PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Votre file - Votre référence

Our file - Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform 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 an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme 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 qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

**THE SHIFTING OF ETHNIC BOUNDARIES:
Causes, factors and effects**

by

Gustave J. Goldmann, B.Sc.

A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

April 29, 1994

© copyright

1994, Gustave J. Goldmann

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

**THE AUTHOR HAS GRANTED AN
IRREVOCABLE NON-EXCLUSIVE
LICENCE ALLOWING THE NATIONAL
LIBRARY OF CANADA TO
REPRODUCE, LOAN, DISTRIBUTE OR
SELL COPIES OF HIS/HER THESIS BY
ANY MEANS AND IN ANY FORM OR
FORMAT, MAKING THIS THESIS
AVAILABLE TO INTERESTED
PERSONS.**

**L'AUTEUR A ACCORDE UNE LICENCE
IRREVOCABLE ET NON EXCLUSIVE
PERMETTANT A LA BIBLIOTHEQUE
NATIONALE DU CANADA DE
REPRODUIRE, PRETER, DISTRIBUER
OU VENDRE DES COPIES DE SA
THESE DE QUELQUE MANIERE ET
SOUS QUELQUE FORME QUE CE SOIT
POUR METTRE DES EXEMPLAIRES DE
CETTE THESE A LA DISPOSITION DES
PERSONNE INTERESSEES.**

**THE AUTHOR RETAINS OWNERSHIP
OF THE COPYRIGHT IN HIS/HER
THESIS. NEITHER THE THESIS NOR
SUBSTANTIAL EXTRACTS FROM IT
MAY BE PRINTED OR OTHERWISE
REPRODUCED WITHOUT HIS/HER
PERMISSION.**

**L'AUTEUR CONSERVE LA PROPRIETE
DU DROIT D'AUTEUR QUI PROTEGE
SA THESE. NI LA THESE NI DES
EXTRAITS SUBSTANTIELS DE CELLE-
CI NE DOIVENT ETRE IMPRIMES OU
AUTREMENT REPRODUITS SANS SON
AUTORISATION.**

ISBN 0-315-98500-3

Canada

Name GUSTAVE J. GOLDMAN

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

SOCIOLOGY, ETHNIC AND RACIAL STUDIES

SUBJECT TERM

0631

U-M-I

SUBJECT CODE

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

Architecture 0729
Art History 0377
Cinema 0900
Dance 0378
Fine Arts 0357
Information Science 0723
Journalism 0391
Library Science 0399
Mass Communications 0708
Music 0413
Speech Communication 0459
Theater 0465

EDUCATION

General 0515
Administration 0514
Adult and Continuing 0516
Agricultural 0517
Art 0273
Bilingual and Multicultural 0282
Business 0688
Community College 0275
Curriculum and Instruction 0727
Early Childhood 0518
Elementary 0524
Finance 0277
Guidance and Counseling 0519
Health 0680
Higher 0745
History of 0520
Home Economics 0278
Industrial 0521
Language and Literature 0279
Mathematics 0280
Music 0522
Philosophy of 0998
Physical 0523

Psychology 0525
Reading 0535
Religious 0527
Sciences 0714
Secondary 0533
Social Sciences 0534
Sociology of 0340
Special 0529
Teacher Training 0530
Technology 0710
Tests and Measurements 0288
Vocational 0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language 0679
General 0289
Ancient 0290
Linguistics 0291
Modern
Literature
General 0401
Classical 0294
Comparative 0295
Medieval 0297
Modern 0298
African 0316
American 0591
Asian 0305
Canadian (English) 0352
Canadian (French) 0355
English 0593
Germanic 0311
Latin American 0312
Middle Eastern 0315
Romance 0313
Slavic and East European 0314

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy 0422
Religion
General 0318
Biblical Studies 0321
Clergy 0319
History of 0320
Philosophy of 0322
Theology 0469

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies 0323
Anthropology
Archaeology 0324
Cultural 0326
Physical 0327
Business Administration
General 0310
Accounting 0272
Banking 0770
Management 0454
Marketing 0338
Canadian Studies 0385
Economics
General 0501
Agricultural 0503
Commerce-Business 0505
Finance 0508
History 0509
Labor 0510
Theory 0511
Folklore 0358
Geography 0366
Gerontology 0351
History
General 0578

Ancient 0579
Medieval 0581
Modern 0582
Black 0328
African 0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania 0332
Canadian 0334
European 0335
Latin American 0336
Middle Eastern 0333
United States 0337
History of Science 0585
Law 0398
Political Science
General 0615
International Law and Relations 0616
Public Administration 0617
Recreation 0814
Social Work 0452
Sociology
General 0626
Criminology and Penology 0627
Demography 0938
Ethnic and Racial Studies 0631
Individual and Family Studies 0628
Industrial and Labor Relations 0629
Public and Social Welfare 0630
Social Structure and Development 0700
Theory and Methods 0344
Transportation 0709
Urban and Regional Planning 0999
Women's Studies 0453

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture 0473
General 0285
Agronomy
Animal Culture and Nutrition 0475
Animal Pathology 0476
Food Science and Technology 0359
Forestry and Wildlife 0478
Plant Culture 0479
Plant Pathology 0480
Plant Physiology 0817
Range Management 0777
Wood Technology 0746

Biology
General 0306
Anatomy 0287
Biostatistics 0308
Botany 0309
Cell 0379
Ecology 0329
Entomology 0353
Genetics 0369
Limnology 0793
Microbiology 0410
Molecular 0307
Neuroscience 0317
Oceanography 0416
Physiology 0433
Radiation 0821
Veterinary Science 0778
Zoology 0422
Biophysics
General 0786
Medical 0760

EARTH SCIENCES

Biogeochemistry 0425
Geochemistry 0996

Geodesy 0370
Geology 0372
Geophysics 0373
Hydrology 0388
Mineralogy 0411
Paleobotany 0345
Paleoecology 0426
Paleontology 0418
Paleozoology 0985
Palynology 0427
Physical Geography 0368
Physical Oceanography 0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences 0768
Health Sciences
General 0566
Audiology 0300
Chemotherapy 0992
Dentistry 0567
Education 0350
Hospital Management 0769
Human Development 0758
Immunology 0982
Medicine and Surgery 0564
Mental Health 0347
Nursing 0569
Nutrition 0570
Obstetrics and Gynecology 0380
Occupational Health and Therapy 0354
Ophthalmology 0381
Pathology 0571
Pharmacology 0419
Pharmacy 0572
Physical Therapy 0382
Public Health 0573
Radiology 0574
Recreation 0575

Speech Pathology 0460
Toxicology 0383
Home Economics 0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences
Chemistry
General 0485
Agricultural 0749
Analytical 0486
Biochemistry 0487
Inorganic 0488
Nuclear 0738
Organic 0490
Pharmaceutical 0491
Physical 0494
Polymer 0495
Radiation 0754
Mathematics 0405
Physics
General 0605
Acoustics 0986
Astronomy and Astrophysics 0606
Atmospheric Science 0608
Atomic 0748
Electronics and Electricity 0607
Elementary Particles and High Energy 0798
Fluid and Plasma 0759
Molecular 0609
Nuclear 0610
Optics 0752
Radiation 0756
Solid State 0611
Statistics 0463
Applied Sciences
Applied Mechanics 0346
Computer Science 0984

Engineering
General 0537
Aerospace 0538
Agricultural 0539
Automotive 0540
Biomedical 0541
Chemical 0542
Civil 0543
Electronics and Electrical 0544
Heat and Thermodynamics 0348
Hydraulic 0545
Industrial 0546
Marine 0547
Materials Science 0794
Mechanical 0548
Metallurgy 0743
Mining 0551
Nuclear 0552
Packaging 0549
Petroleum 0765
Sanitary and Municipal System Science 0554
Geotechnology 0790
Operations Research 0428
Plastics Technology 0796
Textile Technology 0795
0994

PSYCHOLOGY

General 0621
Behavioral 0384
Clinical 0622
Developmental 0620
Experimental 0623
Industrial 0624
Personality 0625
Physiological 0989
Psychobiology 0349
Psychometrics 0632
Social 0451

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

**"THE SHIFTING OF ETHNIC BOUNDARIES:
Causes, factors and effects"**

submitted by Gustave J. Goldmann, B.Sc.

in partial fulfilment of the requirements for

the degree of Master of Arts

Thesis Supervisor

Chair, Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Carleton University
May 20, 1994

ABSTRACT

This thesis deals with ethnic classification in Canada, particularly how definitions change over time. An analysis of data from four successive censuses, beginning with 1971 and ending with 1991, for four ethnic groups (Jewish, Chinese, German and Ukrainian) shows that definitions change over time to a varying degree, depending on the characteristics that are considered to be central in determining membership in a particular group. The results show that characteristics such as language, as measured by mother tongue, tend to be relatively weak with respect to ethnic retention whereas phenotypical characteristics and religion tend to be somewhat stronger. The results also show that age and period of immigration are important factors in determining the degree and rate at which ethnic boundaries shift over time.

CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
2.	A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	8
2.1	How are ethnic boundaries defined?	13
2.2	Social closure and ethnic boundaries	19
2.3	A model for mapping ethnic boundaries	21
3.	A TOUR OF THE MOSAIC	23
3.1	The Chinese in Canada	24
3.2	The Germans in Canada	28
3.3	The Jews in Canada	34
3.4	The Ukrainians in Canada	39
4.	THE ANALYTICAL METHODOLOGY AND CONTEXT	43
4.1	The Methodology	43
4.2	The Census as a measurement vehicle for ethnic origin	46
4.3	The impact of national events	52
4.4	Immigration considerations	55
5.	MOSAIC OR KALEIDOSCOPE	59
5.1	Basic Counts	59
5.2	Controlling for Immigration	64
5.3	The religious dimension of boundaries	68
5.4	Mother tongue as an ethnic indicator	73
6.	INTERPRETATION OF THE RESULTS	76
6.1	Multiple Ethnic Origins - the redefinition of ethnic boundaries	76
6.2	Phenotype and Ethnic Boundaries	80
6.3	Language and ethnic boundaries	81
6.4	The impact of the measurement vehicle	81
6.5	Changing Boundaries	82
7.	CONCLUSION	85
	APPENDIX A: Data Tables	91
	APPENDIX B: Chronology of Census Methods	97
	APPENDIX C: Census Questions on Ethnic Origin	101
	REFERENCES	104

List of Tables

Table 3.1 German-speaking Origins by Selected Census Years	33
Table 4.1 Cohort definitions	44
Table 4.2 Survival Rates by Cohort	44
Table 4.3 Proportion of Multiple Responses (%) for Ethnic Origin	51
Table 4.4 Immigrant population by period of immigration - 1991 Census . . .	57
Table 5.1 Jewish cohorts by census year, controlling for immigration	64
Table 5.2 Chinese cohorts by census year, controlling for immigration . . .	64
Table 5.3 German cohorts by census year, controlling for immigration . . .	65
Table 5.4 Ukrainian cohorts by census year, controlling for immigration . .	65
Table 5.5 Proportion born in Canada (%)	66
Table 5.6 Mother Tongue by Ethnic Origin for the Chinese - 1991 Census .	73
Table 5.7 Mother Tongue by Ethnic Origin for the Germans - 1991 Census	74
Table 5.8 Mother Tongue by Ethnic Origin for the Ukrainians - 1991 Census	74
Table A.1 Jewish Population - Single Responses for 81, 86 & 91	91
Table A.2 Chinese Population - Single Responses for 86 & 91	91
Table A.3 German Population - Single Responses for 86 & 91	91
Table A.4 Ukrainian Population - Single Responses for 86 & 91	91
Table A.5 Jewish Population - Total Response	92
Table A.6 Chinese Population - Total Response	92
Table A.7 German Population - Total Response	92
Table A.8 Ukrainian Population - Total Response	92
Table A.9 Religion - Jewish Cohorts	93
Table A.10 Religion - Chinese Cohorts	94
Table A.11 Religion - German Cohorts	95
Table A.12 Religion - Ukrainian Cohorts	96

List of Figures

Figure 2.1 Taxonomy of characteristics	8
Figure 2.2 A model for ethnic boundaries	21
Figure 3.1 Characteristics of selected ethnic groups	24
Figure 4.1 Distribution by cohort by census, Jewish total response	47
Figure 4.2 Distribution by cohort by census, Chinese total response	48
Figure 4.3 Distribution by cohort by census, German total response	49
Figure 4.4 Distribution by cohort by census, Ukrainian total response	49
Figure 4.5 Responses of "Canadian" to ethnic origin	54
Figure 4.6 Immigrants by place of birth - 1941 Census	55
Figure 4.7 Immigrants by place of birth - 1971 Census	56
Figure 4.8 Immigrants by place of birth - 1991 Census	56
Figure 5.1 Jewish population by cohort	60
Figure 5.2 Chinese population by cohort	60
Figure 5.3 German population by cohort	61
Figure 5.4 Ukrainian population by cohort	61
Figure 5.5 Jewish cohorts	68
Figure 5.6 Chinese cohorts	68
Figure 5.7 German cohorts	69
Figure 5.8 Ukrainian cohorts	69

1. INTRODUCTION

Canadian society, having grown through successive waves of immigration, is unarguably multi-ethnic and multi-cultural (Pryor et al 1992, 217). In fact, very few uni-ethnic states exist in the industrialized world today. One need only consider the number and severity of the inter-ethnic conflicts that the world has witnessed in the last 50 to 60 years to appreciate the sensitivity and impact of relations between ethnic groups. This is why the classification of people by ethnic categories has been, and continues to be, the focus of significant attention in the social science research community, among ethnic groups, in government departments and agencies and in para-public organizations. This is also why special attention must be paid to the definition of the boundaries, as a social construct, between ethnic groups and the dynamics that influence how they shift over time and in changing circumstances.

Evidence exists to show that the social construction of ethnic boundaries has a significant impact on how Canadian society functions and on the interactions between ethnic groups. For instance, the Employment Equity Program defines four sets of boundaries based, in turn, on gender, on phenotype (racial origins), on physical attributes (degree of activity limitation) and on Aboriginal status. The set defined by phenotype is an example of a state-constructed ethnic boundary that distinguishes between groups in society based on their reported identification with the subset of the population described by the term "visible minority". At a more local level, immigrant aid groups define their target populations on the basis

of country of origin, or in some cases on region of origin (e.g. Tamil refugee groups).

It is also clear that ethnicity is often used as a means for classifying the population in reports and studies in which particular aspects of society are discussed. The authors generally present socio-economic and demographic characteristics cross-classified with ethnic origin and then draw comparisons about the relative social and economic mobility of the various groups. One of the objectives of these studies is to highlight inequities of opportunity so that public policy may be introduced to correct for these imbalances. These studies also serve to help ethnic communities to situate themselves socially, economically and geographically with respect to other groups in Canada. This helps them to plan for their continued growth and prosperity as well as lending some support to representations they may make to public organizations. (For particular examples see Alba 1990; Brym et al 1993; Darroch 1985; Driedger and Chappell 1987; Goldscheider 1993; Goldstein 1985; Kalbach and Richard 1990; Krotki and Odynak 1990; Lieberman and Waters 1988; Troper and Weinfeld 1993.)

Although many of these texts focus on the comparative well-being of ethnic groups at a particular point in time, very few address the fluidity of the definitions of the groups in a quantitative manner. Furthermore, although the authors recognize ethnicity as a social construct, most accept the definition of the boundaries as given, and in many cases as static. This may leave the readers of these texts without fundamental information about the context for the comparisons

and about the sensitivity of these definitions to changing socio-economic and political influences over time. When they draw comparative analyses between groups, do they also discuss the factors which influence how the groups are formed and defined such as whether the boundary is imposed or self-determined? How do they deal with the emergence of multi-ethnicities, most of which are the result of exogamous unions between members of different ethnic groups? Given that many of these texts deal with issues such as the impact of membership to a particular ethnic group on economic and social mobility, how ethnicity is defined, how membership in a group is established and how one group is delineated from the others are critical questions which serve to set the context for the discussion. Since no consensus exists for the definition of ethnicity (Butz and Goldmann 1993) and since history has shown that the boundaries which define ethnic groups are continually shifting, this leaves the data and findings subject to misinterpretation and, in the more extreme case, misuse. What is clear is that ethnicity is important not only as a measure of sub-groups of a given population but also when used in association with political, economic and social factors.

By showing that the boundaries around an ethnic group change over time and that the factors which influence this construction differ, depending on the criteria that are central in the definition of a given ethnic group, I intend to set the temporal context that has been previously omitted. Historic and contemporary times contain numerous examples of the impact of changing socio-economic conditions on the social construction of ethnic boundaries. However, most of the

texts focus on the situations in Europe, in Africa, in Asia and, to a limited extent, in the United States. (For examples see Jasso and Rosenzweig 1990; Alba 1990; Alonso and Starr 1983; Lieberman and Waters 1988.) Very few consider the unique set of conditions that exist in Canadian society. Our multilingual and multicultural characteristics, as well as the strong influence of Canada's indigenous population, render the Canadian example different from the others. As Pryor et al observed

"Constitutionally, Canada is unambiguously a multicultural society, including an important native or aboriginal peoples component" (Pryor et al. 1991, 173).

Changes in the size and definition of ethnic groups occur as a result of demographic events such as migration and marriage, and as a result of socio-economic and political events. In this study I show that by using census data to trace the size of an ethnic group over time one can estimate the extent of change in the definition of the boundaries between groups. Furthermore, I examine the effect that factors such as descent paradigms, social characteristics and physical characteristics have on the boundaries between groups. It must be noted that the census questions on ethnic origin have not remained constant over time. For instance, in 1971 the question asked "To what ethnic or cultural group did you or your ancestor (on the male side) belong on coming to this continent?". The emphasis was on patrilineal origins and on single ancestry. In 1981 the wording changed rather dramatically. The question asked "To which ethnic or cultural group did you or your ancestors belong on first coming to this continent?". The

focus on patrilineal origins was dropped and by using the plural of ancestors it was suggested that multiple origins were acceptable. The text of the questions for 1986 was "To which ethnic or cultural group(s) do you or did your ancestors belong?". In 1991 only minor changes were introduced, replacing the phrase "... do you or did your ..." with "... did this person's ...". The full text and format of the questions are shown in Appendix C. Although the questions have changed over time, I argue that since they reflect the changes in Canadian society over the same period these modifications have had little impact on how people interpret the intent of the collection vehicle. On the other hand, I suspect that the analysis will show that demographic events such as immigration/emigration and marriage (specifically exogamy) have a significant impact on the categories respondents will use to report their origins. In fact, the evolution of the text of the survey vehicle provides a unique opportunity to examine the changes in the definition of ethnic boundaries.

In Chapter 2, I list some of the characteristics that I propose to use to define ethnic groups. I also briefly discuss their relative strengths and weaknesses with respect to the stability of definitions based on some combination of these characteristics. In describing the immigration histories of the four ethnic groups being studied (see Chapter 3) I allude to the fact that ethnic boundaries change over time. An analysis of the response patterns to the question on ethnic origin in the respective censuses from 1971 to 1991 will confirm that ethnic boundaries have changed. However, are all group boundaries affected in the same way or

does the nature of the defining characteristic(s) affect the boundaries in different ways? For instance, are the boundaries around groups defined by racial characteristics, such as the Chinese, less volatile to change than those that define a group based predominantly on linguistic characteristics, such as the Germans? I suspect that this is true. The central hypothesis I propose is that boundaries defined by relatively stable characteristics such as phenotype are less susceptible to change over time than those defined by more volatile characteristics such as mother tongue. The analysis will show that with the passage of time it becomes more difficult to use mother tongue as a predictor of ethnic origin. It will also show that physical characteristics, whether ascribed or voluntary, tend to be more stable. Consequently, boundaries around groups defined by these characteristics do not change as dramatically over time. It would be wrong for me to suggest that this is a simple binary problem. In fact, the issue is substantially more complex. The stability of the characteristics over time lies on a continuum ranging from very stable to extremely volatile. The manner in which the characteristics interrelate to define the boundaries around an ethnic group is also complex (Blau 1984, 110). The incidence of reported multiple responses to ethnic origin in the census, as well as changes in the respective sizes of the groups as reported in the census, will be taken as indicators of changes in ethnic boundaries.

A secondary question is whether factors such as age and period of immigration influence how ethnicity is reported and hence contribute to the definitions of the boundaries between ethnic groups. For instance, do older

members of an ethnic group define their boundaries consistently over time? Similarly, do recent immigrants tend to relate more closely to their ancestral roots rather than a perceived or desired identity? Once again, I suggest that the answer to both questions is yes! By tracing the responses for four ethnic groups over time I propose to show that fewer multiple ethnic origins are reported for the older cohorts and for those who have more recently immigrated to Canada. I interpret this as an indicator of stability of the ethnic boundaries.

I begin with a discussion of the theoretical framework on which I propose to base the definitions of ethnic groups and boundaries. This includes a presentation of a proposed model for the definition of ethnicity which takes into account most of the elements that factor into the delineation of the boundaries between ethnic groups. A brief description of the characteristics of the four target communities, Jewish, Chinese, German and Ukrainian, which make them ideal subjects for this analysis, such as their development in Canada and how they define descent, precedes the presentation of the empirical evidence from the 1971 through 1991 Censuses. This is followed by a discussion of the factors which may contribute to the changes in boundaries for these groups and some speculation of how these factors may also affect all other ethnic communities in Canada. I conclude with some general observations about the evolution of ethnic boundaries and I present a possible research agenda for future work in this field.

2. A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Texts dealing with ethnic groups use a variety of terms to describe and to classify the socio-cultural characteristics that distinguish people from one another. One does not have to venture very far into the current literature to see the use of terms such as ethnic group, ethnic origin, ethnicity, identity, ancestry and race. Since these labels are used throughout this thesis, I propose the following definitions to ensure a common understanding of their meaning and of their significance in this context.

The characteristics can be either individual or collective in nature. The following figure graphically represents a taxonomy of ethnic terms and definitions.

Figure 2.1 Taxonomy of characteristics

Let me begin by defining those labels that I consider to be based on objective criteria. **Ancestry**, also referred to as **ethnic origin** in some contexts, refers to an individual's heraldic roots. In most instances people have some

knowledge of their ancestral origins, although the degree and completeness of the picture may vary with time and with the migratory pattern of the group. Nevertheless, if one limits the horizon to a relevant point in history (depending on the application), most people can describe their ancestry with reasonable precision. Although the next label in the series, **race**, is considered by some to be a social construction, I still classify it as objective since it is defined by physical characteristics such as skin colour and facial features. I agree with Michael Banton when he suggests that the word "race" is commonly used to identify an individual's lineage. Banton attributes race's longevity as a classifying characteristic to its continued prominence in popular thought and culture (Banton 1987, 95-96). Terms such as phenotype and racial origins are also used to describe this characteristic. From a sociological standpoint, membership in groups defined by racial characteristics is ascribed to an individual by society (Banton 1987, 127). Therefore, it is relatively certain that an individual is able to correctly and accurately describe his or her race according to the dominant ideology of the day. Naturally, in societies where a great deal of intermarriage occurs between people of different races, the description becomes somewhat more problematic and complex over time. If the process of exogamy continues and increases, the boundaries that define the group become blurred and other factors such as language or religion may become more significant in describing membership.

In defining **Ethnic group**, Calvin Goldscheider characterises it as a collective social construction (Goldscheider 1993, 392). Wsevolod Isajiw takes this one step further by offering the following specific definition

".... community-type group of people who share the same culture or to descendants of such people who may not share this culture but who identify themselves with this ancestral group." (Isajiw 1993, 410)

Ringer and Lawless propose a similar construct for ethnic group. They suggest that community (or kinship), history (or ancestry) and cultural distinctiveness are essential characteristics of an ethnic group (Ringer and Lawless 1989, 3-9). If one does not limit these definitions by suggesting that membership to an ethnic group is ascriptive rather than a voluntary choice, as Ringer and Lawless do, then I believe that it is possible to characterize tension between the objective and subjective dimensions of the collective concept. It can be argued that since these definitions are based on two separate concepts, identity which is subjective, and ancestry which is objective, the resulting definition is difficult to apply. For example, Jews who lived in Austria for many generations identified themselves as Austrians before 1935. However, following the annexation of Austria into the German Reich, many of the survivors of that period report their ethnic group as Jewish rather than Austrian. This is an indication of a conflict between identity and ancestry.

A community, in a sociological sense, refers to a social group defined and delineated by specific characteristics. It is often the case that a community incorporates a basic social infrastructure within which the relationships between the

members are defined. An **ethnic community** is defined by the collective ethnocultural characteristics of its members. The concept of boundaries is significant in the discussion of communities since it serves to delineate the social membership (Jary and Jary 1991, 99).

Ethnic identity is a purely subjective indicator of an individual's feelings, allegiance or association with a particular ethnic group. An individual's identity can and will change over time and in different contexts. Identity can be determined either by how an individual locates himself or herself with respect to the socio-cultural systems in which he or she lives or by how the individual feels he or she is perceived by others in society (Isajiw 1993, 410).

Ethnicity is also an individually based social construct with identity as one of the major elements (Goldscheider 1993, 392 and Meintel 1992, 73). Therefore, it has a subjective dimension and, as such, it is a characteristic which is susceptible to change over time. It must be noted that some authors do not distinguish between ethnicity and ethnic identity. For example, Charles Hirshman used the terms interchangeably in presenting a proposal on how to measure ethnicity in a census (Hirshman 1993, 548). However, ethnicity also has an objective dimension, ancestry. According to Pierre van den Berghe, ethnicity and race should be discussed in the context of kinship (van den Berghe 1985, 19). In fact, it is difficult to conceive of a case where ancestry does not, to some degree, flavour an individual's perception of his or her ethnicity. Edward Herberg's

characterization of ethnicity bridges both the objective and subjective dimensions by stating that

".... similarities to each other in ancestry, values, norms, and cultural practice are essential components of ethnicity." (Herberg 1989, 6)

In order to discuss changes in ethnic boundaries I believe it is necessary to first establish the criteria by which they are defined. For the purposes of this study I propose to use the following characteristics, or according to Herberg, ethnic symbols, to describe ethnicity and hence to define the boundaries around an ethnic group: ancestry, race, religion, geographic (or geo-political) boundaries, language and culture. Some of these symbols are actually measured in the Census. Others are imputed from Census data even though no objective measure exists. The distinction will be made clear during the discussion of the empirical results.

Frederik Barth (1969) developed a definition of ethnicity which focused on the boundaries between groups. A particular group is defined by its boundaries in relation to other groups at a given point in time. This suggests that ethnic boundaries are relative constructions which are subject to change as the ethnic composition of the host environment changes. It can also be stated that ethnic boundaries are a social construction since they are determined by the social, economic and political interactions between groups at a particular point in time. The fluid nature of these boundaries is influenced greatly by an individual's perception or understanding of his or her ancestry (Alba 1990) and by the length of time someone is removed from their ancestral roots. As Goldscheider observes

"As generations exposed to places of destination increase, the impact of places of origin recedes in memory and diminishes in effect on the life of the group." (Goldscheider 1993, 397)

The current situation in the world confirms that most states are pluralistic. In fact, as Ronald Cohen observed at an international conference on the measurement of ethnicity, the uni-ethnic state is extremely rare (Cohen 1993, 367). This means that most states are ethnic mosaics with the shape and boundaries between the tiles defined by the characteristics referred to above. In addition to historical effects, political events and economic conditions also have some bearing on how people view their ancestry. The rise of nationalist sentiments around the world is rekindling fundamentalist expressions of ancestry which, in turn, are reinforcing, redefining or re-establishing ethnic boundaries. Recent events such as the re-emergence of the former republics of the Soviet Union as independent states, the current ethnic strife in what was Yugoslavia and the separation of Czechoslovakia into two independent republics attest to the geopolitical significance of ethnic boundaries. Furthermore, the rise of nationalist sentiments in France, Germany, Austria and, to some extent, Canada also illustrate this point.

2.1 How are ethnic boundaries defined?

The degree to which characteristics such as ancestry, identity, race, religion, language, to list a few, may be used to describe ethnicity and hence to define ethnic groups varies with time and socio-political context. For example, for some groups, such as the Japanese, Chinese and East Indians¹, race, religion and

mother tongue may be used to define the group whereas for the Jewish population ethnic origin and religion are sufficient to define membership in the group.

The shifting of the boundaries between ethnic groups may be influenced by the socio-economic conditions at a given point in time such as a recession or by demographic events such as immigration and marriage between partners of different ethnicities. In fact, increased intermarriage can, in some instances, cause the boundaries to blur significantly. Boundaries may also be formed as a result of the social or economic mobility of a subgroup of the community. For instance, a documentary on the Afro-American population in Washington highlighted the fact that as members of that community gained upward social and economic mobility, generally through higher education and better employment opportunities, they became alienated from the community in which they grew up. In some cases, they married partners from other races. This new group has been labelled the "white blacks" by those who remained in the traditional neighbourhoods and they are considered ethnically different from their racial peers in the same way as African blacks are considered distinct from South American blacks.

The data show that the size of ethnic groups, as measured by the census of population, varies over time. Although the census questions are designed to measure ancestry or ethnic origin, the emergence of new ethnic categories, as manifested through the increase in multiple responses in the 1986 and 1991 Censuses, and the growth in the number of respondents reporting Canadian origin suggest that the data may actually represent ethnicity. Changes over time, which

can be interpreted to be changes in ethnic boundaries, are attributed to the effect of one or more of the following factors:

- demographic changes in the population, such as natural population increase and decrease, migration and shifting marital patterns;
- changes in how the measurement was made, such as different question wording and survey methodology; and
- changes in respondent attitudes and/or perceptions towards their origins.

A careful examination of Census data reported for selected groups in 1971, 1981, 1986 and 1991 will shed some light on the impact of these factors and on the extent of the differences. For instance, by controlling for demographic effects and by addressing differences in the measurement vehicle in the analysis, I will be able to infer how respondents' attitudes and perceptions changed over time. I will also be able to infer how the boundaries were perceived by the respondents.

A key element in the discussion of the impact of particular ideologies on respondents, as expressed through the collection vehicle, is how descent is determined for different groups. Ancestral lineage is attributed in one of three ways. It can be traced through the maternal line (matrilineal descent), the paternal line (patrilineal descent) or without specific guidelines (ambilineal descent). It is known that for some ethnic groups patrilineal descent is the determinant or ancestry, whereas others believe that it is based on the mother's ethnic origin and culture. State programs and policies have, at various points in time, reflected one or the other of these paradigms. Up to and including the 1971 Census, patrilineal descent was imposed on the respondents by asking them to trace their ancestry

"on the male side" (see Appendix C). In 1981 the emphasis for defining lineage in the Census in Canada shifted from patrilineal to ambilineal through the removal of this instruction. This allowed respondents to report their origins in a manner which was most meaningful in their particular case.

Since for most ethnic groups the rules of descent are constant over time, it will also be possible to infer from this analysis whether the collection vehicle ascribes boundaries to respondents. It is reasonable to assume that growth or reduction in the size of a group over this period which cannot be explained by other factors such as changes in immigration/emigration patterns and changes in response patterns, such as increases in the reporting of multiple ethnicities and in the reporting of Canadian origins, must be attributable to the changes in processing and collection methodology, including how descent is defined and attributed.

The following point highlights the importance of the definition and perception of descent on determining the boundaries between ethnic groups. In a country such as Canada, with our low birth rates², immigration becomes a major factor of population growth. As immigration increases and as the number and variety of countries of origin increases, the number and size of ethnic groups will also increase. In the Canadian multicultural context it is logical to assume that this translates into increased contact between ethnic groups since few ethnic enclaves exist. Also, as birth rates decline, the number of eligible marriage partners from within an ethnic group decreases. According to Peter Blau the permeability of the

boundaries is a function of the relative strength (or weakness) of the characteristics that are primary in defining the group (Blau 1984, 83). In the analysis which follows I show that language is a relatively weak characteristics and that age, phenotype and place of birth are relatively strong. Therefore, the combined effect of permeable boundaries, increased immigration and lower birth rates increases the likelihood of intermarriage (exogamy) between partners of different ethnic groups. A 1978 study of ethnic groups in Rhode Island showed that a tendency exists for intermarriage between members of different ethnic groups and that ethnic homogamy becomes less important (Kobrin 1978, 227-228). In fact, recent studies of the Jewish communities in Canada and the United States confirm an increase in patterns of intermarriage. The rate was 28% in the United States in 1990 (CJF 1990, 13) and almost 14% in Canada in 1991 (Torczyner et al 1993, 66). Given this trend, how is the ethnicity of the off-spring of exogamous unions reported? If the parents observe a matrilineal tradition, one would expect that the children would "inherit" their mother's ethnic origin whereas in families who adhere to the patrilineal paradigm the father's origin will be ascribed to the children. However, as the following excerpt from an article by Pryor et al suggests, respondents appear to view descent from an ambilineal perspective.

"In 1981 11 per cent of Canadians said their ethnic background included more than one ethnic group. In 1986, when respondents were instructed to mark or specify as many response categories as applicable, 28 per cent reported two or more ethnic groups as part of their background. The ethnicity concept in Canada has gradually evolved from being considered only paternal, singular, and referring

to origins only outside of North America to the point in the late 1980s where it is recognized that ancestry is to be derived from both the paternal and maternal sides, ..." (Pryor et al 1992, 220)

The data will confirm the fact that the off-spring of exogamous unions are increasingly being raised in multi-cultural households where a blending of traditions and customs occurs. These examples demonstrate that ethnic group, as opposed to ethnic origin, more accurately reflects the changing dynamics of inter-group social interactions since it incorporates both the subjective and objective dimensions. In the extreme case where one of the cultures is particularly strong and dominant, the result may be the total elimination of the subordinate culture in the household. This is a major concern for the Jewish, German and Ukrainian communities in Canada (less so for the Chinese community) since all three are experiencing relatively little growth and all have high proportions of their populations born in Canada³.

Another important aspect of the boundaries between ethnic groups is whether the definition is designed to be restrictive or all inclusive. The definition of visible minorities is an example of a current state imposed collective definition of ethnic groups. To paraphrase the legal text of the federal Employment Equity Act, people are considered to be visible minorities if they are non-aboriginal, non-Caucasian in race and non-white in colour. The boundaries in this instance are extremely broad and, some might argue, rather vague. Membership in the Jewish community is an illustration of a more restrictive definition of boundaries. According to the Council of Jewish Federations, a Jew is someone who is either

Jewish by religion or who professes no religion and is Jewish by ethnic origin. The definition of who is a Jew also serves as an example of how the boundaries can change depending on the context and ideology. For instance, according to biblical interpretations, a Jew is someone who is born of a Jewish mother or who converts to Judaism through the full ritual process whereas according to the authorities in the reform movement ambilineal descent is perfectly acceptable to define membership in the group.

2.2 Social closure and ethnic boundaries

The Weberian concept of social closure embodies a process by which social groups restrict access to resources and opportunities on the basis of social and/or physical attributes (Parkin 1979, 44). This concept links the definition of social groups and, by implication, their boundaries to access to and share of power in all its dimensions (social, political and economic). The apartheid system of South Africa and the caste structure in India are prime examples of closure based on racial grounds in the first instance and social structure in the second. Frank Parkin takes this argument one step further by classifying closure as either exclusionary (i.e. downward directed in a hierarchical sense) or usurpary (upward directed) (Parkin 1979, 48). Both Weber and Parkin stress hierarchical motivation for defining closure.

Economic and political arguments based on the concept of social closure are often used to explain the relationship between ethnic groups. They are also

used to explain events such as rises in inter-ethnic tensions and voluntary and involuntary migration patterns. The link between the definition of boundaries and access to resources and opportunities is clearly illustrated in the following statement.

"The term 'multicultural mosaic' not only refers to the diverse ethno-cultural character of Canada's population but also to the differential access of such groups to popularly assumed resources and entitlements such as health, family, education, jobs and economic security. Far from being the domain of academics, documentation and analysis of ethno-culturally based inequalities often are essential for the delivery of social services and for the development of government programs targeted at specific ethno-cultural groups." (Boyd 1990, 2)

In introducing this study, I suggested that the socio-political context needs to be considered when discussing ethnic boundaries. I believe that this extends to the consideration of the impact of non-economic barriers in limiting access to opportunity and participation in certain parts of the economic structure. Porter (1965), Neuwirth (1969), Parkin (1979) and Clement (1985) all cite examples of how access was limited on the grounds of cultural or racial characteristics. Hence, attributed boundaries served to define social closure.

This dimension of boundaries will not be dealt with in this study for two fundamental reasons. First, the topic is so vast and so complex that it merits greater attention than can be devoted to it in this analysis. Second, cost considerations for this study limited the range and detail of the cross-tabulations that were generated to support the analysis. Nevertheless, I feel that the topic deserves to be mentioned, albeit in this cursory manner.

2.3 A model for mapping ethnic boundaries

What is clear from the preceding discussion is that the definition of ethnic boundaries is sensitive to motivation, time, interpretation, changing socio-economic conditions and changing political conditions. The following figure graphically presents a proposed model for mapping ethnic boundaries.

Figure 2.2 A model for ethnic boundaries

The central elements - religion, phenotype, language and geography - represent the basic characteristics that I intend to use to define the boundaries around an ethnic group. Objective measures can be found for all four in census data. For instance, all decennial censuses include a question on the religion of the respondent. Mother tongue can be used as an indicator of an ethnic language. Phenotype may be derived, in part, from the responses to the question on ethnic origin and geography, as an ethnic indicator, can be imputed from place of birth

data. Culture, although not shown as a central element in this model, is nevertheless significant in defining ethnic boundaries. It is a subjective characteristic that is dependent on the three forces indicated by the arrows to the upper right of the model; ideology, time and space.

In Section 3 I show that most ethnic groups are defined by some combination of these elements. For instance, the German group is defined primarily on the basis of language whereas the Chinese group is defined primarily on the basis of phenotype. The Ukrainians are defined on language, religion and, to some extent, geography. The definition of the Jewish group is somewhat more complex. It can be based on religion, ancestry or some combination of the two. For instance, in the narrow definition presented earlier, the Jewish population can be defined solely on the basis of religion as those who were either born of a Jewish mother or who converted to Judaism through recognized ritual practices. In this study I choose to use a broader definition of the Jewish group. I define membership solely on the basis of ethnic origin data. Religion serves as an explanatory variable.

In the subsequent sections of this study I will show how the elements interact to define the groups at a particular instance in time and how the nature of the interaction changes over time.

3. A TOUR OF THE MOSAIC

Canadian society has grown through successive waves of migration from different sources at different points in time. The result of this pattern of population growth has been referred to in various texts as the Canadian mosaic. The shape and size of the tiles as well as the mosaic pattern vary with time. This becomes evident in the subsequent discussion of the immigration history of each of the four ethnic groups being studied. The factors which affect these boundaries are presented in the context of the model described in Figure 2.2.

Based on an examination of the historical record, it is clear that ethnic boundaries change over time. However, as stated in the hypothesis (see Section 1), do the factors that influence the change apply equally to all ethnic groups? Also, are the changes uniform across all groups and across all ages, regardless of place of birth?

I propose to answer these questions by examining the changes, or lack thereof, in the boundaries of a sample of ethnic groups that satisfy the following criteria.

- i) They must be defined by one or more of the characteristics presented in the model in Figure 2.2.
- ii) The period of immigration must cover the full spectrum of immigrants, from the most recent to the older longer-established groups.
- iii) Since the study depends on data from the Census, the subjects must include groups with sufficient representation in the Census to ensure reliability of results.

The four groups selected to be in the sample are the Chinese, the Germans, the Jews and the Ukrainians. As can be seen in Figure 3.1, individually they include only some of the elements that are deemed to define ethnic boundaries. However, all four groups together cover the full range of characteristics described in this matrix. The data in subsequent sections will show that the groups are substantial in size. Furthermore, the description of their immigration histories will show that they represent both recent and long-standing immigrants.

	Chinese	German	Ukrainian	Jewish
Descent	Patrilineal	Patrilineal	Patrilineal	Matrilineal ⁴
Language		X	X	
Culture	X			X
Religion			X	X
Geography		X	X	
Phenotype	X			

Figure 3.1 Characteristics of selected ethnic groups

The following sections discuss each group in turn, giving a brief overview of their immigration history and highlighting some of the factors which are germane to the questions being considered.

3.1 The Chinese in Canada

Some of the events which led to Chinese emigration are very complex and require an extensive historical study of the political, economic and social systems and structures in China from the moment of contact with the Europeans. This is

beyond the scope of this paper. However, the subset of the events that contributed to Chinese immigration to Canada and to their behaviour once in Canada are dealt with in this section.

Chinese immigration in Canada is marked by three distinct periods rather than successive waves as with the German, Jewish and Ukrainian groups. The first, during the years up to 1923, was triggered by the development of the gold fields in British Columbia between 1855 and 1865. Chinese society was very patriarchal in nature. Men had the obligation to support their families, both nuclear and extended (parents and grandparents). Women had the obligation to support their husbands and to perform the household chores, sometimes with the assistance of other females in the household. The dramatic growth of the population in China during the eighteenth century coupled with a downturn in the Chinese economy forced some to seek employment and sources of wealth outside of their home country. Therefore, the economic boom experienced in western North America with the discovery of gold made this a preferred destination for Chinese immigration. The men were able to earn money, either as prospectors, as suppliers of provisions or as labour contractors. Their earnings were sent back to China to support their families (Tan and Roy 1985, 3-6). This situation is noteworthy for two reasons. First, early Chinese immigration to Canada was male dominated. Second, the Chinese men considered Canada to be a temporary place of residence and work. Many had the intention of returning to their homeland and to their families once they had achieved their economic goals in Canada.

Once the gold fields were no longer productive, the Chinese sought out other sources of employment such as domestic service, labouring in the coal mines and seasonal work in the fishing and lumber industries. They also found employment as labourers helping to build the Canadian Pacific Railway. Two characteristics endeared the Chinese to prospective employers; they were inexpensive and they were reliable. However, the predominantly white population of western Canada considered the Chinese immigrants to be a threat primarily because of these two characteristics. This was further compounded by the perception that the Chinese workers were not able to assimilate and that they were a drain on the Canadian economy, an observation which was founded in part on the Chinese practice of sending money to China to support their families (Tan and Roy 1985, 7).

This situation led to the second period in the development of the Chinese community in Canada. It is marked by the institution of a series of measures aimed at restricting their immigration to Canada and at controlling the population already resident. These included the incorporation of a progressive head tax on Chinese immigrants, preventing family reunification and, eventually, their disenfranchisement. Each of these actions and their effect on the Chinese population in Canada are described in a number of texts (for examples see Li 1988, Elliott 1990, Tan and Roy 1985). Given the nature of the restrictions and controls, it is not difficult to imagine the demographic impact this had on the

Chinese community in Canada. Its growth was severely curtailed and those resident in Canada were, at best, marginalized by the rest of Canadian society.

The next significant period in the history of Chinese immigration to Canada begins after World War II, once the restrictions imposed between 1923 and 1947 were relaxed. Changes in Canadian immigration policy with respect to the Chinese and Canada's reaction to the formation of the People's Republic of China in 1949 made it possible for Chinese Canadians to begin the process of family reunification in Canada. Gradually, in the era leading to the early 1970s, restrictions and the consideration of the Chinese as a special case in immigration policy in Canada were removed (Tan and Roy 1985, 16). This led to a succession of waves of Chinese immigrants, first from the mainland and Hong Kong followed by a flow of Chinese refugees from the conflicts in South East Asia (Li 1988, 91). This pattern of growth is very noticeable in the data shown in Chapter 6.

The west to east orientation of Chinese immigration to Canada is another noteworthy aspect of the development of this group. Initially, they entered Canada primarily through British Columbia and the western United States, unlike the other three groups considered in this study. Therefore, their migration pattern in Canada was contrary to that of the Germans, the Jews and the Ukrainians. Given that the development of Canadian society during the middle to late 19th century was based largely on agricultural production, their ready presence in western Canada would place them in a favourable position to fulfil this role. However, although the Chinese labourers were considered suitable to help build the railroad as transient

cheap labour, they were not "acceptable as agriculturalists" (Elliott 1990, 54). The Eurocentric attitudes towards racial groups other than those of Northern European origins supported the dominant view that immigrants of European origins were the best suited for that role.

It has already been noted that family life for the Chinese in Canada began after 1945, once they were allowed to reunify with their spouses (Li 1988, 56). However, this did not prevent them from developing into a community. Cultural and racial differences between the Chinese and the dominant culture forced them to develop strong organizations, many of which are still in existence today (Reitz 1980, 86). Almost every major city in Canada has a well defined and well-organized Chinese neighbourhood. This serves both to strengthen their position as one of the "multiple cultures" in Canada as well as to protect them economically and socially. They also appear to place a great deal of importance on the education of their young people. This may be a reaction to past prejudices or to the recognition that education is an essential element of success in Canadian society for those who are visibly different.

3.2 The Germans in Canada

As with most non-British and non-French immigrants to Canada, Germans migrated in a series of waves as a result of economic, political and religious events in Europe. Germany did not exist as a political entity until 1871 when the king of Prussia became the emperor (kaiser) of Germany. Therefore, the term "Germans"

referred initially to a category of people defined by a common language. It must be noted that German was the mother tongue for people from other parts of Europe such as the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the Swiss Confederation. This illustrates one of the difficulties in using only language to define an ethnic group.

The first wave of German migration to Canada began in the mid-eighteenth century. It was largely composed of experienced farmers fleeing the religious and economic turmoil in Europe. However, it also included a significant number of Mennonite, Amish, Dunkers and Quakers migrating from the United States. They were collectively labelled the "Pennsylvania Deutsch" regardless of their point of origin (McLaughlin 1985, 4). German presence in Canada grew considerably to the point where 202,991 people of "German" origin were present at the time of the 1871 Census (Census of Canada 1870-71).

German ethnic settlements in Canada were established primarily in Nova Scotia and in Ontario. Lunenburg and Liverpool, in Nova Scotia, were among the first German communities in Canada during the early stages of this first wave of immigration. However, the relative isolation of these communities from subsequent influx of migrants resulted in a lack of new German-speaking people to refresh and reinforce the ethnic community. This marked the beginning of the blurring of ethnic boundaries for the German community. The process of assimilation became evident through the anglicizing of German names, the adopting of the English language and the general melding of the German culture into the neighbouring English culture (McLaughlin 1985, 6).

During the later stages of this first wave many people of German origin settled in Waterloo, Grey, Bruce and Perth counties in Ontario. It was not unusual to see names of communities such as Berlin, Baden, Petersburg, New Hamburg and Breslau. Again, these were primarily agricultural communities and as long as there was a continued influx of German-speaking immigrants to these areas, the German culture continued to flourish. However, as the number of immigrants began to wane, a process similar to that experienced in Nova Scotia occurred. With the exception of those whose religious principles dictated otherwise, such as the Amish and Mennonite settlements, a process of cultural assimilation took place. In his profile of the Germans in Canada, McLaughlin attributes the process of the shifting of the ethnic boundaries for the German community primarily to the decline in immigration.

"The waning of German immigration to Ontario, however, resulted in the creation of a community that contained many who were still German-speaking, but who had never known Germany. Daily newspapers in the English language came to take place of the German Weeklies and the German language in the schools gradually declined." (McLaughlin 1985, 9)

This statement highlights the importance of the German language as a factor in defining and preserving German ethnicity.

The second wave of German immigration occurred during the period leading up to World War I. Given Canada's policy of settling Manitoba and the western lands, agriculture became a primary concern in finding suitable settlers. The fact that Germans were deemed to be ideal pioneers and agriculturalists, based on

their previous experiences in North America, enhanced their desirability as immigrants to Canada. Their close racial relationship to the British monarchy was also a contributing factor in influencing the Canadian government to seek them out as immigrants (McLaughlin 1985, 9-10). It is important to note that many of the German-speaking immigrants to western Canada came from countries other than Germany such as the Ukraine, Poland, Southern Russia, Bessarabia and regions on the French-German border. Therefore, although they were German-speaking, and by definition of German origin, very few would be able to list their place of birth as Germany. In fact, the 1886 Census of Manitoba shows that of the 11,082 who were classified as having German origin, only 528 were shown to have Germany as their place of birth (Census of Manitoba 1885-86).

Religion played an important role in the pattern of German settlement in the west. Germans who practised Catholicism tended to migrate to communities where there was a predominance of Roman Catholics, not all necessarily German-speaking. Similarly, others such as the Lutherans and other Protestant sects tended to migrate to communities that included their religious peers. This is not to imply that religion is an important factor in defining German ethnicity. Just the opposite is true. The absence of a strong ethnic church coupled with low direct migration from Germany helped to accelerate the process of assimilation.

The period between World War I and World War II marked the third wave of German immigration to Canada. German-speaking refugees fleeing eastern Europe and the communist government in the Soviet Union saw Canada as a

choice destination. Religiously they consisted of two main groups, the Mennonites and Roman Catholics. The common denominator in this wave is that they were primarily agricultural workers. Therefore, they tended to migrate to the Prairie provinces (McLaughlin 1985, 12-15).

German-speaking immigration to Canada was facilitated by the existence of organizations such as the Lutheran Immigration Board, the Canadian Lutheran Immigration Aid Society and the Association of German Canadian Catholics. However, this did not signal a resurgence of German culture in Canada. As McLaughlin observed

"German newspapers had been replaced by the local English language dailies. The German clubs that had survived the war were exclusively social clubs, carefully avoiding all talk of politics or European affairs. The language of the streets and of the shops was English and even in their homes people were guarded in their use of German. Moreover, the immigrants were anxious to create a new life in Canada while many of the older generation were now equally content to play their part as Canadians." (McLaughlin 1985, 14)

Once again, there was a move away from the German language, hence a blurring of the boundaries that define the German community.

Following World War II, there was another wave of German-speaking immigration to Canada. However, in this instance the majority migrated from Germany, with a smattering coming from some of the neighbouring states of Czechoslovakia, Romania and other Eastern European countries. This wave was different from its predecessors in other ways. They were relatively well educated and many were able to speak English. Their preferred locations in Canada were

the three major metropolitan centres of Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver. All of this facilitated their integration into Canadian society.

For the German population in Canada, the shifting of ethnic boundaries manifested itself in a number of ways. The most dramatic example is the variability in the number of people who declared German origins between 1911 and 1951. Table 3.1 shows the census counts for those who declared German, Dutch/Netherlands and Austrian origins during this period.

Table 3.1 German-speaking Origins by Selected Census Years

	1911	1921	1931	1941	1951
German	393,320	294,636	473,544	464,682	619,995
Dutch/Netherlands	54,986	117,506	148,962	212,863	264,267
Austrian	129,103	107,671	48,639	37,715	32,231

Source: The 5th through 9th Censuses of Canada and Ryder 1956

It can be seen that the number of people declaring German origins dropped in 1921 and in 1941, with a corresponding increase in those declaring related origins. In analyzing these data Norman Ryder drew the conclusion that "the erratic growth of the German origin" was a function of the status of relations between Germany and Canada (Ryder 1956, 658). I agree that international events influence how people report their origins. The distinct decline in the number of people reporting German origins can be interpreted as a temporary shifting of ethnic boundaries driven by a desire among some members of this group to change or mask their identity. More permanent shifts have manifested themselves in other ways, such as:

- changes in terminology, such as referring to the Pennsylvania Dutch rather than the Pennsylvania Deutsch;
- changes in place names, for example Berlin became Kitchener; and
- changes in surnames, for example Schmidt became Smith and Braun became Brown.

Additional factors have also contributed to the shifting and blurring of the ethnic boundaries for the Germans in Canada. For instance, with the exception of the religious sects such as the Mennonites and the Amish, the German community does not tend to live in ethnic settlements or enclaves. Where residential concentration existed, for example the Germantowns in the west, this ended after World War I. Similarly, very little occupational segregation exists in recent waves of immigration. The increasing and high incidence of multiple responses to ethnic origin for the German ethnic group, as shown in Chapter 6, is evidence of the impact of these factors.

3.3 The Jews in Canada

The Jewish community is one of the oldest non-British and non-French ethnic groups in Canada⁵. Its history can be traced back to 1768 when the first Jewish congregation was founded (Tulchinsky 1992, 8). Early Jewish settlement was tied directly to British colonial rule. Jewish merchants accompanied the British armies as suppliers of non-military goods in their conquest of North America. Members of the Jewish community also served as officers in the colonial militia (Tulchinsky 1992, 10-11). The bulk of Jewish migration to Canada up to the late

nineteenth century emanated from Western Europe and the British Isles. They arrived in Canada either directly or indirectly through the United States. These people were primarily merchants and entrepreneurs. However, changes in Canada's immigration practices and changes in the political situation in Eastern Europe resulted in a major shift in immigration patterns.

"Towards the end of the nineteenth century, Eastern Europe became Canada's greatest source of Jewish immigration." (Tulchinsky 1992, 96)

Many of these people were refugees from the "pogroms" in Russia and the Ukraine. They came to Canada as agricultural workers, peddlers, small entrepreneurs and merchants.

The next significant wave of Jewish immigration to Canada occurred during the first two decades of this century. Almost 100,000 Jews arrived in Canada, most from Eastern Europe (Tulchinsky 1992, 158-180). Many of these migrants established themselves in the larger urban centres of Toronto, Montreal, Vancouver and Winnipeg, working primarily as merchants and peddlers. However, the development and growth of smaller urban communities in the Atlantic provinces and the desire of the Canadian government to establish agricultural communities in the prairies attracted some members of the Jewish community. This resulted in the expansion of the Jewish community in Canada to smaller urban and rural areas where they did not have the critical population mass to form distinctive ethnic neighbourhoods. Therefore, they were not able to ensure sensitivity to

Jewish customs and culture in public institutions such as schools. As Tulchinsky observes

"They lived among non-Jews, and their children were often the only non-Christians in the public schools they attended". (Tulchinsky 1992, 160)

This event marks the beginning of a noticeable shift in ethnic boundaries for the Jews in Canada. As is shown in the analysis of the data, the increased contact and exposure to other ethnic groups led to the blending of origins and the definition of hyphenated identities where these did not exist before. For example, the children of the marriage between partners of different ethnic groups, one who identified as Jewish and one who identified as French, generally absorbed some of the customs and cultures of each, leading to a new ethnicity of Jewish-French. (No significance should be attributed to the sequence in this hyphenated identity since there are insufficient data to determine which, if any, is considered dominant by the respondent.)

Canada's immigration laws underwent a fundamental change in the period before and after the First World War. The Immigration Act of 1910 was amended by a series of Orders-In-Council to permit the exclusion of people who were considered undesirable for various reasons, including an assessment of their ability to be assimilated in Canadian Society. This had the effect of shutting the door to Jewish immigration to Canada until the Act was revised again in 1952. This is not to say that there was a complete ban on Jewish immigration. A small number

succeeded to emigrate to Canada from Western Europe and the United Kingdom but they did so with great difficulty.

The period immediately following World War II brought some relaxation of the restrictions on Jewish immigration to Canada, in spite of the fact that the Act was not formally revised until 1952. For instance, in 1947, under pressure from the Canadian Jewish Congress and Jewish manufacturers, needle trade workers were granted access to Canada from the refugee camps of Europe (Abella 1990, 211). This renewed migration from Western and Eastern Europe was followed by a wave from North African states (Abella 1990, 231).

There has been a steady migration of Jews to Canada over the past forty years. However, changes in Soviet emigration policy towards allowing Jews to leave in the mid to late 1980s resulted in another wave of immigrants to Canada.

This abridged historical review of the Jewish Community in Canada shows clearly that this ethnic group grew on successive waves of immigration from very different parts of the World. Each wave of immigrants brought with them their particular customs, religious practices, language and culture. This had the effect of enriching the existing community in increments. This also had the effect of changing Jewish identity in Canada.

Another essential element in the development of the Jewish Community in Canada is the strength of its organization and institutions, both formal and informal. Religious organizations such as synagogues and schools provided a focus for the members of the community. In addition, as new waves of immigrants arrived, they

availed themselves of the existing institutions rather than developing new ones. In fact, community institutions such as immigrant aid societies and local welfare organizations played key roles in assisting the new-comers to establish themselves in Canada. Once this process of integration and adaptation was complete, those who benefited from the help of these community institutions generally contributed to their preservation and continuation by actively supporting them either through financial contributions or through volunteer activity or both. It should be noted that this tradition continues to this day.

In discussing the theoretical framework for this study, I noted that two sets of boundaries exist in defining an ethnic group; those that are described from within the group, the internal boundaries, and those that described by external observers, the external boundaries (Isajiw 1993, 411). With respect to the Jewish community, most of the discussion in this study will focus on the externally defined boundaries as manifested through the data collection instruments of the State. However, it must be recognized that internal boundaries exist. For instance, there are cultural differences between Sephardic and Ashkenazi Jews. In addition, there are major religious differences between the Orthodox, Conservative and Reform Jewish movements. Although these differences are not usually evident in external relations between the Jewish and non-Jewish communities, they manifest themselves within the community and are noteworthy.⁶

3.4 The Ukrainians in Canada

Ukrainian migration to Canada occurred primarily during the last decade of the nineteenth century and the first decade of this century (Troper and Weinfeld 1993, 193-196). In general, during the early stages, Ukrainian emigration was triggered by political events. The Ukrainian territory was in a region that fell under the rule of a series of autocratic empires such as the Russian and Austro-Hungarian regimes. Hence, Ukrainians, nationals were forced to either flee or to conform to the dictates of the occupying power. This situation is very well characterized in the following extract.

".... Ukrainians have been an oppressed people dispossessed of sovereignty, struggling for national self-realization against the power of foreign imperial might" (Troper and Weinfeld 1993, 193)

Ukrainian migration to Canada occurred in three distinct waves. The first, from the late nineteenth century to the start of the first World War, brought primarily agricultural workers and farmers. Canadian immigration policy and practice during this period was shaped by the desire to populate the territory west of Ontario. Under Clifford Sifton, the Minister of the Interior in Wilfrid Laurier's cabinet, Ukrainian immigration was viewed as a means of achieving this goal. An emphasis on giving priority to farmers coupled with a lack of British, North European and United States migrants willing to come to Canada, led Canadian immigration authorities to consider the regions of Southern and Eastern Europe as alternate sources. The fact that the Ukrainians were experienced farmers and very willing to undertake the hardships of pioneer settlement raised their status as

potential immigrants. Those who chose to migrate were typically young, moderately literate by Canadian standards at the turn of the century and eager to benefit from the Canadian Homestead policy which offered 160 acres (one quarter section) for \$10.00 and some settlement obligations (Gerus and Rea 1985, 7).

This wave of immigrants resulted in the establishment of Ukrainian communities mainly in southern Manitoba and Saskatchewan. However, not all of them migrated to rural communities. A subset, mostly single or unaccompanied men, migrated to working class neighbourhoods in Winnipeg, Saskatoon and Edmonton. Although they lived in close proximity to other ethnic groups, they did not readily blend or integrate into the majority population (Gerus and Rea 1985, 9). It is difficult to speculate whether this was by circumstance or by choice. However, the effect was to maintain their original ethnic boundaries, even under these conditions.

In figure 3.1, language is shown as one of the characteristics that can be used to define the boundaries of the Ukrainian ethnic group in Canada. The experience of this first wave of immigrants confirms the importance of language as an essential ingredient in Ukrainian ethnicity.

"Language retention was also crucial for community integrity. It was the bond between the adult generation, who had difficulty in learning English and were offered few opportunities to do so, and the children who were quickly, and sometimes decisively, influenced by the English culture all around them, especially in urban centres." (Gerus and Rea 1985, 9)

This last point may also help to explain the gradual trend towards the reporting of multiple ethnic origins, especially for the younger cohorts.

The second wave of Ukrainian immigration to Canada began towards the end of the 1920s and continued until the mid 1930s. Employment opportunities generated by the expansion of the two national railroads resulted in a demand for labour. Therefore, the Canadian government relaxed immigration restrictions to allow the companies to recruit workers from eastern Europe. The doors were once again open to Ukrainian migration to Canada.

This wave of migrants differed somewhat from their predecessors. As Gerus and Rea so aptly describe them, they were "war-impooverished peasants and persecuted nationalistic intelligentsia" (Gerus and Rea 1985, 12) fleeing the political and social turmoil of their homeland. Although many of the migrants ended up in the prairies, a significant proportion also settled in southern Ontario, thereby establishing a Ukrainian presence in eastern Canada.

Following World War II, many Ukrainians found themselves to be among the displaced persons of Europe. The post-war need for labour in agriculture and primary industries in Canada once again opened the door for Ukrainian immigrants in Europe. Actions of organizations such as the Ukrainian Canadian Committee helped to stimulate the flow of immigrants to Canada. Once these arrivals fulfilled their contractual obligations in remote regions such as northern Ontario, they migrated to industrial centres in southern Ontario, hence building on the existing communities established during the second wave. By the mid 1950s a majority of the Ukrainians already resident in Canada were Canadian born. Therefore, the arrival of these new immigrants, most of whom were political refugees from parts

of the Ukraine largely under-represented in previous waves (i.e. from regions other than Galicia), resulted in some tensions and divisions in the Canadian-Ukrainian community. However, the data from the census do not allow us to adequately explore this dichotomy in the Ukrainian community in Canada.

Although this community has a long history in Canada and has relatively high proportions of its population born in Canada, it shares similar views to the Jewish community with respect to marriage outside the ethnic and religious group. Exogamy is frowned upon religiously and culturally. This should not be interpreted to mean that marriage outside the community does not occur. The fact that it happens is a cause for concern among Ukrainians in Canada.

The Ukrainian community has not maintained completely exclusive boundaries in Canada. Although inter-marriage is discouraged to varying degrees in both religious groups, it does occur. In addition, since a large proportion were born in Canada, a number of the younger generation have readily adopted the identity of the host society in addition to their cultural heritage. Both conditions give rise to a significant rate of multiple responses to the Census question on ethnic origin.

4. THE ANALYTICAL METHODOLOGY AND CONTEXT

In this chapter I will describe the methodology that I use in this study. I will also set the analytical context by assessing the significance of the impact of the collection vehicle on the responses and the respondents in explaining changes in the data. It is also important that I set the context with respect to major political, social and economic events which may have contributed to the respondents' perception and reporting of their origins.

4.1 The Methodology

Ideally, I would prefer to analyze the phenomena being examined in this study by selecting well defined cohorts in each community and tracing their responses under the differing conditions of the 1971, 1981, 1986 and 1991 Censuses. However, since it is not possible to identify individuals in the Census data and since the analysis was bounded by the limitations in the level of detail generally available for each of the four groups for the four censuses, the investigation has been limited to the following birth cohorts.

Table 4.1 Cohort definitions

COHORT	Year of Birth	Age in 1971	Age in 1981	Age in 1986	Age in 1991
1	1952 - 1956	15-19	25-29	30-34	35-39
2	1947 - 1951	20-24	30-34	35-39	40-44
3	1942 - 1946	25-29	35-39	40-44	45-49
4	1937 - 1941	30-34	40-44	45-49	50-54
5	1932 - 1936	35-39	45-49	50-54	55-59

Although it cannot be said with certainty that for each cohort the population in a given census is exactly the same as the population in the next census, only 5 or 10 years older depending on the time line used, selecting the age ranges in this way eliminates the effect of births and minimizes the effect of deaths on the resulting comparisons. The following table shows the life expectancy and the probability of survival to the next time interval for men and women for each cohort.

Table 4.2 Survival Rates by Cohort

COHORT	GENDER	ex 1971	P ₁	P ₂	P ₃	P ₄
1	Male	56.4	0.99137	0.99209	0.99341	0.99277
	Female	63.1	0.99722	0.99742	0.99731	0.99660
2	Male	51.8	0.99164	0.99299	0.99258	0.99058
	Female	58.3	0.99717	0.99695	0.99629	0.99477
3	Male	47.2	0.99252	0.99171	0.98969	0.98565
	Female	53.4	0.99650	0.99562	0.99408	0.99136
4	Male	42.5	0.99084	0.98792	0.98349	0.97613
	Female	48.6	0.99489	0.99312	0.99032	0.98592
5	Male	37.9	0.98639	0.98038	0.97231	0.95997
	Female	43.8	0.99216	0.98891	0.98441	0.97777

Source: Statistics Canada Catalogue 89-506, 91-209 and Nault 1993

The figures in the column labelled "ex 1971" indicate the remaining life expectancy from 1971 for each cohort. The probabilities that an individual in each cohort will survive to the subsequent time period are indicated under the headings P₁ to P₄, where each column represents a five year interval (i.e. 1971 to 1976, 1976 to

1981, etc.). This table illustrates that mortality is not a major concern in the analysis of the data for these cohorts since the lowest probability of survival to the next interval is almost .96 (males in cohort 5). It must be noted that although the figures in this table apply to the total population I am making the rather bold assumption that they can equally be applied to the four ethnic groups. This is not necessarily a valid assumption since survival rates can vary with lifestyle, diet and ethnic-specific genetic problems. However, I suggest that these will suffice as a proxy for specific survival rates for the four ethnic groups that are the subjects of analysis.

In general, population growth and decline are determined by net migration⁷ and net natural increase⁸. However, when considering sub-groups of the total population, factors which determine classification and membership such as the descent rules and how they are applied, and factors which may influence how respondents report their origins also contribute to growth and decline. Since the structure of the cohorts defined for this study minimizes the impact of natural population increase and decrease as a factor in the analysis, the assumption is made that changes in the respective sizes of the cohorts from one census period to the next can be attributed to the effect of the collection vehicle (questionnaire and survey methodology), the impact of immigration and emigration, changes in the attitudes of respondents or some combination of all of these factors.

Some of the factors which may have influenced how respondents reported their origins are described in subsequent sections. The technical reports that

accompany the data for each census make statements about the impact of coverage and sampling error on the results. However, they do not include assessments or quantitative measures of the effect on the attitudes of respondents of a change in question wording or environmental factors. This is not to suggest that qualitative speculation of the impact of these events is not appropriate. In many cases, the detection of a change in the social construction of ethnic boundaries is made possible precisely by examining such qualitative indicators. The dramatic increase in the reporting of multiple ethnic origins in the 1986 and 1991 censuses is a perfect example of this phenomenon. To quantify the effect of the observed change in reporting patterns requires the administration of two questionnaires to separate samples of the population; one that allows multiple responses and one that does not. Since such data are not available, I can only speculate in a qualitative sense on the impact of this particular change in the census. This issue is dealt with in detail in subsequent chapters of this thesis.

4.2 The Census as a measurement vehicle for ethnic origin

The period of analysis begins with the 1971 Census and includes the 1981, 1986 and 1991 Census data for most variables. Since no question on religion appeared in quinquennial censuses, the 1986 data are not included in the analysis of this characteristic. Also, since the content of the 1976 Census included only the basic demographic characteristics, these data are not included in the analysis.

The 1971 Census marks a major change in how the data were collected (see Appendix B). Up to and including 1961, data were collected from respondents through a personal interview by a census enumerator. Therefore, responses were recorded by an interviewer according to the instructions and procedures that governed this process. For example, the interviewers were given specific instructions on how ancestry was to be determined. As indicated earlier, in 1961 ancestry was determined along patrilineal lines. When the data were collected by personal interview, the census enumerator was directed to probe along patrilineal lines, whether or not this was appropriate for the ethnic group to which the respondent belonged. However, beginning in 1971 the Census was collected by self-enumeration for most of the population⁹. This eliminated the influence of the interviewer in interpreting the responses.

In 1981, the manner by which ancestry was determined changed from patrilineal to ambilineal. This meant that respondents had the freedom to choose the descent rules that were most appropriate in their particular case. Under theoretical conditions it would be reasonable to expect that the change in descent paradigms in the Census between 1971 and 1981 would result in no change in the size of the cohorts for the Ukrainian, German and Chinese communities (since they followed a patrilineal tradition) and some increase in the size of the Jewish cohorts during that period. However, the following figures show that this was not the case.

Figure 4.1 Distribution by cohort by census, Jewish total response

Figure 4.2 Distribution by cohort by census, Chinese total response

Figure 4.3 Distribution by cohort by census, German total response

Figure 4.4 Distribution by cohort by census, Ukrainian total response

Given that descent is determined along matrilineal lines by the Jewish population, the change in how ancestry was attributed to the respondents between 1971 and

1981 should have resulted in either an increase in the size of the cohorts or, at worst, no change. However, the data clearly show that there was a general decrease for every cohort! Similarly, for the Chinese, Ukrainian and German communities one would expect no change in the size of the cohorts since they all follow a patrilineal tradition. Once again, the data show that this was not the case. To some extent the pattern of change of the cohort distributions can be explained for the Chinese population since, as the subsequent analysis will show, they experienced a significant increase in immigration during this period. However, although the rate of migration for the other three communities is not sufficient to explain the decline in all cohorts, it supports the argument that the descent paradigm imposed by the state had little effect on the respondents. Naturally, to make the argument absolutely conclusive would require an attitudinal survey of the four communities. (This is beyond the scope of this study.)

The preceding argument notwithstanding, census data on ethnic origin are affected to a certain extent by the text of the question used to solicit the information from the respondents (see Appendix C). For instance, in the 1971 Census, the question on ethnic origin limited the respondents to consider only one origin along the paternal line. The preceding paragraphs showed that this apparently had little impact on the respondents. By contrast, beginning in 1981 it was possible for respondents to indicate more than one origin. In fact, in the 1986 and 1991 Censuses the wording of the question encouraged multiple responses. In my opinion, this is a reflection of the pluralistic nature of Canadian

society. The following table shows how the incidence of reporting multiple responses has increased over this period.

Table 4.3 Proportion of Multiple Responses (%) for Ethnic Origin

	1981 Census	1986 Census				1991 Census			
COHORT	Jewish	Jewish	Chinese	German	Ukrainian	Jewish	Chinese	German	Ukrainian
1	11.27	30.78	11.39	64.28	57.58	35.20	6.58	65.87	58.61
2	10.43	28.26	9.30	63.20	50.65	32.47	5.99	64.07	52.02
3	9.42	27.94	10.43	54.75	41.25	30.53	8.63	54.98	41.45
4	9.10	24.41	6.94	43.79	31.64	27.35	6.05	44.87	31.25
5	8.46	20.03	5.72	37.45	23.86	24.40	5.03	38.27	24.34
Total	9.98	27.25	9.25	54.98	44.59	31.13	6.45	56.12	45.37

Although multiple responses may have been reported for respondents of Chinese, German and Ukrainian origin in 1981, they were not separately tabulated. Therefore, they are not indicated in Table 4.3. The numbers in this table show an interesting pattern. The changes in proportion of multiple responses appears to parallel the rate of intermarriage (i.e. marriages between partners of different ethnic origins). For instance, it has been observed that the number of Jews living in intermarried families has increased from 9.7% in 1981 to 13.9% in 1991 (Torczyner et al 1993, 66). This pattern parallels the steady increase in the proportion of Jews who declared more than one ethnic origin. Although the empirical evidence is not presented in this study, a similar pattern has been observed for members of the German and Ukrainian communities in Canada, hence the correspondingly high proportions of multiple responses.

4.3 The impact of national events

As indicated in the introduction to this chapter, the attitudes of respondents are shaped, to some extent, by national events that have either a direct or an indirect impact on their lives. The period in Canadian history covered by the four censuses from which the data are drawn is particularly interesting in this respect. The following chronology from 1970 to 1991 highlights the range of events that are considered to be significant in influencing how respondents view their origins. It must be noted that only national events, those which occurred directly on Canadian soil, are considered in this list. This is not to suggest that international events have no influence; quite the contrary. The impact of the current situation in the territory that was formerly Yugoslavia on expatriates living in Canada attests to the fact that distance is not a barrier in this world of mass media and electronic communication. Therefore, international conditions most certainly influence how people perceive themselves. However, such an analysis deserves more attention than can be devoted here.

YEAR

EVENT

1970	The October Crisis of 1970 resulted in a surge of nationalist sentiment in Québec and in the rest of Canada. In addition, the results of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism were published during 1970. This resulted in a heightening of public awareness of the significance of national origins. People also became more vocal about expressing their feelings on this topic.
1976	The surge of nationalist sentiment in Québec culminated with the election of the Parti Québécois government. International sporting events, such as the summer Olympic games held in Montreal, also have a bearing on feelings of national pride, especially in the host country.

- 1980 The referendum campaign on sovereignty association was conducted in May of 1980. Once again, this public process brought the importance and significance of national origins to the forefront in debates and media articles.

- 1982 The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, Constitution Act 1982 was proclaimed into law. This milestone marked the official repatriation of the constitution from England.

- 1986 The Employment Equity Act was official passed into law during 1986. This also marked the beginning of a period of economic recession in Canada that lasted until 1993. Unemployment rose and productivity dropped during this seven year stretch. When coupled with a rise in immigration during the same period, tensions between ethnic groups increased.

- 1988 The passage of the Multiculturalism Act resulted in the creation of a federal Department of Multiculturalism with full Cabinet representation. In addition, the negotiation and signing of the Free Trade Agreement with the United States heightened sensitivity to Canadian sovereignty and to a Canadian identity. The events leading up to the winter Olympic Games held in Calgary, such as the Torch Relay, also had an impact on a sense of Canadian pride.

- 1990 The Meech Lake round of constitutional debates and negotiations had a very strong influence on people's perceptions of their origins and on the expression of their identities.

- Ongoing Although they are not an ethnic group per se, the changing relationship between Canada's Aboriginal population and the remainder of Canadian society also contributed to heightening the general sensitivity to the significance of cultural roots. The Canadian population was exposed to constant media articles, public debates and public demonstrations on the negotiations for Aboriginal self-government and land claims settlements.

Canadian fishing and other primary industries also faced a decline during this period. Given the regional nature of these industries, the effect on the population was not uniform across the country. Therefore, this situation contributed to an increasing sense of regionalism as a component of Canadian national identity.

It would be improper to suggest that there is direct causal relationship between the events listed above and the increase in the number of respondents who declared their ancestry as Canadian in the 1986 and 1991 Censuses. However, in a contextual sense, the influence of one on the other cannot be ignored. The following chart shows incidence of the response "Canadian" to the question on ethnic origin for the four census years in this analysis. For 1986 and 1991 a distinction is made between single responses and multiple responses.

Figure 4.5 Responses of "Canadian" to ethnic origin

Given the changes in the collection vehicle over this period, it is difficult to infer a trend from these data. However, the radical growth in the number of respondents reporting that they were of Canadian origins in 1991 is certainly a signal that cannot be ignored. It will be interesting to see if the trend persists in the 1996 and 2001 Censuses.

4.4 Immigration considerations

In describing the immigration histories for the four groups in Chapter 3, reference was made on a number of occasions to the changes in Canada's immigration policies and laws. The most dramatic impact of these changes is the effect they had on the number of immigrants admitted and on the countries from which they came. The following three figures show the change in immigration patterns by country of birth for 1941, 1971 and 1991. The shift from a European based immigration to one whose sources are in Asia over this period is very striking.

Figure 4.6 Immigrants by place of birth - 1941 Census

Figure 4.7 Immigrants by place of birth - 1971 Census

Figure 4.8 Immigrants by place of birth - 1991 Census

It can be seen that in 1941 (figure 4.6) over 82% of the immigrants in Canada were of European origins whereas slightly more than 2% were born in Asia. By 1991 (figure 4.8) there was a distinct shift with over 25% declaring Asia as their place of birth as compared to less than 53% indicating that they were born in Europe.

I also alluded to the increasing significance of immigration as a factor in population growth in Canada. According to the 1991 Census, over 4 million people reported that they immigrated to Canada. This represents almost 16% of the total non-institutional population (Statistics Canada 1994, Catalogue 93-340). The following table shows the distribution of the immigrant population by period of immigration from the 1991 Census. The proportions are based on the non-institutionalized population since detailed characteristics such as immigration status were not collected from residents of institutions.

Table 4.4 Immigrant population by period of immigration - 1991 Census

	n	%
Total non-institutional population	26,994,045	100.00
Total Immigrant population	4,342,885	16.09
pre 1961	1,239,035	4.59
1961 - 1970	827,960	3.07
1971 - 1980	1,037,440	3.84
1981 - 1991	1,238,450	4.59

Source: Statistics Canada Catalogue 93-340 Table 1

Table 4.4 shows that there has been a steady increase in the number of immigrants since 1961. It also shows that the proportion of the number of people who immigrated to Canada between 1981 and 1991 equals the total

number who immigrated prior to 1961. In fact, over half of the immigrant population in Canada arrived since 1971. This trend is projected to increase over the next few years as immigration targets are revised. This supports the allegation that immigration will contribute significantly to the growth of Canada's population in the foreseeable future.

Since the census data include the period of immigration, it is possible to control for immigration status when comparing the relative sizes of the cohorts. Emigration, on the other hand, cannot be dealt with in a quantitative manner. Although comparisons from one period to the next for each group for each cohort show differences in size, it is not possible from census data to determine the number of emigrants since those who have left the country are no longer in the sample. In order to establish the exact count of emigrants one would have to examine the immigration records of every country of destination. This is clearly beyond the scope of this study.

5. MOSAIC OR KALEIDOSCOPE

The respective size of each ethnic community can be determined from the census data on ethnic origin. However, as stated in Section 4.2, the methods of measurement and classification changed during the 20 year span between 1971 and 1991. Therefore, care must be exercised in how the groups are defined and in which measures are used to estimate the populations in each sub-universe.

In this chapter, the distributions of the population by cohort for each of the four ethnic groups are presented in a sequential and somewhat hierarchical fashion (with respect to detailed characteristics). Section 5.1 begins with a presentation of the basic counts, showing both single and total response data for ethnic origin. Detailed characteristics, such as Religion, Period of Immigration and Mother Tongue are described in subsequent sections. This chapter concludes with a presentation of the net effect of changes over time on ethnic boundaries for each of the four groups. Where appropriate, summary data are included in the text. The detailed tables appear in Appendix A.

5.1 Basic Counts

The basic distributions by cohort for each of the four ethnic groups, shown in the following charts were derived from census counts using responses to the question on ethnic origin as the independent variable. Both single and multiple responses are included for all four groups for 1986 and 1991.

However, for 1981 only single response data are available for the Chinese, German and Ukrainian populations. This will become an important factor in the analysis of the trends over the 20-year period.

Figure 5.1 Jewish population by cohort

Figure 5.2 Chinese population by cohort

Figure 5.3 German population by cohort

Figure 5.4 Ukrainian population by cohort

By examining figures 5.1 to 5.4 it can be seen that, with the exception of the Chinese in Canada, multiple responses are a significant factor in defining

membership in each group. For the Germans and the Ukrainians, considering only single response data for ethnic origin would result in a decline of 34% and 27% respectively from 1971 to 1991 for the population in all cohorts. Given the age structure for the cohorts, such a decline cannot be explained by vital events. Also, with the exception of some out migration among the younger cohorts, such as those who left Canada to pursue an education and a career, there are no significant events that can account for an emigration of this magnitude. Therefore, it is assumed that the decline in numbers represents a shift in reporting patterns - *a shift in ethnic boundaries*.

The 1981 Census appears to be an anomaly for the German, Jewish and Ukrainian groups. All three show a drop in population for all cohorts for that Census. Although part of this trend can be attributed to some of the events described in section 4.3, this is not a sufficient explanation. If the political, social and economic events that occurred between 1976 and 1980 had an effect on how respondents reported their ethnic origin, one would expect to see a substantial increase in the number of people reporting "Canadian" or "Québécois" origins. Figure 4.5 shows that this is clearly not the case. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that another shift in reporting patterns occurred in 1981, a shift towards multiple responses. In their discussion of the rise of multiethnicities in the Census, Krotki and Odynak observe that

"... a considerable number of respondents in 1981 spontaneously began writing in more than one ethnicity. Close to two million people out of 24 million, or 8 percent, had multiple ethnic origins entered on their census forms." (Krotki and Odynak 1990, 416)

This suggests that respondents availed themselves of the opportunity to indicate more than one origin. Unfortunately, with the exception of the data on the Jewish population, the combinations of multiple ethnic origins for the other groups were not available at the time this study was conducted. But it can be seen from the Jewish data that including the multiple responses almost totally eliminates the anomalous condition of the 1981 Census.

The patterns of response differ for each group. The period between 1971 and 1986 marks a slight growth for the younger cohorts in the Jewish population and a more substantial increase for all cohorts for the other three groups. Comparing only 1986 and 1991, there appears to be little difference in the size and distribution of the cohorts for the Jewish, German and Ukrainian groups. Given the high rate of immigration in the Chinese community, the increase in the size of the cohorts was fully anticipated.

The dramatic increase in the German and Ukrainian populations, especially for the younger cohorts, signals an important shift in ethnic boundaries. I already noted previously that this increase can be attributed to the incidence of multiple responses to the question on ethnic origin. I also indicated that the German population in Canada is an older community and one that has made great efforts to assimilate into the host society. The higher incidence of multiple responses in general, and the higher proportion of the

older cohorts who reported multiple ethnicities confirms their success at assimilating.

5.2 Controlling for Immigration

Immigration, as a component of growth, can be estimated from census data through the responses to the question on period of immigration. Tables 5.1 to 5.4 were derived by subtracting the number of respondents who declared that they immigrated to Canada in the period from 1971 to 1991 from the successive counts for each census.

Table 5.1 Jewish cohorts by census year, controlling for immigration

Cohort	1971	1981	1986	1991
1	26,945	23,280	25,900	25,800
2	28,555	24,350	27,385	25,715
3	21,305	18,995	21,195	20,405
4	14,780	13,545	14,780	14,105
5	14,750	13,370	13,785	13,115
Sum of Cohorts	106,335	93,540	103,045	99,140

Table 5.2 Chinese cohorts by census year, controlling for immigration

Cohort	1971	1981	1986	1991
1	9,440	8,780	11,160	11,370
2	11,275	10,655	11,720	12,340
3	8,570	8,060	8,640	8,600
4	11,225	10,970	10,625	11,340
5	11,010	11,165	10,810	11,180
Sum of Cohorts	51,520	49,630	52,955	54,830

Table 5.3 German cohorts by census year, controlling for immigration

Cohort	1971	1981	1986	1991
1	116,315	100,300	202,540	206,095
2	104,245	86,035	168,040	170,625
3	97,775	79,710	137,700	137,755
4	92,675	78,705	119,880	119,915
5	93,225	80,765	111,555	108,830
Sum of Cohorts	504,235	425,515	739,715	743,220

Table 5.4 Ukrainian cohorts by census year, controlling for immigration

Cohort	1971	1981	1986	1991
1	53,260	47,050	82,655	81,245
2	45,745	42,385	67,750	65,730
3	37,830	35,275	50,430	48,595
4	32,655	30,800	39,970	38,200
5	34,530	33,265	38,525	37,415
Sum of Cohorts	204,020	188,775	279,330	271,185

Once immigration has been controlled for, the change in size from one census period to the next differs by ethnic group. The Chinese cohorts show the greatest stability over time. This further confirms that immigration is a major factor in the growth of the cohorts shown in section 5.1. It also shows that the definition of the boundaries for the Chinese is least susceptible to change over time. Continuing with this logic, the Jewish population is the next most stable with respect to the definition of boundaries. They are followed in turn by the Ukrainians and the Germans.

The proportion of foreign born among the four ethnic groups appears to be almost inversely proportional to the rate of multiple responses to ethnic origin. Table 5.5 indicates the proportion born in Canada for all cohorts for each of the four ethnic groups. In addition, the final column includes the rate of reporting multiple ethnic origins in the 1991 Census for all cohorts for these groups.

Table 5.5 Proportion born in Canada (%)

	1971	1981	1986	1991	Multiple Origins 1991
Jewish	72.5	64.9	62.4	61.6	31.13
Chinese	19.3	6.8	7.5	8.1	6.45
German	75.0	71.7	78.8	79.2	56.12
Ukrainian	93.9	93.9	93.9	93.9	45.37

The literature tells us that the longer a given ethnic group is in direct contact with other groups in a society, the greater will be the potential for some form of interaction, whether it be social, economic or political (Meintel 1992, Goldscheider 1993). In the Canadian context the nature of the interaction is likely to be in all three spheres. The membership of the major political parties includes representation from a broad cross-section of the ethnic groups in Canada. Similarly, the number and variety of ethnic business establishments has increased substantially over the past 20 years. They usually draw their clientele from all members of Canadian society, not specifically from their own ethnic group. For example, Chinese restaurants can be found throughout Canada and they serve patrons from all ethnic groups.

I have already noted in section 2.1 that interaction between members of different ethnic groups may lead to intermarriage, assuming there is no strong cultural prohibition against this practice. In fact, the longer a group is in a "host" environment, the greater the probability that they will interact with people of the host society or of other ethnic groups. In many instances this is accompanied by a general weakening of the cultural biases against such interactions. (However, there exist some notable exceptions in the Indian and Chinese communities.) This form of interaction leads to a blurring of the ethnic boundaries as indicated by an increase in the rate of multiple responses to ethnic origin. This explains, in part, why the rate of multiple responses to the census question on ethnic origin increases with the proportion born in Canada (Table 5.5).

It is interesting to note that between 1986 and 1991, the sum of the Jewish, Ukrainian and German cohorts (see Tables 5.1, 5.3 and 5.4 respectively) decreased in size. Since the question on ethnic origin was essentially the same in these two censuses and since there was a dramatic increase in the number of respondents who indicated that they were of Canadian origins, I suggest that some people in these groups chose to respond as Canadian when asked their ethnic origin. In this instance the boundaries are changed rather than merely blurred, as with the multiple responses. In fact, I suspect that a more detailed analysis of these respondents will show that they tend to be in the younger cohorts and that they most certainly are born in Canada. The examination of this particular instance of a boundary shift will be the subject of another study.

5.3 The religious dimension of boundaries

As stated earlier, the question on religion is included only for the decennial censuses. Therefore, the analysis presented in this section does not include data for the 1986 Census. The following charts show the distribution of the population within these four groups by major religion by decennial census year.

Figure 5.5 Jewish cohorts

Figure 5.6 Chinese cohorts

Figure 5.7 German cohorts

Figure 5.8 Ukrainian cohorts

Given the range of values for the religion code set, I decided to limit the number of categories to the more common ones for the ethnic groups being

studied. Unfortunately, it was not possible to separately tabulate the traditional Chinese religions. Therefore, they are included in the *other* category, along with *no religion* and the fringe faiths. The typical Germanic religions, such as Lutheran and Mennonite, are included in the broad category of Protestant.

Religion, as an explanatory variable, has a different significance for the four groups. For instance, for the Jewish population respondents can report to be Jewish by religion and/or Jewish by ethnic origin. This situation affords a unique opportunity to examine the relationship between ethnic origin and religion. The drop in the relative size of the cohorts by ethnic origin for the Jewish population (see Table A.1) is paralleled by a drop in the proportion of the responses of Jewish to the question on religion (see Table A.9). This shows that even though there may not be a direct concordance between Jewish ethnicity and Jewish religion, the populations described by each behave in a similar fashion. Another example of the relationship between the two classification variables for the Jewish population is the manner in which the incidence of multiple responses and the reporting of non-Jewish religions co-vary. This may be attributed, in part, to intermarried couples, either directly or through their off-spring. In either case, this further reinforces the argument that the boundaries tend to fade somewhat with the increase in multiple origins. Basic religious values which are normally tied to a Jewish ethnic origin are lost in these cases.

With respect to the Chinese cohorts, increased immigration has resulted in a corresponding increase in the proportion of the population reporting an *other*

religion. Since this category includes the responses of "no religion" as well as the traditional Chinese religions, the increase is taken as an indication that the new immigrants (primarily in the younger cohorts) have maintained their customs and culture in Canada. It is reasonable to assume that those emigrating from mainland China would tend to be atheists or agnostics. The data from the 1991 Census show that almost 74% (107,475 out of 145,550) of the respondents in the 5 cohorts who were classified under "other" religion in fact declared "no religion". If this trend is combined with the continuous decline in the proportion of Western religions in the Chinese community (about 50% in 1971 compared to just over 28% in 1991), it shows that religion may not be a factor in defining and maintaining Chinese culture.

The German population appears to be moving away from the traditional Christian religions over time. The greatest increase seems to be in the *other* category. This pattern is once again related to the growing incidence of multiple ethnicities for this population. I suspect that as members of the German community intermarry with members of other ethnic groups, they tend to move away from their religious roots. Therefore, religion is not a significant factor in defining German ethnicity.

By contrast, the Ukrainian community appears to be fairly stable with respect to religious affiliation. They show a marginal increase in the proportion reporting Protestant religions and a slight decrease in the proportion reporting Catholic. This difference is almost compensated for by the number reporting

Ukrainian Orthodox. Over the 20 year period the proportion reporting other religions has remained relatively stable. Once again, the relatively high proportion of people reporting *other* religions appears to be consistent with the rate of multiple responses to ethnic origin.

In discussing religion as an ethnic characteristic it is important to note the significance of the responses of *other* religion. For instance, the increase in the proportion of respondents reporting *other* religion for the Chinese cohorts suggests that new immigrants bring with them the religious traditions with which they are most familiar. I have also argued in this section that the increase in the rate of reporting of multiple origins is accompanied by an increase in the reporting of non-traditional religions (i.e. *other* religion category). Finally, the change in reporting patterns for *other* religion for the Jewish, German and Ukrainian cohorts are not sufficient to explain the respective declines in the sizes of these groups between 1971 and 1981. Therefore, although religion is an ethnic indicator, it generally requires support from other characteristics when used to define boundaries.

An examination of the detailed tables on religion in Appendix A will undoubtedly yield further observations about the patterns of reporting. For instance, the data confirm that the tendency to religious adherence is stronger among the older cohorts. However, such an analysis is beyond the scope of this paper.

5.4 Mother tongue as an ethnic indicator

In chapter 2, I propose language (specifically mother tongue) as an ethnic indicator that can serve to define the German and Ukrainian ethnic groups. The historical review of the migration patterns for the German population in Canada confirms that language was a factor in settlement patterns. The evidence is not quite as conclusive for the Ukrainian population. However, the erosion of the boundaries over time of both the German and Ukrainian groups suggests that language may be a weak indicator, especially with respect to ethnic retention. The following contingency tables show mother tongue cross-classified by ethnic origin for the Chinese, German and Ukrainian groups for 1991. No data for the Jewish population are included in these tables since it is difficult to select one language that can be considered unique and inclusive of that group.

Table 5.6 Mother Tongue by Ethnic Origin for the Chinese - 1991 Census

Mother Tongue	Statistic	Ethnic Origin		
		Chinese	Other	Total
Chinese	n	404,410	7,075	411,475
	row	98.28%	1.72%	100.00%
	column	79.66%
Other	n	103,265		
	column	20.34%		
Total	n	507,675		

Table 5.7 Mother Tongue by Ethnic Origin for the Germans - 1991 Census

		Ethnic Origin		
Mother Tongue	Statistic	German	Other	Total
German	n	373,105	62,435	435,540
	row	85.66%	14.34%	100.00%
	column	18.49%
Other	n	1,645,200		
	column	81.51%		
Total	n	2,018,305		

Table 5.8 Mother Tongue by Ethnic Origin for the Ukrainians - 1991 Census

		Ethnic Origin		
Mother Tongue	Statistic	Ukrainian	Other	Total
Ukrainian	n	175,760	6,945	182,700
	row	96.20%	3.60%	100.00%
	column	22.94%
Other	n	590,270		
	column	77.06%		
Total	n	766,030		

These data show that over 98% of the respondents who declare Chinese mother tongue are of Chinese origin whereas less than 80% who describe themselves as having Chinese origin also speak Chinese as their mother tongue (see table 5.6). The situation is somewhat similar for the Ukrainian group. Table 5.8 shows that over 96% of those who reported Ukrainian mother tongue also declared Ukrainian origins. However, fewer than ¼ of the respondents reporting their origins as

Ukrainian declared that they spoke Ukrainian as their mother tongue. This is probably due to the high proportion of Ukrainians born and educated in Canada. With respect to the German group, slightly fewer than 86% of those who said their mother tongue was German also reported German origins (see Table 5.7). The proportion of German ethnics whose mother tongue is other than German is over 81%. I assume that this is due to the high proportion who were born and educated in Canada, as with the Ukrainians. In both cases, these tables show that there was a significant transfer from the ethnic to another language, presumably either English or French. This would be consistent with the blurring of the boundaries indicated by the multiple responses to ethnic origin.

6. INTERPRETATION OF THE RESULTS

The analysis in the previous chapter has shown that a number of issues must be taken into account when interpreting data based on ethnic origin in Canada. First, multiple ethnic origins are a fact in Canadian society. As the number of ethnic groups grows and as they become more established socially and economically in Canada, the tendency towards a blending of cultures increases. Second, phenotype is an important factor in the preservation of "cultural distinctness". The example of the Chinese community in Canada provides ample evidence to support this assertion. Third, group boundaries that are based primarily on language tend to be the most susceptible to erosion and change over time. Finally, the results are not entirely independent of the factors which influence the design of the survey vehicle. As stated in Chapter 4, the design of the survey vehicle is, in some way, a reflection of the dominant ideology of the day. An attempt will be made in this chapter to offer some discussion of these issues, supported by the empirical evidence presented in the preceding chapter.

6.1 Multiple Ethnic Origins - the redefinition of ethnic boundaries

The data clearly show that there has been an increase in the reporting of multiple ethnic origins in the Canadian Census over the 20 year period covered by this study. However, the significance of this trend in reporting is not entirely

clear nor is it entirely independent of the socio-political context. As William Petersen observed

"Any enumeration depends essentially on three factors - how members of the population regard the particular attribute, the methods used by the statistical agency, and the political or fiscal influences on one or both of these." (Petersen 1987, 188)

Petersen characterises ethnic groups as "subnations" with a structure that consists of a core population with a strong link to their origins, an intermediate group with only partial participation and a fringe or marginal group that can be classified as either in or out of the community (Petersen 1987, 188). The core population in this study can be considered as those who report only one origin. Using this measure, I have shown that in Canada they tend to be either more recent immigrants or among the older cohorts of their communities. The low proportion of multiple responses for the Chinese population (less than 6.5% in the 1991 Census) who are mainly recent immigrants and the relatively lower proportion for the older cohorts for each of the three other groups confirms this observation.

It should be noted that the low rate of multiple ethnicities for the Chinese population is also explained, in part, by other factors such as the impact of phenotype on maintaining cultural boundaries. The data from the 1991 Census show that of those who emigrated to Canada before 1946 only approximately 1/3 reported multiple origins (110 out of 310).

If I continue with Petersen's model, those who are in the intermediate and fringe sectors can be identified by the growing prevalence to report multiple origins. The measures provided in the Census do not allow us to distinguish the intermediate from the fringe. However, I suggest that as one moves away from the core, the number and range of multiple responses will tend to increase. I equate the intermediate sector with a blurring of ethnic boundaries. This is a transition stage leading to the redefinition of boundaries in the fringe sector. Therefore, in my interpretation of Petersen's model, the fringe for one group may, in fact, be the core for another.

The Census questions dealing with ethnic origin (see Appendix C) explicitly direct respondents to consider their ancestry as opposed to their identity. It has been suggested that in the more recent censuses respondents have tended to either ignore this distinction or to confuse one concept with the other. Factors such as the growing number of people reporting Canadian ancestry and the increase in the reporting of multiple origins have been used to support this position. A more detailed examination of the population reporting Canadian origins in the 1991 Census, either singly or as part of a multiple response, would shed some light on this issue. Those who responded Canadian to the question on ethnic origin and who are either immigrants or the first or second generation descendants of immigrants are probably reporting an ethnicity based on identity rather than ancestry. I suspect that a careful analysis of the 1991 Census data will show that such cases exist.

As the number of people marrying partners from ethnic groups other than their own increases, the number of multiple origins also increases. The 1991 Census question on ethnic origin refers to "this person's ancestors" in delimiting the number of generations to be considered. If the respondent interprets this to mean his or her parents and grandparents and if they are all from different ethnic groups, this individual would have four origins according to this question. Taking the example one generation further (i.e. to great-grandparents), the number of origins could increase to eight. I find it difficult to conceive of a situation where someone can accurately define their ethnic group on the basis of four origins, let alone eight! I suggest that in most instances the respondent will make a selection on the basis of a subset of the origins that is most meaningful in his or her life. In my interpretation this constitutes reporting perceived ethnicity rather than ancestry. This further strengthens the argument that the boundaries are being redefined by the respondents.

Some may argue that the growing rate of multiple responses suggests that Canada is, in effect, moving towards a melting pot. It is becoming increasingly difficult to classify those who fall in the "intermediate" or "fringe" groups in one of the traditional non-Canadian origins. However, is it not entirely possible that the definition of new ancestries is emerging from this debate? Perhaps the "fringe" group are not on the periphery, as the label implies. Perhaps they can be classified as having a "Canadian" or hyphenated Canadian ancestry or they may be forming entirely new groups, as I suggest above, based on an evolution that

can only occur when multiple ethnicities are brought together. With the possible exception of aboriginal people, most ethnic groups known today, regardless of their country of residence, have at some point in their history evolved through contact with other others. One may have to return to biblical times to find the sources.

6.2 Phenotype and Ethnic Boundaries

For some ethnic groups, physical characteristics such as skin colour, facial features and other racial features are an important consideration in determining membership in that community. In general, members of these ethnic groups tend to form social relations only with others within their community. For instance, the Indian community has very strong views with respect to selecting marriage partners from within their own ethnic group. The low rate of multiple responses for the Chinese community also suggests that lower rates of exogamy are probable.

Phenotype is also an important factor in external classification of people into ethnic groups, as defined by Isajiw (1993). History has shown that racial characteristics have often been used to separate people into different groups and classes. The examples that have been used in the discussion of social closure are evidence that this is equally true in contemporary times. Regardless of the motivation for and desirability of delineating groups based on racial characteristics, it is a fact that cannot be denied. It must be noted that, at times,

such boundaries are defined with the objective of being inclusive as well as exclusive.

6.3 Language and ethnic boundaries

The analysis has shown that language retention, as measured through mother tongue, tends to be relatively weak for the older (with respect to time in Canada) ethnic groups such as the Germans and Ukrainians. This is not surprising since the public educational system in Canada is centred on either English or French as the languages of instruction. Also, most of the daily business transactions are conducted in either or both of the two official languages. Finally, English and French are generally the languages used in the provision of social and community services. With respect to the Jewish population, it is also very difficult to define the boundaries on the basis of mother tongue since very few declare a specific ethnic language such as Hebrew or Yiddish. Therefore, although language may be a valid ethnic indicator during the early stages of migration for some groups, its influence on defining membership in an ethnic group fades over time.

6.4 The impact of the measurement vehicle

The 1971 Census question on ethnic origin was worded to encourage single responses and directed the respondent to consider only patrilineal descent. By 1981 both restrictions were removed from the question. Although the

increasing incidence of reporting multiple ethnic origins is evidence that the measurement vehicle can influence respondents, I question its extent and impact. For instance, the qualifier "on the male side" was dropped from the question on ethnic origin after the 1971 Census. If this change in descent rules for determining ancestry between 1971 and 1981 had an impact on respondents, one would expect to see an increase in the size of the cohorts for groups who define their ancestry along matrilineal lines and no change for those who define it along patrilineal lines. The data show that this was not the case. The size of the Jewish cohorts actually declined between 1971 and 1981 as did the Ukrainians and the Germans. This suggests that respondents will generally not compromise their ideological principles when reporting their ancestry. I can only present this as a conjecture at this point in time since a substantive qualitative study is required to confirm this observation.

6.5 Changing Boundaries

It has been shown in Section 5.2 that after controlling for immigration, variations which cannot be explained by demographic events occurred in the size of the German and Ukrainian groups between 1971 and 1991. Both groups show a marked increase in population between 1971 and 1986 (46.7% for the Germans and 36.9% for the Ukrainians). They also appear to be relatively stable between 1986 and 1991. Considering that the major change between 1971 and 1986 was

the inclusion of multiple origins in the data, this suggests rather strongly that the definition of the ethnic boundaries for these two groups changed over that time.

The figures in tables 5.1 and 5.2 also show that the Jewish and Chinese groups did not change dramatically, once immigration was taken into account, over the full 20 year period. Since the figures for 1986 and 1991 are calculated on the basis of total response and since multiple origins are significant for the Jewish population (approximately 30%), I suggest that the definition of the Jewish group boundaries has also changed over time, albeit not as dramatically as the German or Ukrainian groups. The differences are less pronounced for the Chinese group. This suggests to me that boundaries defined on the basis of phenotype, such as for the Chinese, are most stable over time.

Since these groups are considered representative, based on the model presented in Chapter 2, it is reasonable to assume that similar variations exist for other ethnic groups in Canada. What the data do not explain is why the boundaries are changing. One possible explanation is that a change occurred in how people perceived and reported their ancestries, given the incidence of multiple responses to ethnic origin for the German and Ukrainian groups. The view that respondents used to define their ancestry, as defined in Figure 2.1, changed because, for the first time, they were able to report more than one origin. In this way, they were probably able to more accurately reflect the impact of demographic events, such as exogamy, on their lives.

The reporting of Canadian origin, either singly or in combination with either German, Ukrainian or Jewish, is a special case which confirms the hypothesis that ethnic boundaries change over time. It has been suggested that since members of the English and French communities have been in Canada since before Confederation, many can no longer trace their ancestries to origins other than Canadian. The same conditions do not apply to either the Jewish, German or Ukrainian communities. With minor exceptions, respondents from all three communities can trace their ancestry to either parents or grandparents who immigrated to Canada within the last 80 to 100 years. Therefore, responses of "Canadian" by members of these communities to a question on ethnic origin in the Census can only be interpreted as an expression of a redefinition of the boundaries around the respective groups.

7. CONCLUSION

The evidence presented in Chapter 6 clearly indicates that reporting patterns change over time. It also shows that the impact is not uniform on all groups. In this chapter I present some thoughts on the causes of the observed changes and the extent and nature of the shift in ethnic boundaries for the four groups. I also speculate on whether or not these patterns can be imputed to all ethnic groups in Canada. I conclude with a proposed agenda for future research on this topic.

I have demonstrated, through the analysis of census data, that there is a distinct increase in the number of people reporting more than one ethnic origin. The data have also shown an increase in the number of people reporting "Canadian" origin, either as a single response or as part of a multiple response. The changes in reporting patterns can be attributed, in part, to changes in the design of the collection vehicle. However, the census questionnaire has evolved over time to reflect changes in Canadian society. This leaves us with a chicken and egg situation. Can it be said that these new reporting patterns are due to the instrument? I suggest that this is only partially true since the instrument reflects the evolution of the society. The other part of the explanation is that ethnic boundaries have shifted and new or modified ethnic groups have formed. These changes in reporting patterns also suggest that perhaps respondents are reporting both the subjective and objective dimensions of their membership in ethnic groups rather than merely providing their ancestry.

There is no doubt that the design of the collection instrument and the collection and processing methods have an impact on respondents. Most social scientists agree that proper questionnaire design is fundamental for all surveying activities. The effort and expense that national statistical agencies incur in preparing for major surveys and censuses attests to the importance they place on proper design. However, the analysis of the impact of the change in descent paradigms between 1971 and 1981 shows that the instrument has a limited influence on respondents on selected issues. Although it has been proven in countless tests and experiments that improper design will yield poor results and that proper design will result in consistent and relatively accurate data, the example of the descent paradigms suggests to me that respondents in Canada are not willing to compromise their ideological beliefs and principles regardless of the design of the questionnaire.

The factors that influence shifts in ethnic group boundaries can be classified on a continuum ranging from those that are relatively weak in effect to those that are extremely strong.

WEAK**STRONG**

Language, as in the case of the German group, is an extremely weak characteristic on which to define ethnic boundaries, especially when the lingua franca of the place of residence is different from the mother tongue of the immigrants. Similarly, the greater the number of generations born in Canada, the weaker will be the ethnic retention. It is also true, based on the cohorts, that the younger respondents are more likely to have more than one origin. In this sense age is a weak factor of retention. Conversely, phenotype, as with the Chinese, recent immigration to Canada and age, as in elderly, are strong factors of retention. Religion falls somewhere in between, depending on the situation and

on the group being defined. It is strong for groups like the Jews and weak for the Germans.

If one proceeds with caution it is possible to impute the results of this analysis to other groups in Canadian society. However, the results cannot be generalized. The first caution is that the characteristics that define the target group must be identical to those of the donor group. For instance, it is not advisable to suggest that the Spanish group behaves in a manner similar to the Germans. Although language is a major factor in defining both groups, geography also plays a significant role in defining the Spanish. The second caveat is that one should not impute trends from these data. Depending on the degree of boundary shift, the comparisons may no longer be valid after a period of time. For example, one cannot consider messianic Jews to be part of the Jewish group since they form an entirely new group based on different characteristics.

Any discussion on a topic as complex as the shifting of ethnic boundaries tends to raise almost as many questions as it answers. I have made a number of references to issues that are not covered in this study. Each of these can be considered a major topic for further research in this field. The following list presents a few of the questions that I would like to pursue in the future. There is no significance to the sequence nor do I assume that these questions do not already form part of someone else's research agenda. In fact, I hope that

publication of this list will encourage others to come forward with their ideas. The complexity of the topic certainly merits collective thought.

- An attitudinal survey should be conducted to determine whether changes such as amending the descent rules influence respondents. The survey should also measure the significance of the number and sequence of multiple responses to a question on ethnic origin.
- I have noted that the incidence of people declaring "Canadian" origins has increased. At this time very little is known about these respondents. A detailed examination of census data from 1986 and 1991 should yield an interesting profile of this (or these) ethnic group(s). Are we witnessing the emergence of the hyphenated Canadian? Is there any significance to the other responses that are included with Canadian? How do these relate to period of immigration, age, marital status, family structure, etc.?
- Are there generational differences in how ethnic origin is reported? For instance, I have shown that recent immigrants tend to report single origins whereas those born in Canada have shown a propensity towards multiple origins. Are there differences in how the first, second, third and subsequent generations define their ethnic group?
- Do ethnic groups that are primarily rural based behave differently with respect to the definition and retention of boundaries from those that are concentrated in urban areas? Judging by communities such as the Mennonites and the Amish I suspect that they do. However, can this be generalized to all rural group?
- What is the impact of international events on ethnic groups living in Canada. For example, do the events in the Middle East affect the relationship between members of the Moslem and Jewish Communities in Canada? Can it be said that those who are born in Canada view the events differently than those who are first generation immigrants? I am aware of one study being conducted on the expatriate Croatian community in Canada by Daphne Winland of the University of Toronto.

As I indicated earlier, this list is neither exhaustive nor complete. However, it is indicative of the breadth and scope of the topic. I believe that this thesis only scratches the surface.

NOTES

1. For the Chinese and the East Indians, mother tongue may be tied to particular regions within the country considered to be their home land. Therefore, more than one mother tongue may apply for either of these groups.
2. In 1991 the crude rate was 14.9 births per 1000 population and the total fertility rate was 1.8
3. According to the 1991 Census, the respective proportion of the population 15 years and older for the 4 ethnic groups born in Canada was 64% for the Jews, 14% for the Chinese, 83% for the Germans and 91% for the Ukrainians.

For analytic purposes I have chosen to exclude the ambilineal descent tradition practiced by the Jewish Reform Movement from this table.
5. I recognize that the Aboriginal people predate all other groups in Canada. However, it would be improper to consider them an ethnic group. They are, in effect, many ethnic groups defined by language, religion and geography. Furthermore, they are generally excluded from analyses and comparisons of ethnic groups and communities by mutual agreement (between Aboriginal groups and researchers).
6. The ultra-orthodox are intentionally omitted from this comparison since they constitute an exception within the Jewish community, as would any fundamentalist sect. Their relations with society at large differ from those of the rest of the Jewish community.
7. Net migration is defined as immigration minus emigration.
8. Net natural increase is the number of births in a given period less the number of deaths in the same period.
9. Data are collected by interview on Indian Reserves and in remote areas.

APPENDIX A: Data Tables

Table A.1 Jewish Population - Single Responses for 81, 86 & 91

COHORT	1971 Census			1981 Census			1986 Census			1991 Census		
	n	%	RATIO	n	%	RATIO	n	%	RATIO	n	%	RATIO
1	26,945	25.34	103.40	22,400	24.83	107.70	20,205	24.48	100.45	20,140	25.39	95.96
2	28,555	26.85	107.45	24,555	27.22	109.07	22,675	27.48	108.22	21,510	27.11	108.03
3	21,305	20.04	107.40	17,650	19.56	109.25	16,020	19.41	108.12	15,480	19.51	104.09
4	14,780	13.90	101.71	12,890	14.29	99.84	11,950	14.48	101.01	11,400	14.44	111.05
5	14,750	13.87	96.21	12,720	14.10	104.17	11,675	14.15	101.03	10,745	13.54	95.00
TOTAL	106,335	100.00	103.98	90,215	100.00	106.70	82,525	100.00	104.17	79,330	100.00	102.22

Table A.2 Chinese Population - Single Responses for 86 & 91

COHORT	1971 Census			1981 Census			1986 Census			1991 Census		
	n	%	RATIO	n	%	RATIO	n	%	RATIO	n	%	RATIO
1	9,440	18.32	120.05	11,320	26.67	100.83	36,980	28.30	98.55	59,215	31.13	94.36
2	11,275	21.88	115.58	32,225	27.44	95.66	35,580	27.23	96.63	53,095	27.91	99.32
3	8,570	16.63	84.99	18,285	15.57	101.93	19,790	15.15	95.55	27,420	14.41	97.69
4	11,225	21.73	97.28	18,740	15.96	103.31	19,765	15.13	100.76	25,845	13.59	105.77
5	11,010	21.37	162.26	16,850	14.35	137.99	18,535	14.19	117.48	24,660	12.96	105.64
TOTAL	51,520	100.00	114.31	117,420	100.00	104.50	130,650	100.00	100.36	190,235	100.00	99.17

Table A.3 German Population - Single Responses for 86 & 91

COHORT	1971 Census			1981 Census			1986 Census			1991 Census		
	n	%	RATIO	n	%	RATIO	n	%	RATIO	n	%	RATIO
1	116,315	23.07	102.33	103,345	24.08	102.29	74,385	22.01	110.38	72,840	21.87	104.84
2	100,245	20.67	99.96	88,035	20.51	107.13	63,295	18.73	109.66	63,215	18.98	106.67
3	97,775	19.39	104.73	78,045	18.19	105.45	62,115	18.38	107.19	62,175	18.67	103.54
4	92,675	18.38	104.99	76,840	18.37	105.89	67,995	20.12	101.80	67,005	20.12	102.73
5	93,225	18.49	110.43	80,895	18.85	111.37	70,155	20.76	110.45	67,760	20.35	109.36
TOTAL	504,235	100.00	104.23	429,180	100.00	106.19	337,945	100.00	107.89	332,995	100.00	105.31

Table A.4 Ukrainian Population - Single Responses for 86 & 91

COHORT	1971 Census			1981 Census			1986 Census			1991 Census		
	n	%	RATIO	n	%	RATIO	n	%	RATIO	n	%	RATIO
1	53,280	26.11	102.11	47,235	24.91	103.20	35,235	22.94	108.61	34,015	22.73	112.86
2	45,745	22.42	99.32	42,800	22.47	107.68	33,845	21.62	109.11	31,900	21.31	100.94
3	37,830	18.54	102.00	35,415	18.68	107.81	29,770	19.13	103.17	28,720	19.19	105.92
4	32,855	16.01	101.76	30,950	16.33	102.25	27,520	17.68	104.65	26,520	17.72	100.67
5	34,530	16.92	99.15	33,390	17.61	97.20	29,475	18.94	100.27	28,525	19.06	93.03
TOTAL	204,020	100.00	100.94	189,595	100.00	103.78	156,845	100.00	105.34	149,680	100.00	102.87

Table A.5 Jewish Population - Total Response

COHORT	1971 Census			1981 Census			1986 Census			1991 Census		
	n	%	RATIO	n	%	RATIO	n	%	RATIO	n	%	RATIO
1	26,945	25.34	103.40	25,245	25.19	107.52	29,190	25.73	97.80	31,380	26.98	92.92
2	28,555	26.85	107.45	27,420	27.36	106.71	31,605	27.86	102.66	31,860	27.65	106.02
3	21,305	20.04	107.40	19,475	19.43	109.24	22,230	19.60	107.13	22,275	19.33	103.01
4	14,780	13.90	101.71	14,180	14.15	99.79	15,810	13.94	98.00	15,775	13.69	108.11
5	14,750	13.87	96.21	13,895	13.87	105.62	14,605	12.87	100.76	14,220	12.34	97.50
TOTAL	106,335	100.00	103.98	100,215	100.00	106.24	113,440	100.00	101.33	115,210	100.00	100.97

Table A.6 Chinese Population - Total Response

COHORT	1971 Census			1981 Census			1986 Census			1991 Census		
	n	%	RATIO	n	%	RATIO	n	%	RATIO	n	%	RATIO
1	9,440	18.32	120.05	31,320	26.67	100.83	41,735	28.99	97.89	63,340	31.17	93.85
2	11,275	21.88	115.58	32,225	27.44	95.66	39,230	27.25	96.89	56,480	27.77	98.02
3	8,570	16.63	84.99	18,285	15.57	101.93	22,095	15.35	95.06	30,010	14.76	97.66
4	11,225	21.79	97.28	18,740	15.96	103.31	21,240	14.75	100.38	27,510	13.53	104.69
5	11,010	21.37	162.26	16,850	14.35	137.99	19,680	13.66	116.04	25,970	12.77	105.13
TOTAL	51,520	100.00	114.31	117,420	100.00	104.50	143,960	100.00	99.83	203,350	100.00	98.39

Table A.7 German Population - Total Response

COHORT	1971 Census			1981 Census			1986 Census			1991 Census		
	n	%	RATIO	n	%	RATIO	n	%	RATIO	n	%	RATIO
1	116,45	23.07	102.33	103,345	24.08	102.29	208,250	27.74	95.91	213,465	28.13	91.42
2	104,245	20.67	99.96	88,035	20.51	107.13	172,020	22.92	99.37	175,930	23.18	97.13
3	97,775	19.39	104.73	78,045	18.19	105.45	137,285	18.29	102.87	138,125	18.20	99.04
4	92,675	18.38	104.89	78,840	18.37	105.89	120,965	16.11	100.26	121,555	16.02	99.88
5	93,225	18.49	110.43	80,895	18.85	111.37	112,155	14.94	106.81	109,760	14.46	103.86
TOTAL	504,235	100.00	104.23	429,160	100.00	106.19	750,675	100.00	100.24	758,835	100.00	97.20

Table A.8 Ukrainian Population - Total Response

COHORT	1971 Census			1981 Census			1986 Census			1991 Census		
	n	%	RATIO	n	%	RATIO	n	%	RATIO	n	%	RATIO
1	53,260	26.11	102.11	47,235	24.91	103.20	83,080	29.57	100.59	82,175	29.99	98.54
2	45,745	22.42	99.32	42,800	22.47	107.68	68,180	24.28	101.18	66,485	24.27	99.50
3	37,830	18.54	102.00	35,415	18.68	107.81	50,670	18.04	102.78	49,045	17.90	103.53
4	32,855	16.01	101.76	30,955	16.33	102.25	40,250	14.33	104.13	38,575	14.08	98.48
5	34,530	16.92	99.36	33,390	17.61	97.20	38,705	13.78	100.34	37,700	13.76	96.30
TOTAL	204,020	100.00	100.94	189,595	100.00	103.78	280,805	100.00	101.59	273,980	100.00	99.33

Table A.9 Religion - Jewish Cohorts

COHORT	RELIGION	1971		1981			1991		
		n	%	n	%	% Change	n	%	% Change
1	Total	26,945	100.00	25,245	100.00	6.31	31,080	100.00	23.11
	Catholic	260	0.96	485	1.92	86.54	1,225	3.94	152.58
	Protestant	650	2.41	825	3.27	26.92	2,100	6.76	154.55
	Jewish	24,950	92.60	21,690	85.92	13.07	23,340	75.23	7.79
	Other	1,085	4.03	2,245	8.89	106.91	4,375	14.08	94.88
2	Total	28,555	100.00	27,420	100.00	3.97	31,855	100.00	16.17
	Catholic	365	1.28	375	1.37	2.74	930	2.92	148.00
	Protestant	670	2.35	915	3.34	36.57	2,000	6.28	118.58
	Jewish	25,765	90.23	23,395	85.32	9.20	24,785	77.81	5.94
	Other	1,750	6.13	2,730	9.96	56.00	4,140	13.00	51.65
3	Total	21,310	100.00	19,480	100.00	-8.59	22,275	100.00	14.35
	Catholic	315	1.48	265	1.36	-15.87	740	3.32	179.25
	Protestant	590	2.77	590	3.03	0.00	1,400	6.29	137.29
	Jewish	18,900	88.69	16,890	86.70	-10.63	17,425	78.23	-3.17
	Other	1,505	7.06	1,735	8.91	15.28	2,715	12.19	56.48
4	Total	14,780	100.00	14,180	100.00	-4.06	15,770	100.00	11.21
	Catholic	215	1.45	235	1.66	9.30	590	3.74	151.06
	Protestant	365	2.47	390	2.75	6.85	940	5.96	141.03
	Jewish	13,395	90.63	12,420	87.59	-7.28	12,575	79.74	-1.25
	Other	805	5.45	1,135	8.00	40.99	1,665	10.56	46.70
5	Total	14,745	100.00	13,895	100.00	-5.76	14,215	100.00	2.30
	Catholic	210	1.42	180	1.30	-14.29	360	2.53	100.00
	Protestant	335	2.27	290	2.09	-13.43	720	5.07	148.78
	Jewish	13,590	92.17	12,510	90.75	-7.21	11,915	83.82	-5.51
	Other	610	4.14	815	5.87	33.61	1,220	8.58	49.69
Total	Total	106,335	100.00	100,220	100.00	-5.75	115,195	100.00	14.94
	Catholic	1,365	1.28	1,540	1.54	12.82	3,845	3.34	149.68
	Protestant	2,610	2.45	3,010	3.00	15.33	7,160	6.22	137.87
	Jewish	96,600	90.84	87,005	86.81	-9.93	90,080	78.20	-3.53
	Other	5,755	5.41	8,660	8.64	50.48	14,115	12.25	62.99

Table A.10 Religion - Chinese Cohorts

COHORT	RELIGION	1971		1981			1991		
		n	%	n	%	% Change	n	%	% Change
1	Total	9435	100	31320	100	231.96	63380	100	102.36
	Catholic	1080	11.45	5410	17.27	400.93	10425	16.45	92.7
	Protestant	3745	39.69	5200	16.6	38.85	6835	10.78	31.44
	Other	4610	48.86	20670	66	348.37	46095	72.73	123
2	Total	11270	100	32230	100	185.98	56480	100	75.24
	Catholic	1755	15.57	6265	19.44	256.98	11060	19.58	76.54
	Protestant	3605	31.99	5770	17.9	60.06	5930	10.5	2.77
	Other	5910	52.44	20170	62.58	241.29	39470	69.88	95.69
3	Total	8565	100	18280	100	113.43	30010	100	64.17
	Catholic	1715	20.02	3870	21.17	125.66	5855	19.51	51.29
	Protestant	2800	32.69	3735	20.43	33.39	3620	12.06	-3.08
	Other	4055	47.34	10660	58.32	162.89	20520	68.38	92.5
4	Total	11225	100	18735	100	66.9	27510	100	46.84
	Catholic	1660	14.79	3030	16.17	82.53	4330	15.74	42.9
	Protestant	4095	36.48	4155	22.18	1.47	3415	12.41	-17.81
	Other	5465	48.69	11535	61.57	111.07	19770	71.86	71.39
5	Total	11015	100	16845	100	52.93	25965	100	54.14
	Catholic	1090	9.9	1960	11.64	79.82	2800	10.78	42.86
	Protestant	4175	37.9	3850	22.86	-7.78	3465	13.34	-10
	Jewish	0	0	20	0.12	0	5	0.02	-75
	Other	5750	52.2	11015	65.39	91.57	19695	75.85	78.8
Total	Total	51510	100	117410	100	127.94	203345	100	73.19
	Catholic	7300	14.17	20535	17.49	181.3	34470	16.95	67.86
	Protestant	18420	35.76	22710	19.34	23.29	23265	11.44	2.44
	Other	25790	50.07	74050	63.07	187.13	145550	71.58	96.56

Table A.11 Religion - German Cohorts

COHORT	RELIGION	1971		1981			1991		
		n	%	n	%	% Change	n	%	% Change
1	Total	116,315	100.00	103,345	100.00	11.15	213,460	100.00	106.55
	Catholic	30,410	26.14	25,545	24.72	16.00	51,070	23.92	99.92
	Protestant	73,985	63.61	60,075	58.13	18.80	110,275	51.66	83.56
	Jewish	0	0.00	115	0.11	0	690	0.32	200.00
	Other	11,920	10.25	17,605	17.04	47.69	51,340	24.05	191.62
2	Total	104,245	100.00	88,035	100.00	15.55	175,935	100.00	99.85
	Catholic	27,215	26.11	21,690	24.64	20.30	41,705	23.70	92.28
	Protestant	64,030	61.42	51,680	58.70	19.29	94,470	53.73	82.80
	Jewish	0	0.00	155	0.18		635	0.36	309.68
	Other	13,000	12.47	14,505	16.48	11.58	39,085	22.22	169.46
3	Total	97,770	100.00	78,040	100.00	20.18	138,120	100.00	76.99
	Catholic	24,865	25.43	19,320	24.76	22.30	33,210	24.04	71.89
	Protestant	60,865	62.25	47,415	60.76	22.10	76,945	55.71	62.28
	Jewish	0	0.00	135	0.17		430	0.31	218.52
	Other	12,040	12.31	11,160	14.30	-7.31	27,495	19.91	146.37
4	Total	92,680	100.00	78,840	100.00	14.93	121,550	100.00	54.17
	Catholic	24,300	26.22	20,125	25.53	17.18	29,625	24.37	47.20
	Protestant	58,670	63.30	49,385	62.64	15.83	71,220	58.59	44.21
	Jewish	0	0.00	70	0.09		255	0.21	264.29
	Other	9,710	10.48	9,260	11.75	4.63	20,420	16.80	120.52
5	Total	93,225	100.00	80,890	100.00	13.23	109,760	100.00	35.69
	Catholic	24,285	26.05	20,750	25.65	14.56	27,310	24.88	31.61
	Protestant	59,925	64.28	51,375	63.51	14.27	65,580	59.75	27.05
	Jewish	0	0.00	95	0.12		185	0.17	94.74
	Other	9,005	9.66	8,675	10.72	-3.66	16,685	15.20	92.33
Total	Total	504,235	100.00	429,150	100.00	14.89	758,825	100.00	76.82
	Catholic	131,075	25.99	107,430	25.03	18.54	182,920	24.11	70.27
	Protestant	317,475	62.96	259,930	60.57	19.13	418,490	55.15	61.00
	Jewish	0	0.00	570	0.13		2,195	0.29	285.09
	Other	55,675	11.04	61,205	14.26	9.93	155,025	20.43	153.29

Table A.12 Religion - Ukrainian Cohorts

COHORT	RELIGION	1971		1981			1991		
		n	%	n	%	% Change	n	%	% Change
1	Total	53260	100	47235	100	-11.31	82180	100	73.98
	Catholic	25230	47.37	20940	44.33	-17	30410	37	45.22
	Protestant	15060	28.28	12720	26.93	-15.54	26145	31.81	105.54
	Ukrainian Orthodox			475			2380		401.05
	Jewish	0	0	85	0.18		330	0.4	288.24
	Other	12975	24.36	13025	27.57	0.39	22910	27.88	75.89
2	Total	45745	100	42600	100	-6.88	66485	100	56.07
	Catholic	20860	45.6	19195	45.06	-7.98	24930	37.5	29.88
	Protestant	13195	28.84	11450	26.88	-13.22	20815	31.31	81.79
	Ukrainian Orthodox			400			2035		408.75
	Jewish	0	0	80	0.19		500	0.75	525
	Other	11690	25.55	11475	26.94	-1.84	18205	27.38	58.65
3	Total	37825	100	35415	100	-6.37	49050	100	38.5
	Catholic	16950	44.81	15785	44.57	-6.87	19215	40.46	25.72
	Protestant	11225	29.68	9805	27.69	-12.65	14570	29.7	48.6
	Ukrainian Orthodox			315			1755		457.14
	Jewish	0	0	50	0.14		245	0.5	390
	Other	9660	25.54	9450	26.68	-2.17	12630	25.75	33.65
4	Total	32650	100	30955	100	-5.19	38570	100	24.6
	Catholic	14540	44.53	13625	44.02	-6.29	15675	40.64	15.05
	Protestant	9675	29.63	8875	28.67	-8.27	11500	29.82	29.58
	Ukrainian Orthodox			320			1755		448.44
	Jewish	0	0	60	0.19		215	0.56	258.33
	Other	8440	25.85	8075	26.09	-4.32	9425	24.44	16.72
5	Total	34530	100	33390	100	-3.3	37700	100	12.91
	Catholic	15045	43.57	14705	44.04	-2.26	15225	40.38	3.54
	Protestant	10450	30.26	9435	28.26	-9.71	11375	30.17	20.56
	Ukrainian Orthodox			370			1910		416.22
	Jewish	0	0	55	0.16		135	0.36	145.45
	Other	9035	26.17	8820	26.42	-2.38	9055	24.02	2.66
Total	Total	204010	100	189595	100	-7.07	273985	100	44.51
	Catholic	92625	45.4	84250	44.44	-8.64	108085	38.72	25.92
	Protestant	59605	29.22	52285	27.58	-12.28	84405	30.81	61.43
	Ukrainian Orthodox			1880			9835		423.14
	Jewish	0	0	330	0.17		1425	0.52	331.82
	Other	51800	25.39	50845	26.82	-1.84	72225	26.36	42.05

APPENDIX B: Chronology of Census Methods

Census Year	Collection	Sampling	Geography	Content	Terminology	Significant Differences from Previous Census
1871	Canvasser	None	Ontario, Québec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia	Population (including Socio-demographic and economic), Housing and Families, Health, Vital Statistics, Agriculture, Economic, Primary Industries.	Origin refers to ethnic origin. It includes national origins (e.g. Dutch, English, etc.), cultural origins (e.g. Jewish), religious origins (e.g. "Hindoo") and race (e.g. African [Nors], Half breed, Indian)	
1881	Canvasser	None	Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Québec, Ontario, Manitoba, British Columbia, The Territories	Population (including Socio-demographic and economic), Housing and Families, Health, Vital Statistics, Agriculture, Economic, Primary Industries.	Same as 1871	Greatly expanded geographic coverage
1891	Canvasser	None	Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Québec, Ontario, Manitoba, British Columbia, The Territories	Population (including Socio-demographic and economic), Housing and Families, Health, Vital Statistics, Agriculture, Economic, Primary Industries.	Not applicable	This census was essentially a repeat of the 1881 Census without a question dealing with origins
1901	Canvasser	None	Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Québec, Ontario, Manitoba, British Columbia, The Territories (Alberta, Assiniboia East, Assiniboia West, Saskatchewan, Unorganized)	Population (including Socio-demographic and economic), Housing and Families, Health, Vital Statistics, Agriculture, Business, Primary Industries	The rules for descent were clearly patrilineal for the white population. Any mixture including some Aboriginal origin was classified as "other breed", regardless of which parent was Indian. Also, Japanese, Chinese and Negro were considered proper racial terms. Descent for these groups was implied but not specified. Tabulations included national, cultural and racial origins under the heading "racial origins".	Greater geographic detail The adjectives racial or tribal were introduced to qualify origins. They appear as footnotes and in the instructions but not in the tables

Census Year	Collection	Sampling	Geography	Content	Terminology	Significant Differences from Previous Census
1911	Carrvasser	None	Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Québec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia, Yukon, The Northwest Territories	Population (including Socio-demographic and economic), Housing and Families, Health, Vital Statistics, Disability, Agriculture, Economic, Primary Industries	Racial or tribal origin was derived along patrilineal lines except for the Indians where the origin is traced through the mother; and names of their tribes should be given, as Chippewa, Cree, etc. Also, children of marriage between white and black or yellow races will be classed as Negro or Mongolian, (Chinese or Japanese) as the case may be.	Expanded geography to include the new provinces Official sanction to use the Royal North West Mounted Police or other agents to collect the data on reserves and in the Northwest Territories
1921	Carrvasser	None	Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Québec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia, Yukon, The Northwest Territories	Population (including all characteristics), Housing and Families, Agriculture.	Patrilineal descent was applied for the white population. Matrilineal descent for the Native population. In the case of mixed races the instructions forces a non-white classification, regardless of which parent was non-white.	It was explicitly mentioned that a response of Canadian or American was not appropriate (not allowed) for the question on Racial or Tribal Origin. The tabulations grouped origins under the headings "British races", "European races", "Asiatic races", "Indian", "Negro", "Various" and "Unspecified".
1931	Carrvasser	None	Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Québec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia, Yukon, The Northwest Territories	Population (including all characteristics), Housing and Family, Agriculture, Merchandising & Services.	Same as 1921. Monograph by Hurd used terms such as "racial origins" and "stocks" when discussing ethnic origin and ancestry.	The monograph series. No specific mention was made of excluding Canadian as a response
1941	Carrvasser	10% sample for the housing questionnaire.	Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Québec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia, Yukon, The Northwest Territories	Population (including all characteristics), Agriculture, Merchandising.	Patrilineal descent was applied to the white population. "Aborigines" were classified either as Indian, Eskimo or Half-Breed. People of mixed blood were imputed the non-white racial category, regardless of which parent was white. Race was interpreted to mean descent from a common ancestor. The tabulations used headings similar to 1921.	References to tribal origins were dropped from the question and from the instructions. The question referred only to racial origin.
1951	Carrvasser	20% sample for the housing questionnaire	Canada as we know it today	Population (including all characteristics), Housing and Family, Agriculture, Retail and Wholesale Trade, Fisheries	Patrilineal descent was the dominant rule for determining origin. Mother tongue of the father was used to determine the respondent's origin.	Newfoundland was added to the geographic coverage. This was the first instance of the use of the term Native Indian (North American) in the Census. The term "racial" was dropped from the vocabulary of the Census. However, the groupings remained the same as in previous censuses.

Census Year	Collection	Sampling	Geography	Content	Terminology	Significant Differences from Previous Census
1961	Carnasser	A short form (2A) was administered to 80% of the households and a long form (2B) was administered to one in every 5 households in urban areas and to every household in remote areas and on reserves	Canada as we know it today	Population (including all characteristics), Housing and Families, Agriculture	Descent was determined along patrilineal lines. Mother tongue of the respondent, or the respondent's "ancestor on the male side" was used to determine ethnic or cultural group. For Native Indians the enumerators were instructed to determine whether or not they were Band members. Respondents of mixed white and Indian parentage were coded as Indian if they lived on reserve. If they lived off reserve they were coded according to patrilineal lines.	The question used to determine ancestry was the first to refer to ethnic or cultural origins. In essence, this Census "inherited" a tradition for wording the question and the concept. Different descent rules were applied for the metropolitan living on reserve and those living off reserve. Specific mention is made of band membership. The category Canadian was accepted as a write-in if the respondent insisted on this. Also ethnic groups were listed individually in tables without being grouped under quasi-racial headings (e.g. Asiatic)
1971	Self-enumeration except on reserves and remote regions. Questionnaires were delivered and picked up by the enumerators	1/5 sample was used for the 2B questionnaire. However, all carver areas were administered a 2B questionnaire	Canada as we know it today	Population (including all characteristics), Housing and Families, Agriculture	Same as 1961	A mark-sense technology (FOSDIC) developed at the United States Bureau of the Census was used to capture the data from the census questionnaires. Advanced statistical methods were introduced to correct for errors and non-response. This was the first census to use self-enumeration for most of the population
1981	Self-enumeration except in carver areas. Questionnaires were dropped off by the enumerators and mailed back in most parts (urban areas) of the country	Sampling ratio was 20% for the 2B questionnaire	Canada as we know it today	Population (including all characteristics), Housing and Families, Agriculture	No specific rules were imposed on how ancestry was to be established. Although multiple responses were not encouraged, they were captured when present. Also, Canadian was accepted as a response when written in by the respondent. The question included four categories for the Aboriginal people: Status Indian, Non-status Indian, Metis and Inuit	All carver areas (i.e. reserves and remote areas) were administered a 2B questionnaire. Key entry at Revenue Canada-Taxation was used to capture the data. This Census presented a major departure from the past with respect to the descent rules that were to be applied for ethnic origin. In addition, major new systems and methodologies were introduced to process the data
1986	Same as 1981	Same as 1981	Canada as we know it today	Population, including all characteristics except religion, Housing and Families, Agriculture	No specific rules were imposed on how ancestry was to be established. Multiple responses were encouraged and they were captured when present. Also, Canadian was accepted as a response when written in by the respondent. The question included four categories for the Aboriginal people: Status Indian, Non-status Indian, Metis and Inuit	This was the first quinquennial Census which included comprehensive content. In most other respects it was a repeat of the 1981 Census with the notable exception that multiple responses for ethnic origin were encouraged. A post-censal survey was conducted on health and activity indicators

Census Year	Collection	Sampling	Geography	Content	Terminology	Significant Differences from Previous Census
1991	Self enumeration except in canvasser areas. Questionnaires were dropped off by the enumerators and mailed back in most parts (urban areas) of the country.	20% sample for the 28 questionnaire except in canvasser areas where every household was administered a 28 questionnaire	Canada as we know it today	Population (including all characteristics); Housing and Families; Agriculture	The wording of the question on ethnic origin allowed for multiple responses. It was essentially a repeat of the question used in 1986	Two post-censal surveys were conducted in conjunction with the Census. One dealt with the Aboriginal population. The other dealt with disabilities. Major public consultations were conducted to determine the content of the Census. A specific questionnaire was developed for canvasser areas (e.g. reserves). The tradition of a monograph program was re-established.

APPENDIX C: Census Questions on Ethnic Origin

15 To what ethnic or cultural group did you or your ancestor
(on the male side) belong on coming to this continent?

☐ English	☐ Native Indian
Band	☐ Polish
☐ French	☐ Native Indian
- Non-band	☐ Scottish
☐ German	☐ Netherlands	☐ Ukrainian
☐ Irish	☐ Norwegian	
☐ Italian		
☐ Jewish		

Other write here

1971 Census

26. To which ethnic or cultural group did you or your ancestors belong
on first coming to this continent?

(See guide for further information)

☐ French	Native Peoples
☐ English	☐ Inuit
☐ Irish	☐ Status or registered Indian
☐ Scottish	☐ Non-status Indian
☐ German	☐ Métis
☐ Italian	
☐ Ukrainian	
☐ Dutch (Netherlands)	
☐ Polish	
☐ Jewish	
☐ Chinese	

Other (specify)

1981 Census

-
17. To which ethnic or cultural group(s) do you or did your ancestors belong? (See Guide)

Mark or specify as many as applicable

- ☐ French
- ☐ English
- ☐ Irish
- ☐ Scottish
- ☐ German
- ☐ Italian
- ☐ Ukrainian
- ☐ Dutch (Netherlands)
- ☐ Chinese
- ☐ Jewish
- ☐ Polish
- ☐ Black
- ☐ Inuit
- ☐ North American Indian
- ☐ Métis

Other ethnic or cultural group(s). For example, Portuguese, Greek, Indian (India), Pakistani, Filipino, Japanese, Vietnamese. (specify below)

Other (specify)

Other (specify)

Other (specify)

1986 Census

15. To which ethnic or cultural group(s) did this person's ancestors belong?

Mark or specify as many as applicable

Note:

While most people of Canada view themselves as Canadian, information about their ancestral origins has been collected since the 1901 Census to reflect the changing composition of the Canadian population and is needed to ensure that everyone, regardless of his/her ethnic or cultural background, has equal opportunity to share fully in the economic, social, cultural and political life of Canada. Therefore, this question refers to the origins of this person's ancestors.

See Guide.

- ☐ French
- ☐ English
- ☐ German
- ☐ Scottish
- ☐ Italian
- ☐ Irish
- ☐ Ukrainian
- ☐ Chinese
- ☐ Dutch (Netherlands)
- ☐ Jewish
- ☐ Polish
- ☐ Black
- ☐ North American Indian
- ☐ Métis
- ☐ Inuit/Eskimo

Other ethnic or cultural group(s) - Specify

Examples of other ethnic or cultural groups are:
Portuguese, Greek, Indian from India, Pakistani, Filipino,
Vietnamese, Japanese, Lebanese, Haitian, etc.

| |
| |
| |
| |

REFERENCES

- Abella, Irving and Harold Troper. 1982. *None is too many: Canada and the Jews of Europe*, New York: Random House
- Alba, Richard D. 1990. *Ethnic Identity: The Transformation of White America*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Alonso, William and Paul Starr. 1983. *The Politics of Numbers*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation
- Banton, Michael. 1987. *Racial Theories*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Barth, Frederik. 1969. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference*, London: Allen & Unwin.
- Blau, Peter M. and Joseph E. Schwartz. 1984. *Crosscutting Social Circles: Testing a Macrostructural Theory of Intergroup Relations*, Orlando: Academic Press
- Brym, Robert J., William Shaffir and Morton Weinfeld ,eds. 1993. *The Jews in Canada*, Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Boyd, Monica. 1990. *Ethno-Cultural Questions on the General Social Survey: An Assessment*, Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Butz, William and Gustave Goldmann. 1993. "Introduction" in Statistics Canada and U.S. Bureau of the Census, *The Measurement of Ethnicity: Science, politics and reality*, Gustave J. Goldmann and Nampeo McKenney, eds, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 15-21
- Census of Canada 1870-71. 1873. Volume 1, Ottawa: I. B. Taylor
- Census of Manitoba 1885-86. 1887. Ottawa: Maclean, Rodger & Co.
- CJF. 1991. *Highlights of the CJF 1990 National Jewish Population Survey*, New York: Council of Jewish Federations
- Clement, Wallace. 1985. "The Canadian Corporate Elite: Ethnicity and Inequality of Access" in *Ethnicity and Ethnic Relations in Canada*, Rita Bienvenue and Jay Goldstein, eds, Toronto: Butterworths, 143-151

Cohen, Ronald. 1993. "Ethnicity, The State and Moral Order" in Statistics Canada and U.S. Bureau of the Census, *The Measurement of Ethnicity: Science, politics and reality*, Gustave J. Goldmann and Nampeo McKenney, eds, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 365-390

Darroch, Gordon A. 1985. "Another Look at Ethnicity, Stratification, and Social Mobility in Canada" in *Ethnicity and Ethnic Relations in Canada*, Rita Bienvenue and Jay Goldstein, eds, Toronto: Butterworths, 153-179

Driedger, Leo and Neena Chappell. 1987. *Aging and Ethnicity: Toward an Interface*, Toronto: Butterworths.

Elliott, Jean Leonard and Augie Fleras. 1990. "Immigration and the Canadian Ethnic Mosaic" in *Race and Ethnic Relations in Canada*, Peter S. Li, ed, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 51-76

Gerus, O.W. and J.E. Rea. 1985. *The Ukrainians in Canada*, Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association.

Goldscheider, Calvin. 1993. "What Does Ethnic/Racial Differentiation Mean? Implications for Measurement and Analyses" in Statistics Canada and U.S. Bureau of the Census, *The Measurement of Ethnicity: Science, politics and reality*, Gustave J. Goldmann and Nampeo McKenney, eds, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 391-406

Goldstein, Jay E. 1985. "The Prestige Dimension of Ethnic Stratification" in *Ethnicity and Ethnic Relations in Canada*, Rita Bienvenue and Jay Goldstein, eds, Toronto: Butterworths, 181-197

Herberg, Edward N. 1989. *Ethnic Groups in Canada: Adaptations and Transitions*, Scarborough: Nelson Canada

Isajiw, Wsevolod W. 1993. "Definition and Dimensions of Ethnicity: A theoretical framework." in Statistics Canada and U.S. Bureau of the Census, *The Measurement of Ethnicity: Science, politics and reality*, Gustave J. Goldmann and Nampeo McKenney, eds, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 407-427

Jary, David and Julia Jary. 1991. *Collins Dictionary of Sociology*, Glasgow: Harper Collins Manufacturing

Jasso, Guillermina and Mark R. Rosenzweig. 1990. *The New Chosen People: Immigrants in the United States*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation

Kalbach, Warren E. and Madeline A. Richard. 1990. "Ethno-Religious Identity and Acculturation" in *Ethnic Demography: Canadian Immigrant, Racial and Cultural Variations*, Shiva S. Halli, Frank Trovato and Leo Driedger, eds, Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 179-197

Kobrin, Frances E. and Calvin Goldscheider. 1978. *The Ethnic Factor in Family Structure and Mobility*, Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing Company

Krotki, Karol J., and Dave Odynak. 1990. "The Emergence of Multiethnicities in the Eighties" in *Ethnic Demography: Canadian Immigrant, Racial and Cultural Variations*, Shiva S. Halli, Frank Trovato and Leo Driedger, eds, Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 415-437

Li, Peter S. 1988. *The Chinese in Canada*, Toronto: Oxford University Press

Lieberson, Stanley and Mary C. Waters. 1988. *From Many Strands: Ethnic and Racial Groups in Contemporary America*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation

McLaughlin, K.M. 1985. *The Germans in Canada*, Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association

Meintel, Dierdre. 1992. "L'identité ethnique chez de jeunes Montréalais d'origine immigrée" in *Sociologie et Sociétés: Racisme, Ethnicité, Nation*, Christopher McAll, Victor Piché and Anne-Marie Fortier, eds, Montréal: Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 73-89

Nault, François. 1993. *Internal Estimates Using the Adjusted Population*, unpublished table.

Neuwirth, Gertrud. 1969. "A Weberian outline of a theory of community: its application to the 'Dark Ghetto'" in *The British Journal of Sociology*, volume XX No. 2 June 1969, London: Routledge and Kegan Pau' Ltd, 148-163

Parkin, Frank. 1979. *Marxism and Class Theory: A Bourgeois Critique*, London: Tavistock Publications

Petersen, William. 1987. "Politics and the Measurement of Ethnicity" in *The Politics of Numbers*, William Alonso and Paul Starr, eds, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 187-233

Porter, John. 1965. *The Vertical Mosaic*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press

- Pryor, Edward T., Gustave J. Goldmann, Donald A. Royce. 1991. "Future Issues for the Census of Canada" in *International Migration Review*, 25:167-175, New York: Center for Migration Studies
- Pryor, Edward T., Gustave J. Goldmann, Michael Sheridan, Pamela White. 1992. "Measuring ethnicity: is 'Canadian' an evolving indigenous category?" in *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Volume 15 Number 2 April 1992, London: Routledge Journals, 214-235
- Reitz, Jeffrey G. 1980. *The Survival of Ethnic Groups*, Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson
- Ringer, Benjamin B. and Elinor R. Lawless. 1989. *Race-Ethnicity and Society*, New York: Routledge, Chapman and Hall
- Ryder, Norman B. 1956. "The Interpretation of Origin Statistics", in *Estadística: Journal of the Inter-American Statistical Institute*, Washington, 651-666
- Statistics Canada. 1973. *1971 Census of Canada, Population: Ethnic Groups*, Catalogue 92-723 Vol: 1 - Part: 3, Ottawa: Statistics Canada
- Statistics Canada. 1984. *1981 Census of Canada: Population by Ethnic Origin*, Catalogue 92-911 Vol:1, Ottawa: Statistics Canada, February 1984
- Statistics Canada. 1986. *Longevity and Historical Life Tables, 1921 - 1981 (abridged) Canada and the Provinces*, Catalogue 89-506, Ottawa: Statistics Canada
- Statistics Canada. 1988a. *1986 Report on the Demographic Situation in Canada*, Catalogue 91-209, Ottawa: Statistics Canada
- Statistics Canada. 1988b. *1991 Census Content Consultation Report*, Ottawa: Statistics Canada
- Statistics Canada. *Profile of urban and rural areas, Part B, Canada, provinces and territories*, Ottawa: Industry, Science and Technology Canada, 1994. 1991 Census of Canada. Catalogue number 93-340.
- Tan, Jin and Patricia E. Roy. 1985. *The Chinese in Canada*, Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association.

Torczyner, Jim, Shari Brotman, Kathy Viragh and Gustave Goldmann. 1993. *Demographic Challenges Facing Canadian Jewry: Initial findings from the 1991 Census*, Montreal: Council of Jewish Federations and McGill Consortium for Ethnicity and Strategic Social Planning

Troper, Harold and Morton Weinfeld. 1993. "Jewish-Ukrainian Relations in Canada since World War II and the Emergence of the Nazi War Criminal Issue" in *The Jews in Canada*, R. Brym, W. Shaffir and M. Weinfeld, eds, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 193-217

Tulchinsky, Gerald. 1992. *Taking Roots: Origins of the Canadian Jewish Community*, Toronto: Lester Publishing

van den Berghe, Pierre L. 1985, "Race and Ethnicity: A Sociobiological Perspective" in *Ethnicity and Ethnic Relations in Canada*, Rita Bienvenue and Jay Goldstein, eds, Toronto: Butterworths, 19-29

Weinfeld, Morton. 1993. "The Jews of Quebec: An Overview" in *The Jews in Canada*, R. Brym, W. Shaffir and M. Weinfeld, eds, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 171-192

END

2 9-05-95

FIN