cabinet," p. 31.

Alberta) was appointed to Cabinet as a minister without portfolio; responsibility for multiculturalism was transferred from Munro to Guay.

Guay, who had shown little interest in the multiculturalism policy previous to this appointment, had difficulty adjusting to his new portfolio, and his inability to answer even the most straightforward questions relating to multiculturalism soon made him a laughingstock in the House.⁴² At one point, for example, Guay voted against an amendment to the Immigration Act, introduced by the NDP and supported by the Conservative Party, which proposed that a recognition of the "multicultural" nature of Canadian society be incorporated into the Act.⁴³

No major initiatives in the area of multiculturalism were undertaken during Guay's short term of office; however, the credibility of the policy suffered considerably as a result of Guay's poor performance in the multiculturalism portfolio.⁴⁴

The Appointment of Norman Cafik

Responsibility for multiculturalism was transferred from Guay to Norman Cafik on September 16, 1977. Cafik had a reputation as an energetic, vocal backbencher, and as an able "grass-roots" politician; his appointment was probably partly motivated by hopes that he could raise the public profile of the multiculturalism policy before the upcoming federal election.⁴⁵ An effective public speaker who enjoyed public appearances, Cafik made

⁴² Debates, 30th Parliament, 2nd Session, 1977, pp. 5175, 5402, 5458, 6424, 6472. Globe and Mail, 16 May 1977.

⁴³ Debates, 30th Parliament, 2nd Session, 1977, pp. 7887-92, 7901.

⁴⁴ After a short stint as Minister of National Revenue, Guay was named to the Senate in March 1978. Globe and Mail, 24 March 1978.

⁴⁵ Montreal Star, 17 September 1977; Globe and Mail, 17 September 1977.

countless speeches before a wide variety of audiences, and was highly conscious of the public relations aspect of his job.

Cafik succeeded in considerably raising the profile of the multiculturalism policy. He viewed his portfolio, for example, as giving him some responsibility not only for domestic human rights, but also for questions relating to international human rights, insofar as many members of the "other" ethnic groups in Canada have close relatives in countries where there are persistent violations of basic human rights. Thus, despite the reluctance of senior officials in the Department of External Affairs to allow infringements on their "territory," Cafik insisted on attending and speaking at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, and delivered the closing Canadian statement at this conference as a special representative of the Secretary of State for External Affairs.⁴⁶ Cafik was also quite forceful in calling for greater representation for members of the "other" ethnic groups in government appointments to various boards and committees.⁴⁷ With his forthright stance and aggressive behavior, Cafik did much to raise morale within the Multiculturalism Directorate.

Cafik had a strong interest in and commitment to the multiculturalism policy. However, he was very much aware of the symbolic importance of the policy, and may have expended too much time and effort just on improving its

⁴⁶ Interview, 4 May 1979. See also Minister of State (Multiculturalism), News Release 78-16 and 78-17, 10 March 1978; "Notes for the Closing Canadian Statement by the Honorable Norman Cafik, Minister of State for Multiculturalism and Special Representative of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, to the Meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe in Belgrade," 9 March 1978. (Mimeographed.) For a skeptical view of the significance of Cafik's appearance in Belgrade, see the Winnipeg Free Press, 16 March 1978.

⁴⁷ See, for example, Norman Cafik, "Address by the Minister of State (Multiculturalism) at the 12th Ukrainian Canadian Congress," Winnipeg, 8 October 1977. (Mimeographed.)

public image. The constant flow of press releases from his office soon became a source of ridicule in the press, and Cafik placed a disproportionate emphasis on popular and highly visible, but nonetheless "one-shot" gestures such as the provision of matching government funds for the endowment of chairs of Hungarian and Ukrainian studies at the University of Toronto. In addition, his speaking style was rhetorical and somewhat bombastic, which led to frequent accusations that his statements and appearances contained a strong partisan political element.⁴⁸

Preoccupied with improving the public image of the multiculturalism policy, Cafik devoted little time to dealing with the poor status of the policy within the bureaucratic arena. Few new initiatives in the field of multiculturalism were proposed during Cafik's term of office; the new multiculturalism programs and increased funding for the Multiculturalism Directorate which he announced in March 1978 stemmed from proposals which were put forward during Munro's term of office.⁴⁹

By the spring of 1979 there had been little concrete progress in implementing an effective and ongoing horizontal coordinating role for the multiculturalism policy; no satisfactory interdepartmental coordinating structure to deal with questions pertaining to multiculturalism had been established, cooperation with provincial officials in this field continued to be conducted on an ad hoc basis, and contacts between the Multiculturalism Directorate and the central agencies remained poor.

⁴⁸ Globe and Mail, 21 December 1978; Winnipeg Free Press, 16 March 1978; Abraham J. Arnold, "Sometimes Words Fail, and the Word That's Failed Us Most Is Multiculturalism," Maclean's, 24 July 1978, p. 8. Cafik was vain and extremely prestige-conscious. The first issue of a small periodical entitled Multicultural Update, published in March 1978, included a picture of Cafik on nearly every page. This issue was to have been published by the Multiculturalism Directorate, but after complaints from officials of the Department of the Secretary of State concerning its partisan nature, it was published by Cafik's office. Interview, 4 May 1979.

⁴⁹ See pp. 125-26 above. As Gus Mitges pointed out, the commitment to increase funding for multiculturalism programs to ten million dollars a year simply represented belated recognition of a promise made in 1973 to increase funding for multiculturalism. Debates, 30th Parliament, 3rd Session, 1978, p. 398.

CONCLUSIONS

Persistent Ambiguities

The federal government's multiculturalism policy was announced in response to increasing activism among the non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups in Canada during the middle and late sixties. The policy was intended to provide symbolic recognition of the contribution of these groups to Canadian society, assist them in retaining some aspects of their ethnocultural heritage, and promote greater citizen participation, greater concern for human rights, and creative encounters among all Canadian ethnocultural groups in the interest of national unity. Underlying the above intentions was a hope that greater recognition of the "other" ethnic groups would prevent a backlash from these groups against the official bilingualism policies promoted by the federal government. The multiculturalism policy was an important component in a broader scheme of innovative "participatory citizenship" policies coordinated by an energetic group of "maverick" bureaucrats within the Citizenship Branch of the Department of the Secretary of State.

It was difficult to formulate a cohesive policy addressing the concerns of the various "other" ethnic groups. No single issue, such as racial tension or immigrant integration, provided a strong focus for such a policy, and the Report of the B & B Commission did not include a final summary volume which might have drawn some conclusions concerning the place of the "other" ethnic groups in Canadian society. In Book 4 of its Report the B & B Commission simply offered a set of somewhat eclectic recommendations dealing with ethnocultural pluralism which it proposed be implemented by both the federal and provincial governments.

The multiculturalism policy, the nucleus of which originally consisted of the government's response to the recommendations of Book 4, was therefore experimental in nature, and its terms of reference were broad and general. It was clear from the policy announcement that the "other" ethnic groups would be provided with only modest assistance in retaining certain elements of their ethnic identity, and the policy did not envisage any collective rights guarantees for these minority groups.¹ However, the announcement left many important questions, such as the extent of federal government support for third-language teaching, and the role of the multiculturalism policy in immigrant integration, to be resolved at a later date.

The experimental nature of the multiculturalism policy, and its vague terms of reference, were largely due to the problem of reconciling the concepts of anglophone-francophone dualism and ethnocultural pluralism. Tension between these countervailing principles still exists, and there has been little progress in defining the place of the "other" ethnic groups in Canadian society. Thus, for example, both the makeup of the Task Force on National Unity and the manner in which it conducted its business showed a bicultural disposition in terms of its definition of Canadian society and the scope of the debate on national unity.² A continuing reluctance to

¹ According to the first section of the four-part statement outlining the nature of federal government support for the multiculturalism policy: "First, resources permitting, the government will seek to assist all Canadian cultural groups that have demonstrated a desire and effort..." (Italics mine.) For a bitter critique of the various qualifying phrases in Prime Minister Trudeau's policy announcement, and its condescending tone, see the two-part article "Multiculturalism and Ukrainianism: Middle Class Sellout," by Yury Boshyk, in Student, November 1971 and January 1972.

² The Task Force on Canadian Unity, A Future Together (Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services, 1979), pp. 55-56; Student, March-April 1979. Some of the "other" ethnic groups did attempt to make a contribution to the debate on national unity. See Shiu L. Kong and Riten Ray, eds., Unity in Diversity: Proceedings of a Multicultural Conference on Canadian Unity (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978); Manoly R. Lupul, ed., Ukrainian Canadians, Multiculturalism, and Separatism: An Assessment (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1978).

acknowledge the ethnocultural diversity of Canadian society is also reflected in the nature of the debates over the symbolic recognition of Canada's "multicultural" identity in the new Immigration Act passed in 1977, and the "enshrinement" of the concept of multiculturalism in the Canadian constitution.³ In practical terms, fears that major concessions to the "other" ethnic groups would undermine the status of the "two founding races," and detract from official bilingualism policies, has prompted the government to accord a low profile to the multiculturalism policy and its programs. There has been a particular indecisiveness in providing support for non-official language teaching, and in pressing the CBC to provide multicultural and multilingual broadcasting.

It has also been difficult for the multiculturalism policy to address the different concerns of the various non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups in a consistent fashion. There are many profound differences among and within these groups, and the interests of the new immigrant groups, the visible minorities, and the established "other" ethnic groups have often varied a great deal. There has been little cooperation among these groups in presenting realistic and well-formulated demands to the government, and even those groups which are fairly well organized have had problems creating an effective lobby for their interests. In addition, representatives of the "other" ethnic groups have often had difficulty demonstrating grass-roots support for their demands, leading to accusations that the multiculturalism policy is serving small, entrenched, and vocal ethnic elites.

The multiculturalism policy was formulated largely in response to pressure from representatives of established "other" ethnic groups of

³ Canada, House of Commons, Debates, 30th Parliament, 2nd Session, 1977, pp. 7887-92, 7901; Debates, 30th Parliament, 4th Session, pp. 247, 2836-37; Student, August 1978.

European background, and the multiculturalism policy announcement dealt primarily with the cultural development goals emphasized by these groups. One section of the four-part statement outlining the nature of government support for the policy did deal with the mobility of the "other" ethnic groups in Canadian society, but even this section reads: "Second, the government will assist members of all cultural groups to overcome cultural barriers to full participation in Canadian society."⁴ (Italics mine.) Since the late sixties, however, an increasing proportion of the immigration stream to Canada has consisted of members of the "visible minorities" who, at least in the short term, are more concerned with the problem of racial discrimination, especially in the job market, than with cultural or linguistic rights. Munro tried to reorient the multiculturalism policy to respond to some of the concerns of the visible minorities and the new immigrant groups, but this attempt was resisted by members of the established non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups, and by politicians and government officials who wanted the multiculturalism policy to retain a purely cultural perspective. Although several aspects of Munro's reorientation plans were eventually approved, albeit in a watered-down form, the Multiculturalism Directorate possesses only a limited capability to deal with questions of social policy such as human rights and immigrant integration, and many members of the visible minority and new immigrant groups still view the multiculturalism policy as oriented towards the established ethnic groups.

Last but not least, the acceptance of the multiculturalism policy in some circles has been affected by the continuing arguments of some assimilationists that government support for the "other" ethnic groups will help lead to their "ghettoization," thereby impeding the mobility of the

⁴ Debates , 28th Parliament, 3rd Session, 1971, p. 8546.

members of these groups in Canadian society, while other assimilationists still contend that the multiculturalism policy will promote the retention of "old-world" animosities.⁵

Relatively little progress has been made in resolving these continuing debates over the place of the "other" ethnic groups in Canadian society, the best means of dealing with the disparate concerns of these groups, and the values of ethnicity in a modern technological society. Thus the government has been reluctant to clearly delineate the status of the multiculturalism policy in the bureaucratic and executive arenas, and to formulate an effective coordinating role of any kind for the policy.

The Coordinating Role of the Multiculturalism Policy
and the Ministers of State (Multiculturalism)

As Aucoin and French have pointed out, in the absence of strong power-program and/or control responsibilities, horizontal coordinating bodies such as the Ministry of State for Science and Technology (MOSST) and the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs (MSUA) must cooperate closely with the central agencies (especially the PCO and Treasury Board Secretariat) in policy formulation activities, and require consistent guidance and support from Cabinet and especially the Prime Minister.⁶

⁵ For a recent detailed critique of the idea and policy of multiculturalism which illustrates the ongoing nature of the controversy concerning government policies in this area, see the article by Gregory Baum, "Perspectives on Multiculturalism," The Grad Front, 30 November 1978, pp. 5-7. A shorter version of this article appeared in the Toronto Star, 15 November 1977. For a recent and rather unsophisticated diatribe criticizing the multiculturalism policy see Gordon Donaldson, "Our Costliest Cult," Quest, May 1979, pp. 36-40.

⁶ Peter Aucoin and Richard French, Knowledge, Power and Public Policy (Ottawa: Information Canada, 1974), pp. 26-30, 43-44.

During the period of euphoric enthusiasm for the "participation" programs of the Citizenship Branch, the multiculturalism policy was also projected as having a significant horizontal coordinating role; the establishment of both an Inter-Agency Coordinating Committee and an Interdepartmental Coordinating Committee was envisaged to ensure that a wide range of federal government policies and programs reflect and respond to the ethnocultural diversity of Canadian society. Plans for the multiculturalism policy to have a significant horizontal impact on the activities of the cultural agencies and various government departments have often been used as a rationale to explain the limited program capability of the Multiculturalism Directorate itself. This presupposes that, as in the case of MOSST and MSUA, the work of the Directorate would receive consistent guidance and support from the central agencies and Cabinet.

However, after a brief flurry of interest in multiculturalism, Trudeau and his advisors devoted little attention to the policy, and it became increasingly susceptible to partisan political influences after the October 1972 federal election. When enthusiasm for the "participation" programs of the Citizenship Branch began to wane in 1973, it also became evident that the government was reluctant to take any initiatives regarding multiculturalism which might appear to detract from the perceived cultural dualism of Canadian society and official bilingualism policies.

After Assistant Under Secretary of State for Citizenship Bernard Ostry left the Department of the Secretary of State, ties between the Multiculturalism Directorate and the central agencies became very weak; no official in the PCO or PMO, for example, was assigned responsibility for ensuring that multicultural concerns receive suitable attention in policy and planning initiatives throughout the federal government. In fact, some officials of the Citizenship Branch felt that on several occasions (notably in connection with Munro's

reorientation plans) officials in the PCO played an important role in paralyzing important initiatives from the Branch.⁷

It may seem that too much attention in this study has been devoted to the behavior and personalities of the different ministers responsible for multiculturalism. However, strong and consistent leadership by competent ministers would have provided some stability to a policy plagued by ambiguity and a lack of direction, whereas the actual choice of some of the ministers responsible for multiculturalism, as well as their administrative abilities, did not inspire much faith in the government's intentions regarding this policy. On the contrary, the poor performance of ministers such as Haidasz and Guay provoked a great deal of cynicism, while Munro, despite his good intentions, found it difficult to devote much time to multiculturalism because of his heavy labor portfolio responsibilities.

The fact that four ministers occupied the multiculturalism portfolio over a period of less than seven years is not in itself surprising. There was an extraordinary fluidity in the Trudeau Cabinet, both in terms of movement in and out of the Cabinet, and lateral movement within.⁸ Williams also points out that, concurrent with the growth and rising influence of the central agencies, the requirement that ministers possess a reasonably high degree of competence and expertise was steadily eroded as they increasingly became articulators or "salesmen" of policies and programs.⁹

The circumstances in which almost all of the junior minister of state portfolios were established provide a striking example of the growing

⁷ Interview, 10 May 1979, 20 May 1979, 27 June 1979.

⁸ Blair Williams, "The Transformation of the Federal Cabinet Under P.E. Trudeau," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, Saskatoon, 30 May 1979, pp. 7-9. (Mimeographed.)

⁹ Ibid., pp. 30-31.

importance of the public relations function of Cabinet ministers, and the general decline of Cabinet. Lack of competence and continuity in ministerial guidance has been particularly harmful in the case of the young and novel multiculturalism policy.

It is doubtful whether much consideration was given to the question of how the appointment of junior ministers of state would affect the intra-departmental (and, in some cases, interdepartmental) coordinating role of the administrative units whose work they supervise. These ministers can play an important role in ensuring that the policy areas for which they are responsible receive some consideration in Cabinet deliberations, and can act as "watchdogs" for the interests of these policy areas. Nonetheless, since their inception these portfolios have primarily been utilized to provide symbolic representation to a group or interest, to bring energetic backbenchers into Cabinet, or to bypass an administrative bottleneck, and the junior ministers of state possess a clearly subordinate status in Cabinet. They have assumed some of the characteristics of ministers without portfolio, but in fact provide for even less mobility within Cabinet than the latter. Whereas from 1968 on the appointment of ministers without portfolio has almost without exception led to their rapid appointment to regular (often senior) Cabinet portfolios, fewer than half of all the junior ministers of state who have been appointed since 1971 moved on to more prestigious portfolios.¹⁰

Relationships between junior ministers of state and other Cabinet ministers have often been strained. Haidasz and Guay, for example, were seldom treated seriously by their Cabinet colleagues,¹¹ and even a vocal

¹⁰ Based on data from Colin Campbell, Canadian Political Facts, 1945-1976 (Toronto: Methuen, 1977), pp. 19-31, and the indexes to Hansard.

¹¹ Interview, 24 April 1979, 25 April 1979, 4 May 1979, 20 May 1979.

and aggressive minister such as Cafik had difficulty establishing a working relationship with the ministers of departments, such as External Affairs or Manpower and Immigration, which included a strong "multicultural" component in some of their activities. What is more surprising, Cafik had a very poor working relationship with Secretary of State John Roberts, the minister responsible for the department within which the Multiculturalism Directorate is located.¹²

Thus the creation of junior minister of state portfolios has performed a largely symbolic role. However, once such a portfolio has been occupied for some time, it may prove difficult to eliminate if a large or powerful sector of public opinion feels that such a step would represent a serious downgrading of the importance of the policy area supervised by the given minister. Some representatives of the "other" ethnic groups, for example, have placed considerable emphasis on the symbolic representation which these groups obtain by virtue of the presence of a spokesman for their interests in Cabinet, and have reacted strongly to indications that this representation is being threatened in some fashion.¹³

Unlike the ministries of state, the administrative units supervised by junior ministers of state cannot claim to possess special expertise in areas of great public concern. Unless the policy areas they administer achieve a high public profile, and are given a high priority by Cabinet and the central agencies, it is unlikely that these administrative units will be able to perform an effective horizontal coordinating role within the departments in which they are located, much less any interdepartmental coordinating function.

¹² Interview, 4 May 1979, 20 May 1979.

¹³ See p. 112 above.

The low profile of the multiculturalism policy in ~~Cabinet~~ and the central agencies has been reflected in the ambiguous status of the multiculturalism policy in the bureaucratic arena. Senior officials in the Department of the Secretary of State have usually accorded the multiculturalism policy a low priority, and there has been no success in clearly delineating the relationships and lines of authority among the Minister of State (Multiculturalism), and the Secretary of State, and senior officials in the Department of the Secretary of State. The nature of cooperation among the above has depended on the strength of their personal relationships and good will.

Frequent reorganizations and a rapid turnover of senior staff in the Department of the Secretary of State further complicated the situation. Within a six year period following the appointment of the first Minister of State (Multiculturalism) four individuals held the position of Under Secretary of State, there were five (including one acting) Assistant Under Secretaries of State for Citizenship, and the Directorship of the Multiculturalism Directorate changed four times.¹⁴ In recent years the operation of the Multiculturalism Directorate has been hampered by the fact that after Bernard Ostry left the Department of the Secretary of State early in 1974, none of the Under Secretaries of State or Assistant Under Secretaries of State has shown a strong interest in the concerns of the "other" ethnic groups.¹⁵

¹⁴ Under Secretaries of State (1972-78): Jules Léger; Jean Boucher; André Fortier; Pierre Juneau. Assistant Under Secretaries of State for Citizenship (1972-78): Bernard Ostry; André Renaud; Robert Blain (Acting); Denise Moncion; Paul LaRose. Directors, Multiculturalism Directorate (1972-78): Jennifer McQueen; Orest Kruhlak; Michael Andrassy; Orest Kruhlak.

¹⁵ Interview, 24 April 1979, 20 May 1979, 27 June 1979.

Thus the Multiculturalism Directorate has remained a small unit within the Department of the Secretary of State with only a minor program capability. Attempts to establish effective inter-agency and interdepartmental coordinating committees have been unsuccessful, and in the last few years discussions between the Directorate and the cultural agencies or other departments have been conducted only on an ad hoc basis.

The Future of the Multiculturalism Policy

The announcement of the multiculturalism policy provided the "other" ethnic groups with an important symbolic affirmation of their place in Canadian society. In addition, the various programs of the Multiculturalism Directorate and the modest financial aid which it extends to some activities sponsored by the "other" ethnic groups have probably given an important psychological "boost" to organizations which have often operated in a depressing "church basement" environment. The proliferation and popularity of various inter-group "ethnic" festivals in almost all major urban centers would seem to indicate that, at least on a superficial level, there is a growing acceptance of Canada's ethnocultural diversity, and, more significantly, there has been some progress in modifying school curricula to reflect this diversity.¹⁶

However, there is little hard evidence to show that the multiculturalism policy has significantly affected the cultural development of the "other" ethnic groups, eased the situation of recent immigrants, created a more favorable climate for official bilingualism policies, or influenced the political fortunes of the Liberal Party. Two national surveys carried out in 1973 and 1974 showed that approximately twenty per cent of the respon-

¹⁶ T. Aoki, J. Dahlie, and W. Werner, eds. Canadian Ethnicity: The Politics of Meaning (Vancouver: Centre for the Study of Curriculum and Instruction, University of British Columbia, 1978).

dents knew of the federal multiculturalism policy, and that these respondents were generally favorable to multiculturalism as it was explained to them.¹⁷

These studies, however, were conducted quite soon after the announcement of the multiculturalism policy, and it is impossible to generalize about subsequent trends in public opinion, or to determine how the announcement and implementation of the policy have influenced societal attitudes.

Considering present preoccupations with the situation in Quebec and the possibility of an economic recession, it is doubtful whether the federal government will attach a high priority to the multiculturalism policy or allow for a significant increase in funds for multiculturalism programs in the near future. Only a massive influx of immigrants, a dramatic increase in racial tension, or considerably more sophisticated lobbying by the "other" ethnic groups on a national basis would likely lead to a radical change in the status of the multiculturalism policy.

However, certain steps could be taken which might improve the status of the multiculturalism policy in the bureaucratic arena. It is interesting to note that shortly before the May 1979 federal election, the office of the Progressive Conservative Multiculturalism Coordinator, Gus Mitges, prepared the draft of a new P.C. multiculturalism policy which included several interesting proposals. The draft recommended that a P.C. government not only retain the portfolio of minister of state (multiculturalism), but that a Commissioner of Multiculturalism be appointed

...with a mandate to monitor and influence the application of the principles of multiculturalism in all spheres of the federal government...as an ombudsman for multiculturalism, the Commissioner would provide an unbiased link between the ethnocultural communities and government.¹⁸

¹⁷ K.G. O'Bryan, J.G. Reitz, and O.M. Kuplowska, Non-Official Languages: A Study in Canadian Multiculturalism (Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1976), p. 154; John W. Berry, Rudolf Kalin, and Donald Taylor, Multiculturalism and Ethnic Attitudes in Canada (Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1977), p. 136.

¹⁸ Gus Mitges, "The Progressive Conservative Party's Proposed Policy on

In addition, it was suggested that the Multiculturalism Directorate be elevated to a full division within the Department of the Secretary of State, administered by an Assistant Under Secretary of State whose sole responsibility would be multiculturalism. Other proposals included a reduction in the size of the CCM, and the removal of prohibitions on third language broadcasting by the CBC.¹⁹ However, even if some of the proposals in the document, such as the appointment of a Commissioner of Multiculturalism, were to be implemented, they would still only represent token gestures unless there would be genuine commitment by the government to a revived multiculturalism policy. The new P.C. government has not reacted officially to these proposals; one can only predict that, unless the Multiculturalism Directorate is given greater program responsibilities in areas such as immigrant integration or human rights, it is unlikely to achieve a significantly higher profile within the Department of the Secretary of State.

In the long run, if Canadian fertility rates continue at their present low level, it is likely that Canada will continue to accept an annual gross immigration movement of between 75,000 and 150,000 individuals.²⁰ Since as a proportion of total immigration to Canada, the Black and Asian group increased from approximately 14.6 per cent in 1967 to 36.6 per cent in 1974, if present trends continue it is likely that the proportion of the non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French ethnic groups, (especially the visible minorities) in the population will continue to grow. In fact, because of the very low fertility rate among French Canadians, members of the "other" ethnic groups may soon outnumber the French

Multiculturalism: Revised Draft," Ottawa, March 19, 1979, p. 2. (Mimeographed.) This draft was prepared too soon before the election was called (March 26, 1979) to be approved by Clark and the P.C. caucus, and therefore just represents tentative proposals.

¹⁹ Ibid., pp. 3-4.

²⁰ Freda Hawkins, "Canadian Immigration: Present Policies, Future Options," The Round Table 67 (January 1977): 60.

element of the population.²¹

Thus there will be a growing problem of political recognition, political access, and political power for Canadians of "other" ethnic background in a system designed for two "charter" groups which functions by accommodating entrenched elites in which one or both of these charter groups predominate.²² If the multiculturalism policy can begin to address some of these problems, it may come to play a significant role in the future, although the focus of the policy will probably shift away from the established "other" ethnic groups (especially those of East European origin, whose numbers are not being replenished by new immigration) to the visible minorities whose presence is increasingly being felt in major urban centers.²³

However, although the federal government will probably continue to maintain a multiculturalism policy of some sort, it may encourage the provinces to assume greater responsibilities in this area. Federal initiatives in the early seventies played an important role in spurring some provinces to announce multiculturalism policies of their own, and there is a growing recognition of Canada's ethnocultural diversity at both the provincial and municipal levels. In fact, two of the three recommendations of the Task Force on Canadian Unity which dealt with multiculturalism advocated that:

19. i--The provincial governments should assume the primary responsibility for the support of multiculturalism in Canada, including the funding of ethno-cultural organizations.

²¹ Anthony H. Richmond and G. Lakshmana Rao, "Recent Developments in Immigration to Canada and Australia," International Journal of Comparative Sociology 17 (September-December 1976): 188; Hawkins, "Canadian Immigration," p. 62.

²² Hawkins, "Canadian Immigration," p. 63.

²³ Some of the visible minorities have begun to show more interest in the federal government's multiculturalism policy. See Anthony Chan, "Neither French nor British: The Rise of the Asian Canadian Culture," Canadian Ethnic Studies 10, no. 2 (1978): 114-17. See also recent articles in two journals published by young Asian Canadians: Rikka and the Asianadian.

- ii--The major ethno-cultural organizations in Canada should attempt to work more closely with the provincial governments to develop ways in which multiculturalism can find most effective expression through provincial initiatives.²⁴

In this fashion the Task Force recognized that the various "other" ethnic groups have played a much more prominent role in the development of certain provinces and communities than of others, and that some ethnic communities have been able to organize and express themselves most effectively within a regional or provincial framework. In fact, many areas of most concern to the "other" ethnic groups, such as education, human rights, and immigrant integration, lie wholly or partly within provincial jurisdiction.

Four provinces (Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario) have announced provincial multiculturalism policies, while British Columbia, Quebec, and Nova Scotia administer programs providing various forms of support for the activities of the "other" ethnic groups.²⁵ Advisory groups or councils on multiculturalism have been established in several provinces, and Saskatchewan's multiculturalism policy was given a statutory base by the passage of a "Saskatchewan Multiculturalism Act" (1974), the purpose of which is to encourage multiculturalism in the province and to provide assistance to individuals and groups in order to increase their opportunities to learn about their cultural heritage.

Although the necessity of federal-provincial cooperation in the field of multiculturalism has been emphasized several times since the actual announce-

²⁴ The Task Force on National Unity, "A Future Together," p. 123.

²⁵ British Columbia is to announce a provincial multiculturalism policy late in 1979. See Affiliation of Multicultural Societies of British Columbia, "Toward a Provincial Multicultural Policy," Vancouver, 1979, p. 63. (Mimeographed.) The information on provincial multiculturalism policies is from the following sources: Interview, 11 May 1979 (a), 28 June 1979, 20 July 1979; Canada, Department of the Secretary of State, Citizenship Branch, Multiculturalism Directorate, "Provincial Positions on Multiculturalism," Ottawa, 1978. (Mimeographed.)

ment of the federal government's multiculturalism policy, federal officials were reluctant to begin any discussions with the provinces until the results of the Culture Development Program (primarily consisting of the Non-Official Languages Study) were available, since the question of federal support for non-official language instruction would be one of the major issues raised.²⁶ However, even after the results of the NOL Study became available in 1976, little was done to coordinate the multiculturalism programs of the federal and provincial governments, although several minor disagreements over federal-provincial jurisdiction concerning assistance to voluntary groups for third-language teaching groups have already arisen. There have been no formal federal-provincial negotiations on multiculturalism either at the senior official or ministerial level, although some ad hoc discussions have taken place.

In view of the continuous increase of provincial activity in the overall area of cultural affairs and immigrant integration,²⁷ if the federal government wishes to maintain an active presence in the field of multiculturalism, it will have to significantly increase its contacts with the appropriate officials at the provincial level.

²⁶ Interview, 24 April 1979, 20 May 1979.

²⁷ Bernard Ostry, The Cultural Connection (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1978), pp. 135-139; Hawkins, "Canadian Immigration," pp. 52-53.

APPENDIX A

Junior Ministers of State and Ministers Without
Portfolio, August 1971 to June 1979

Junior Ministers of State

Martin O'Connell (Citizenship)	12 Aug. 1971 to 27 Jan. 1972
Pat Mahoney	28 Jan. 1972 to 26 Nov. 1972
Bryce Mackasey	3 June 1974 to 7 Aug. 1974
Stanley Haidasz (Multiculturalism)	27 Nov. 1972 to 7 Aug. 1974
John Munro (Multiculturalism)	8 Aug. 1974 to 20 April 1977
Joseph Guay (Multiculturalism)	21 April 1977 to 15 Sept. 1977
Norman Cafik (Multiculturalism)	16 Sept. 1977 to 4 June 1979
Romeo LeBlanc (Fisheries)	8 Aug. 1974 to 15 Sept. 1976
Leonard Marchand (Small Business)	14 Sept. 1976 to 15 Sept. 1977
Anthony Abbott (Small Business)	16 Sept. 1977 to 4 June 1979
Iona Campagnolo (Fitness and Amateur Sport)	14 Sept. 1976 to 4 June 1979
Leonard Marchand (Environment)	16 Sept. 1977 to 4 June 1979

Ministers Without Portfolio (Excluding Leaders
of the Government in The Senate)

Jean Marchand	26 Sept. 1975 to 21 Jan. 1976
Joseph Guay	4 Nov. 1976 to 20 April 1977
Gilles Lamontagne	19 Jan. 1978 to 2 Feb. 1978
Jack Horner	21 April 1977 to 16 Sept. 1977

APPENDIX B

Recommendations of Book IV of the Report of the RoyalCommission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism,and the Response of the Federal Government¹

1. Recommendation 1

We recommend that any provinces that have not yet enacted fair employment practices, fair accommodation practices, or housing legislation prohibiting discrimination because of race, creed, colour, nationality, ancestry, or place of origin, do so and that this legislation be made binding upon the Crown and its agencies. We further recommend that all provinces make provision for full-time administrators of their human rights legislation.

Response

This is directed primarily to the provinces but the federal government has the whole question of human rights under consideration.

2. Recommendation 2

We recommend that the same conditions for citizenship, the right to vote, and to stand for election to public office be accorded to all immigrants, with no regard to their country of origin.

Response

The Canada Elections Act (proclaimed April 12, 1971) and intended amendments to the Citizenship Act now in preparation provide for the equality called for in this recommendation.

3. Recommendation 3

We recommend that the teaching of languages other than English and French, and cultural subjects related to them, be incorporated as options in the public elementary school programme, where there is sufficient demand for them.

Response

Elementary school education is a provincial concern, but the govern-

¹ Taken from Canada, Federal Government, "Response to Book 4 of the Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism," Document, tabled in the House of Commons, Debates, 28th Parliament, 3rd Session, 1971, pp. 8583-85.

ment plans to undertake a major research project on the relationship of language to cultural retention and development. It also plans to discuss with the provinces and cultural groups ways of assisting in the development and duplication of new teaching aids for languages and cultures other than English and French.

4. Recommendation 4

We recommend that special instruction in the appropriate official language be provided for children who enter the public school system with an adequate knowledge of that language; that provincial authorities specify the terms and conditions of financial assistance for such special instruction; and that the federal authorities assist the provinces in mutually acceptable ways through grants for the additional cost incurred.

Response

The federal government approves in principle aid towards the teaching of official languages to children of immigrants, and will be discussing it with the provinces.

5. Recommendation 5

We recommend that more advanced instruction and a wider range of options in languages other than English and French, and in cultural subjects related to them, be provided in public high schools, where there is sufficient demand for such classes.

Response

This is primarily a matter of provincial jurisdiction. However the development of new teaching aids (noted in the response to Recommendation 3) and the ethnic histories programme will be useful in the high schools. The Prime Minister's letter to each of the provincial premiers urges a positive response to all those recommendations which touch upon provincial authority.

6. Recommendation 6

We recommend that Canadian universities broaden their practices in giving standing or credits for studies in modern languages other than French and English both for admission and for degrees.

Response

This is primarily a matter for consideration by the academic institutions.

7. Recommendation 7

We recommend that Canadian universities expand their studies in the fields of the humanities and the social sciences relating to particular

areas other than those related to the English and French languages.

Response

This is primarily a matter for consideration by the academic institutions.

8. Recommendation 8

We recommend that the CRTC remove restrictions on private broadcasting in languages other than English and French, except those restrictions necessary to meet the administrative and legal responsibilities of the licensees and those that also apply to English- and French-language programmes.

Response

The CRTC has agreed to place this matter before the Commission in the very near future.

9. Recommendation 9

We recommend that the CBC recognize the place of languages other than English and French in Canadian life and that the CBC remove its proscription on the use of other languages in broadcasting.

Response

The CBC has not agreed to the spirit of this recommendation. The question of broadcasting in non-official languages will be considered within the major research project.

10. Recommendation 10

We recommend that the CRTC undertake studies in the field of broadcasting in other languages to determine the best means by which radio and television can contribute to the maintenance of languages and cultures and that the CBC participate in these studies. We further recommend that these studies include pilot projects on either AM or FM radio in both Montreal and Toronto.

Response

The CRTC has agreed to undertake these studies, and the CBC has agreed to cooperate. The studies will be carried on within the total framework of the major research project on language retention which will be directed by the Citizenship Branch of the Department of the Secretary of State.

11. Recommendation 11

We recommend that research be undertaken through the CRTC concerning the nature and effects of the portrayal of other cultural groups on both publicly- and privately-owned English-and-French-language radio and television stations.

Response

This study will be broadened to include all the media and will be carried on within the major research project mentioned above.

12. Recommendation 12

We recommend that the National Film Board undertake to publicize the fact that it produces prints of many of its films in languages other than English and French, particularly in regions where there are concentrations of persons who speak languages other than English and French. In addition, we recommend that the voluntary associations of cultural groups stimulate interest among their groups in the use of these films.

Response.

The multicultural programme to be undertaken by the National Film Board meets this recommendation.

13. Recommendation 13

We recommend that the National Film Board continue and develop the production of films that inform Canadians about one another, including films about the contribution and problems of both individuals and groups of ethnic origin other than British and French, and that the National Film Board receive the financial support it requires in order to produce such films.

Response

The multicultural programme to be undertaken by the National Film Board meets this recommendation.

14. Recommendation 14

We recommend that the appropriate federal, provincial, and municipal agencies receive the financial means they require to maintain and extend their support to cultural and research organizations whose objectives are to foster the arts and letters of cultural groups other than the British and French.

Response

The grants programme administered by the Citizenship Branch of the Department of the Secretary of State will provide funds to assist such organizations.

15. Recommendation 15

We recommend that the administrative costs of the Canadian Folk Arts Council or a similar body be provided for out of public funds through the Citizenship Branch of the Department of the Secretary of State.

Response

The Canadian Folk Arts Council already receives an annual grant for administrative purposes from the Arts and Culture Branch of the Department of the Secretary of State. In the Citizenship Branch, requests for grants to pay for specific projects suggested by the Canadian Folk Arts Council or similar bodies will continue to receive consideration if they meet the objectives of the multicultural programme.

16. Recommendation 16

We recommend that the National Museum of Man be given adequate space and facilities and provided with sufficient funds to carry out its projects regarding the history, social organizations, and folk arts of cultural groups other than the British and French.

Response

The multicultural programme of the National Museum of Man meets this recommendation.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Aoki, T.; Dahlie, J.; and Werner W., eds. Canadian Ethnicity: The Politics of Meaning. Vancouver: Centre for the Study of Curriculum and Instruction, University of British Columbia, 1978.
- Aucoin, Peter, and French, Richard. Knowledge, Power and Public Policy. Science Council of Canada Background Study, no. 31. Ottawa: Information Canada, 1974.
- Australia. Parliament. Migrant Services and Programs: Report of the Review of Post-Arrival Programs and Services for Migrants. Parliamentary Paper No. 164/1978. Canberra: The Commonwealth Government Printer, 1978.
- Australian Ethnic Affairs Council. Australia As a Multicultural Society. 2nd ed. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1978.
- Berry, John W.; Kalin, Rudolf; and Taylor, Donald M. Multiculturalism and Ethnic Attitudes in Canada. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1977.
- Campbell, Colin, and Szablowski, George J. The Superbureaucrats: Structure and Behaviour in Central Agencies. Toronto: Macmillan, 1979.
- Cameron, David. Nationalism, Self-Determination and the Quebec Question. Canadian Controversies Series. Toronto: Macmillan, 1974.
- Canada. Minister of State (Multiculturalism). Multiculturalism and the Government of Canada. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1978.
- Canada. Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. Report. Book 4. The Cultural Contribution of the Other Ethnic Groups. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1970.
- Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism. First Annual Report. Ottawa: Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism, 1975.
- Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism. Multiculturalism as State Policy: Conference Report, Second Canadian Conference on Multiculturalism. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1976.
- Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism. Report--1977. Ottawa: Minister of State (Multiculturalism), 1977.
- Canadian Cultural Rights Committee. Concerns: A Conference to Study Canada's Multicultural Patterns in the Sixties. Ottawa: Canadian Cultural Rights Committee, 1969.
- Clarke, Harold D.; Jenson, Jane; LeDuc, Lawrence; Pammett, John H. Political Choice in Canada. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1979.

- Davis, Morris, and Krauter, Joseph F. Minority Canadians: Ethnic Groups. 2nd ed. Toronto: Methuen, 1978.
- Doern, G. Bruce, and Wilson, V. Seymour, eds. Issues in Canadian Public Policy. Toronto: Macmillan, 1974.
- Doern, G. Bruce, and Aucoin, Peter, eds. Public Policy in Canada: Organization, Process and Management. Toronto: Macmillan, 1979.
- Driedger, Leo, ed. The Canadian Ethnic Mosaic: A Quest for Identity. Canadian Ethnic Studies Association Series, vol. 6. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1978.
- Elliott, Jean Leonard, ed. Two Nations, Many Cultures: Ethnic Groups in Canada. Scarborough: Prentice-Hall, 1979.
- The Federation of Francophones Outside Quebec. The Heirs of Lord Durham: Manifesto of a Vanishing People. Toronto: Burns and MacEachern, 1978.
- Glazer, Nathan, and Moynihan, Daniel P.; eds. Ethnicity: Theory and Experience. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- Hawkins, Freda. Canada and Immigration: Public Policy and Public Concern. Canadian Public Administration Series. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1972.
- Hockin, Thomas A., ed. Apex of Power: The Prime Minister and Political Leadership in Canada. 2nd ed. Scarborough: Prentice-Hall, 1977.
- Hodgetts, J.E. The Canadian Public Service: A Physiology of Government. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973.
- Isajiw, Wsevolod, ed. The Impact of Ethnicity on Canadian Society. Canadian Ethnic Studies Association Series, vol. 5. Toronto: Peter Martin Associates, 1977.
- Kong, Shiu L.; and Ray, Riten, eds. Unity in Diversity: Proceedings of a Multicultural Conference on Canadian Unity. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978.
- Kovacs, Martin L., ed. Ethnic Canadians: Culture and Education. Canadian Plains Studies, no. 8. Regina: Canadian Plains Research Center, 1978.
- Krickus, Richard. Pursuing the American Dream: White Ethnics and the New Populism. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1976.
- Lupul, Manoly R., ed. Ukrainian Canadians, Multiculturalism, and Separatism: An Assessment. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1978.
- Martin, Jean I. The Migrant Presence: Australian Responses 1947-1977. Studies in Society, no. 2. Sydney: George Allen and Unwin, 1978.
- Matheson, W.A. The Prime Minister and the Cabinet. Toronto: Methuen, 1976.

Migus, Paul M., ed. Sounds Canadian: Language and Cultures in Multi-Ethnic Society. Canadian Ethnic Studies Association Series, vol. 4. Toronto: Peter Martin Associates, 1975.

Newman, William. American Pluralism: A Study of Minority Groups and Social Theory. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.

Novak, Michael. The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics: Politics and Culture in the Seventies. New York: Macmillan, 1971.

O'Bryan, K.G.; Reitz, J.G.; and Kuplowska, O.M. Non-official Languages: A Study in Canadian Multiculturalism. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1976.

Ostry, Bernard. The Cultural Connection. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1978.

Palmer, Howard, ed. Immigration and the Rise of Multiculturalism. Toronto: Copp Clark, 1975.

Porter, John. The Vertical Mosaic. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965.

Shackleton, Doris. Power Town: Democracy Discarded. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1977.

Smith, David E. Prairie Liberalism: The Liberal Party in Saskatchewan, 1905-71. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975.

Stein, Howard F., and Hill, Robert F. The Ethnic Imperative: Examining the New White Ethnic Movement. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1977.

Storer, Des, ed. Ethnic Rights Power and Participation: Toward a Multi-cultural Australia. Monographs on Migration Issues, no. 2. Richmond, Victoria: Clearing House on Migration Issues, Ecumenical Migration Centre, and Centre for Urban Research and Action, 1975.

Wilson, Paul R. Immigrants and Politics. Immigrants in Australia Series, no. 3. Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1973.

Yelaja, Shankar A., ed. Canadian Social Policy. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1978.

Articles

Anderson, A.B. "Racism in Toronto." Canadian Ethnic Studies 10, no. 2 (1978): 141-48.

Anderson, Grace M. "Immigration and Social Policy." In Canadian Social Policy, pp. 107-132. Edited by Shankar A. Yelaja. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1978.

- Arnold, Abraham J. "Sometimes Words Fail, and the Word That's Failed Us Most Is 'Multiculturalism'." Maclean's, 24 July 1978, p. 8.
- Aucoin, Peter. "Portfolio Structures and Policy Co-ordination." In Public Policy in Canada: Organization, Process and Management, pp. 213-38. Edited by G. Bruce Doern and Peter Aucoin. Toronto: Macmillan, 1979.
- Baum, Gregory. "Perspectives on Multiculturalism." The Grad Front, 30 November 1978, pp. 5-7.
- Bell, Daniel. "Ethnicity and Social Change." In Ethnicity: Theory and Experience, pp. 141-74. Edited by Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- Berghe, Pierre L. van den, "Ethnic Pluralism in Industrial Societies: A Special Case?" Ethnicity 3 (September 1976): 242-55.
- Bociurkiw, Bohdan. "The Federal Policy of Multiculturalism and the Ukrainian-Canadian Community." In Ukrainian Canadians, Multiculturalism, and Separatism: An Assessment, pp. 98-128. Edited by Manoly R. Lupul. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1978.
- Burgess, Elaine M. "The Resurgence of Ethnicity: Myth or Reality?" Ethnic and Racial Studies 1 (July 1978): 265-85.
- Burnet, Jean. "Ethnicity: Canadian Experience and Policy." Sociological Focus 9 (April 1976): 199-207.
- Burnet, Jean. "Multiculturalism, Immigration and Racism: A Comment on the Canadian Immigration and Population Study." Canadian Ethnic Studies 7, no. 1 (1975): 35-39.
- Burnet, Jean. "The Policy of Multiculturalism within a Bilingual Framework: An Interpretation." In Education of Immigrant Students: Issues and Answers, pp. 205-214. Edited by Aaron Wolfgang. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1975.
- Burnet, Jean. "The Policy of Multiculturalism within a Bilingual Framework: A Stock-taking." Canadian Ethnic Studies 10, no. 2 (1978): 107-13.
- Cameron, David M. "Urban Policy." In Issues in Canadian Public Policy, pp. 228-52. Edited by G. Bruce Doern and V. Seymour Wilson. Toronto: Macmillan, 1974.
- Cameron, David R. "Dualism and the Concept of National Unity." In Approaches to Canadian Politics, pp. 228-246. Edited by John H. Redekop. Scarborough: Prentice-Hall, 1978.
- Chan, Anthony. "Neither French nor British: The Rise of the Asian Canadian Culture." Canadian Ethnic Studies 10, no. 2 (1978): 114-17.
- Cooley, Rita W. "Ethnic Minorities in the United States: Perspectives from Political Science." International Journal of Group Tensions 7 (December 1977): 42-56.

- Cummings, Scott, and Price, Marty D. "Partisan Political Identification Among White Ethnic Groups: An Historical Analysis." Sociological Focus 11 (October 1978): 301-316.
- Darroch, A. Gordon. "Another Look at Ethnicity, Stratification and Social Mobility in Canada." Canadian Journal of Sociology 4 (Winter 1979): 1-25.
- Davies, Arthur. "Migrants, Ethnic, Refugees and the New Federalisms." Politics 12 (November 1977): 167-74.
- Deslauriers, Omer. "Multiculturalism and Franco-Ontarians." In Unity in Diversity, pp. 48-54. Edited by Shiu L. Kong and Riten Ray. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978.
- Doern, G. Bruce. "The Cabinet and Central Agencies." In Public Policy in Canada: Organization, Process and Management, pp. 27-61. Edited by G. Bruce Doern and Peter Aucoin. Toronto: Macmillan, 1979.
- Doern, G. Bruce. "Horizontal and Vertical Portfolios in Government." In Issues in Canadian Public Policy, pp. 310-36. Edited by G. Bruce Doern and V. Seymour Wilson. Toronto: Macmillan, 1974.
- Doern, G. Bruce. "The Policy-Making Philosophy of Prime Minister Trudeau and His Advisers." In Apex of Power: The Prime Minister and Political Leadership in Canada, pp. 189-96. Edited by Thomas A. Hockin. 2nd ed. Scarborough: Prentice-Hall, 1977.
- Donaldson, Gordon. "Our Costliest Cult." Quest, May 1979, pp. 36-40.
- Gans, Herbert J. "Symbolic Ethnicity: The Future of Ethnic Groups and Cultures in America." Ethnic and Racial Studies 2 (January 1979): 1-20.
- Garrett, Stephen A. "Eastern European Ethnic Groups and American Foreign Policy." Political Science Quarterly 93 (Summer 1978): 301-323.
- Gerus, Oleh W. "Ethnic Politics in Canada: The Formation of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee." In The Jubilee Collection of the Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences, pp. 467-80. Edited by O.W. Gerus, A. Baran, and J. Rozumnyj. Winnipeg: Trident Press, 1976.
- Gerus, Oleh W. "The Ukrainian Canadian Committee." In Essays in Ukrainian-Canadian History (tentative title). Edited by Manoly R. Lupul. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, forthcoming.
- Greely, Andrew M., and Jacobsen, Christian W. "Editorial Research Note." Ethnicity 5 (March 1978): 1-13.
- Gwyn, Sandra. "The Great Ottawa Grant Boom (And How It Grew)." Saturday Night, October 1972, pp. 22-24.
- Gwyn, Sandra. "Multiculturalism: A Threat and a Promise." Saturday Night, February 1974, pp. 15-18.

- Harasymiw, Bohdan. "Political Life of Ukrainian Canadians Since 1945." In Essays in Ukrainian-Canadian History (tentative title). Edited by Manoly R. Lupul. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, forthcoming.
- Hawkins, Freda. "Canadian Immigration: Present Policies, Future Options." The Round Table 67 (January 1977): 50-63.
- Isajiw, W.W. "Definitions of Ethnicity." Ethnicity 1 (July 1974): 111-124.
- Isajiw, Wsevolod W. "Olga in Wonderland: Ethnicity in a Technological Society." In The Canadian Ethnic Mosaic: A Quest for Identity, pp. 29-39. Edited by Leo Driedger. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1978.
- Jaenen, Cornelius J. "Canadian Education and Minority Rights." In Slavs in Canada: Proceedings of the Third National Conference on Canadian Slavs, pp. 191-208. Edited by Cornelius J. Jaenen. Ottawa: Inter-University Committee on Canadian Slavs, 1971.
- Jaenen, Cornelius J. "The Manitoba School Question: An Ethnic Interpretation." In Ethnic Canadians: Culture and Education, pp. 317-29. Edited by Martin L. Kovacs. Regina: Canadian Plains Research Center, 1978.
- Jaenen, Cornelius J. "Ruthenian Schools in Western Canada, 1897-1919." Paedagogica Historica 10, no. 3 (1970): 517-41.
- Kuplowska, O.M. "Whither Goeth Multiculturalism." Meta 2 (Winter 1979): 3-5.
- Lupul, Manoly R. "Canada's Options in a Time of Political Crisis and Their Implications for Multiculturalism." In Ukrainian Canadians, Multiculturalism, and Separatism: An Assessment, pp. 153-67. Edited by Manoly R. Lupul. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1978.
- Lupul, Manoly R. "The Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism: A Progress Report and Some Concerns about the Future." Ukrainian Canadian Review no. 5 (1974): 39-47.
- Lupul, Manoly R. "The Ukrainians and Public Education." In Essays in Ukrainian-Canadian History (tentative title). Edited by Manoly R. Lupul. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, forthcoming.
- Lupul, Manoly R. "The Unorganized Ukrainians in Canada." Ukrainian Canadian Review no. 5 (1974): 8-11.
- Macgregor, Roy. "John Reid: Man on the Move, Finally." Maclean's, 26 February 1979, pp. 4-12.
- Manyoni, Joseph R. "Ethnics and Non-Ethnics: Facts and Fads in the Study of Intergroup Relations." In Ethnic Canadians: Culture and Education, pp. 27-42. Edited by Martin L. Kovacs. Regina: Canadian Plains Research Center, 1978.
- Martin, Lawrence. "The Social Conscience of John Munro." Maclean's, May 1972, pp. 36-39.

- Montero, Gloria. "Facing Up to Multiculturalism," Canadian Forum, May 1976, pp. 12-13.
- Murphy, Rae. "The Unmaking of the Minister of Culture." Last Post, September 1973, pp. 27-31.
- Myhul, Ivan M. "Ethnic Minorities and the Nationality Policy of the Parti Québécois." In Ukrainian Canadians, Multiculturalism, and Separatism: An Assessment, pp. 37-58. Edited by Manoly R. Lupul. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1978.
- Nagata, Judith A. "One Vine, Many Branches: Internal Differentiation in Canadian Ethnic Groups." In Two Nations, Many Cultures: Ethnic Groups in Canada, pp. 173-81. Edited by Jean Leonard Elliott. Scarborough: Prentice-Hall, 1979.
- Newman, William M. "Theoretical Perspectives for the Analysis of Social Pluralism." In The Canadian Ethnic Mosaic: A Quest for Identity, pp. 40-54. Edited by Leo Driedger. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1978.
- Nord, Douglas C. "The 'Problem' of Immigration: The Continuing Presence of the Stranger Within Our Gates." The American Review of Canadian Studies 8 (Autumn 1978): 116-33.
- Olsen, Dennis. "The State Elites." In The Canadian State: Political Economy and Political Power, pp. 199-224. Edited by Leo Panitch. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977.
- Osicki, Richard. "The Agony of Julius Koteles." Weekend Magazine, 5 March 1977, pp. 14-17.
- Painchaud, Robert. "The Franco-Canadians of Western Canada and Multiculturalism." In Multiculturalism as State Policy: Conference Report, Second Canadian Conference on Multiculturalism, pp. 29-47. Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1976.
- Palmer, Howard. "Canada: Multicultural or Bicultural?" Canadian Ethnic Studies 3, no. 1 (1971): 109-118.
- Palmer, Howard. "History and Present State of Ethnic Studies in Canada." In Identities: The Impact of Ethnicity on Canadian Society, pp. 167-183. Edited by Wsevolod Isajiw. Toronto: Peter Martin Associates, 1977.
- Palmer, Howard. "Mosaic Versus Melting Pot?: Immigration and Ethnicity in Canada and the United States." International Journal 31 (Summer 1976): 488-528.
- Palmer, Howard. "Reluctant Hosts: Anglo-Canadian Views of Multiculturalism in the Twentieth Century." In Multiculturalism as State Policy: Conference Report, Second Canadian Conference on Multiculturalism, pp. 81-118. Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1976.

- Palmer, Howard, and Troper, Harold. "Canadian Ethnic Studies: Historical Perspectives and Contemporary Implications." Interchange 4 (October 1973): 15-23.
- Parkin, Andrew. "Ethnic Politics: A Comparative Study of Two Immigrant Societies, Australia and the United States." Journal of Commonwealth and Comparative Politics 15 (March 1977): 22-38.
- Parsons, Talcott. "Some Theoretical Considerations on the Nature and Trends of Change of Ethnicity." In Ethnicity: Theory and Experience, pp. 53-83. Edited by Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- Peterson, Thomas. "Manitoba: Ethnic and Class Politics." In Canadian Provincial Politics: The Party Systems of the Ten Provinces, pp. 61-119. Edited by Martin Robin. 2nd ed. Scarborough: Prentice-Hall, 1978.
- Petryshyn, Roman. "Minority Rights Versus Multiculturalism." Meta (forthcoming).
- Porter, John. "Dilemmas and Contradictions of a Multi-Ethnic Society." Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada 4th ser. 10 (1972): 193-205.
- Porter, John. "Ethnic Pluralism in Canadian Perspective." In Ethnicity: Theory and Experience, pp. 267-304. Edited by Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- R.R.H. "In the Bosom of a Single State." Journal of Canadian Studies 6 (November 1971): 1, 2, 63, 64.
- Redekop, John. "Social Policy: The Role of the Governing Party." In Canadian Social Policy, pp. 243-60. Edited by Shankar Yelaja. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1978.
- Richmond, Anthony H., and Rao, G. Lakshmana. "Recent Developments in Immigration to Canada and Australia." International Journal of Comparative Sociology 77 (September-December 1976): 183-205.
- Rocher, Guy. "Les ambiguïtés d'un Canada bilingue et multiculturel." Revue de l'Association Canadienne d'éducation de langue française 1 (September 1972): 21-23.
- Rocher, Guy. "Multiculturalism: The Doubts of a Francophone." In Multiculturalism as State Policy: Conference Report, Second Canadian Conference on Multiculturalism, pp. 47-53. Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1976.
- Schwartz, Mildred A. "Political Behaviour and Ethnic Origin." In Papers on the 1962 Election, pp. 235-71. Edited by John Meisel. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964.
- Special Issue (on Multiculturalism). Communique: Canadian Studies 3 (October 1976).

- steinburg, Stephen. "Ethnicity in the United States: A Sociological Perspective." International Journal of Group Tensions 7 (December 1977): 130-44.
- Stursberg, Peter. "Ottawa Letter." Saturday Night, March 1964, pp. 10-11.
- Swierenga, Robert P. "Ethnicity in Historical Perspective." Social Science 52 (Winter 1977): 31-44.
- Wilson, Paul R. "Immigrants, Politics and Australian Society." In Critical Essays in Australian Politics, pp. 164-83. Edited by Graeme Duncan. Melbourne: Edward Arnold, 1978.
- Wilson, V. Seymour. "Federal-Provincial Relations and Federal Policy Processes." In Public Policy in Canada: Organization, Process and Management, pp. 190-212. Edited by G. Bruce Doern and Peter Aucoin. Toronto: Macmillan, 1979.
- Wilson, V. Seymour. "Language Policy." In Issues in Canadian Public Policy, pp. 253-85. Edited by G. Bruce Doern and V. Seymour Wilson. Toronto: Macmillan, 1974.
- Zubrzycki, Jerzy. "Research on Ethnicity in Australia and Canada." In Identities: The Impact of Ethnicity on Canadian Society, pp. 184-88. Edited by Wsevolod W. Isajiw. Toronto: Peter Martin Associates, 1977.

Unpublished Materials

- Affiliation of Multicultural Societies of British Columbia. "Toward a Provincial Multicultural Policy." Vancouver, 1979. (Mimeographed.)
- Agnew, W.H. "Historical Review of the Citizenship Branch." Ottawa, 1967. (Mimeographed.)
- Aoki, Ted, and Dahlie, Jorgen. "Canadian Ethnic/Multicultural Content in Program Guides of Provincial and Territorial Departments of Education." Report submitted to the Canadian Ethnic Studies Advisory Committee, Ottawa, September 1974. (Mimeographed.)
- Arnold, Abraham J. "How Far Do We Go With Multiculturalism?" Paper presented to a Seminar on Multiculturalism, Edmonton, 18 September 1970. (Mimeographed.)
- Bosnitch, Sava D. "The Neglected Political and Constitutional Implications of the Policy of Multiculturalism." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, Saskatoon, Sask., 30 May 1979. (Mimeographed.)
- Breton, Raymond, and Isajiw, Wsevolod W. "Citizenship Goals for Canada: A Report on the Five Policy Objectives of the Citizenship Branch." Ottawa, 1972. (Mimeographed.)

- Bruce, Harry. "'The Branch,' Who Needs It?: A Short History of the Gathering Purposes of the Citizenship Branch, the Department of the Secretary of State, in the Government of Canada." Ottawa, 1972. (Mimeographed.)
- Burnet, Jean. "Myths and Multiculturalism." Paper presented at the Conference of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education, Saskatoon, Sask., 6 June 1979. (Mimeographed.)
- Canada. Department of the Secretary of State. Citizenship Branch. "Canadian Society--1967--Social Development: Report of the National Staff Training Conference." Ottawa, 1967. (Mimeographed.)
- Canada. Department of the Secretary of State. Citizenship Branch. Ethnic Participation Division. "Ethnic Press Reaction to the Publication of the Fourth Volume of the B and B Report." Ottawa, 16 July 1970. (Mimeographed.)
- Canada. Department of the Secretary of State. Citizenship Branch. Immigrant Participation Division. "Comments on the Thinkers' Conference on Cultural Rights." Ottawa, 1967. (Mimeographed.)
- Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. "CBC Language Policy." Ottawa, 7 February 1973. (Mimeographed.)
- Clement, Wallace, and Olsen, Dennis. "The Ethnic Composition of Canada's Elites." Report submitted to the Department of the Secretary of State, Ottawa, April 1974. (Mimeographed.)
- Dobbs, Kildare. "To Become What We Are: Discussion Paper on Citizenship." Ottawa, 1971. (Mimeographed.)
- Semotiuk, Andriy. "Multiculturalism: A Three-Dimensional Approach to Canada." Unpublished Manuscript. 1971. (Mimeographed.)
- Tarnopolsky, Walter. "Multiculturalism in a Bilingual Context and the Just Society." Paper presented at Confederation '78, Toronto, 29 June 1978. (Mimeographed.)
- Williams, Blair. "The Transformation of the Federal Cabinet Under P.E. Trudeau." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, Saskatoon, 30 May 1979. (Mimeographed.)
- Yuzyk, Paul. "Multiculturalism: A Historical Perspective." Remarks to the First Canadian Conference on Multiculturalism, Ottawa, 15 October 1973. (Mimeographed.)
- Zybalá, S. "Ethnic Participation Division." Ottawa, 25 June 1970. (Mimeographed.)

Other Sources Consulted

Extensive use was made of personal interviews with present and former employees of the Citizenship Branch, Department of the Secretary of State. Interviews were also conducted with several Members of Parliament who were associated with the multiculturalism policy, academics who were associated with the multiculturalism policy in various advisory capacities, senior federal civil servants associated with other junior ministers of state, and senior provincial civil servants who work in the area of multiculturalism.

All interviews were conducted on a not-for-attribution basis; individuals were asked to express their personal views rather than to speak on behalf of their organization. Attempts were made to verify all information gathered during interviews. The individuals for whom interview dates are given in the footnotes were asked specific questions in an interview situation; informal discussions were conducted with a number of other individuals. A key listing all individuals with whom interviews were conducted is available only with the permission of the author. Some confidential documents which are not included in the footnotes and are not listed in the bibliography provided background information which proved to be useful during the interviews.

Extensive use was made of the Official Report of Debates, House of Commons, and of clippings from a wide range of Canadian newspapers. Another source which proved to be useful was the archives of the Ukrainian Canadian Students' Union, which are now held by the Public Archives of Canada.

END

08 12 80

FIN