Multiculturalism Policy and the Importance of Place:

An Uneven Policy and Jurisdictional Landscape

Kristin Good, Assistant Professor
Department of Political Science, Dalhousie University

Please send comments to: Kristin.Good@Dal.Ca

Immigration, Minorities and Multiculturalism in Democracies Conference

October 25-27, 2007

Fairmont Queen Elizabeth, Montreal

Abstract

Through its multiculturalism policies, the federal government has established a normative framework to govern ethnic relations and the long-term immigrant integration process in Canada. This framework prescribes a proactive government role in facilitating ethno-cultural equity in social, economic and political institutions. However, because immigrants tend to settle primarily in cities, the multiculturalism policy challenge is largely an urban question. In fact, close to three-quarters of Canada' s immigrants settle in its three largest city-regions. In addition, since the 1970s, there has been a steep upward trend in the number of immigrants who are visible minorities. Therefore, Canada's largest urban centres have experienced a dramatic shift in the ethno-cultural composition of their populations in a relatively short period of time. The paper addresses the extent to which municipal governments in English-speaking Canada's two most numerically significant immigrant receiving city-regions are following the Canadian multiculturalism model of immigrant integration through a comparison of seven municipalities: Toronto, Mississauga, Brampton and Markham in the Greater Toronto Area (GTA) and Vancouver, Richmond, and Surrey in Greater Vancouver (GV). It finds that there is a great deal of variation in municipal multiculturalism policy efforts and develops a three-fold typology of "municipal responsiveness" to characterize these differences. It argues that this jurisdictional unevenness and, more broadly place-specific challenges, must be addressed to ensure the continued viability of the multiculturalism model in Canada.

I. Introduction

Through its "multiculturalism policies," the Canadian federal government has established a normative framework that prescribes a proactive public role in facilitating positive ethno-cultural relations and inter-ethnic equity. These policies provide a normative standard to guide the long-term immigrant integration process. Nevertheless, since more than three quarters of Canada's immigrants choose to settle in its three largest city-regions -- Toronto, Vancouver, and Montreal -- the social, economic and political consequences of changing ethno-racial demographics in Canada is most immediate in these locales.

Despite the spatial concentration of the multiculturalism policy challenge in Canada very little was known about how these demographic trends have affected municipal governance in Canada' primary immigrant-receiving locales until recently.[1] The limited but growing literature on this subject documents a great deal of variation in the extent to which municipal governments respond to immigration by adapting their services and governance structures to incorporate immigrants' preferences and to increase immigrant access to services (Tate and Quesnel 1995; Wallace and Frisken 2000; Edgington and Hutton 2002; Good 2004; Good 2005; Good 2006; Graham Philips 2006). Thus, only some municipalities are following Canada's national model of immigration integration – official multiculturalism. To *what extent* and *how* are municipal governments in urban Canada adapting their services and governance mechanisms to the dramatic demographic changes that immigration causes? To what extent are municipalities in Canada's most numerically- important immigrant

[1] This gap in our understanding is a symptom of the marginalization of the study of urban politics in the field of Canadian political science (Garber 1995; Abu-Laban 1997), which has conceptualized municipal autonomy in a very limited way following a strict "creatures of provinces" constitutional doctrine (Lightbody 1995; Magnusson 2005).

receiving city-regions following the multiculturalism policy framework that is embraced at the federal and some in provincial jurisdictions? This paper engages with these questions through a comparison of the policy responses of seven urban and suburban municipalities located in Canada's two most numerically important city-regions in English-speaking Canada – Toronto, Mississauga, Brampton and Markham in the Greater Toronto Area (GTA) and Vancouver, Richmond, and Surrey in the Greater Vancouver (GV).

In section II, the paper begins by describing the broad contours of the Canadian commitment to multiculturalism at a national scale, a model of immigrant integration that has been plagued by periodic conceptual and empirical confusion in national debates. As this paper is being written, the model is being challenged from a variety of fronts based on unsupported and even inaccurate empirical claims (Ley 2007). Next, in section III, the paper describes the scalar implications of immigration and, ultimately, of the multiculturalism policy challenge. This section demonstrates that multiculturalism is a primarily urban phenomenon and, particularly, a large urban center issue. The next section of the paper (section IV) develops a typology to characterize the nature of multiculturalism policy variation in Canada's primary immigrant-receiving city regions and provides an empirical portrait of these municipal policies. In this section, it becomes apparent

implementation of effective multiculturalism policies in Canada. It argues that policy makers at all levels must address jurisdictional and spatial unevenness in multiculturalism policy-making in order to ensure the continued viability of Canada's model of immigrant integration.

II. Multiculturalism Policies in Canada

Multiculturalism in Canada is a growing and changing *empirical reality* to which Canada's *official policy of multiculturalism* has responded. Today, few Canadians would disagree that multiculturalism constitutes a defining characteristic of the Canadian population. However, there exists a great deal of confusion within Canada as to the goals of Canada's official policy of multiculturalism (Kymlicka 1998; Ley 2007). Misunderstandings are at least a partial result of the evolving nature of Canada's policy.

Audrey Kobayashi (1993) has outlined three stages of the development of multiculturalism in Canada: *demographic multiculturalism*, *symbolic multiculturalism* and *structural multiculturalism*. In a practical sense, these stages represent an evolution from a recognition of the cultural contribution of groups other than the historical "charter groups" in the 1960s, to a limited official policy of multiculturalism that provided state support to celebrate and to maintain Canada's diversity in the 1970s, to a policy model that addresses institutional, systemic barriers to inter-ethnic equity and integration (Kobayashi 1993; Ley 2007). As geographer David Ley (2007) observes in his recent "defence" of Canadian multiculturalism, the popular impression of multiculturalism policy goals today reflect the second stage of the policy's development, a stage that encouraged the maintenance of, and even emphasized, cultural differences (Ley 2007, 10). Will Kymlicka (1998) made similar

observations in his defense of the policy in the late 1990s in response to challenges at that time (Kymlicka 1998).

Nevertheless, as Ley so bluntly puts it: "multiculturalism has moved on" (Ley 2007, 10). The current goals of Canada's federal policy involve the government's proactive attempts to address barriers to the fair inclusion of ethno-racial minorities in economic, social and political institutions. The *Canadian Multiculturalism Act (1988),* which legislated the

experiences a deeper level of *racialization* than other visible minority communities (Kymlicka 2001, 178). Thus, existing measures of success in integrating immigrants and ethno-cultural minorities into Canadian society and institutions should not overshadow the ongoing, proactive efforts that are needed to manage Canada's ethno-cultural diversity as Canadian society evolves and new challenges become apparent.

Furthermore, the research cited above has not addressed an important dimension of the multiculturalism policy challenge – its urban reality. And, as Mario Polèse and Richard Stren (2000) caution, whereas there are important opportunities associated with immigration, at the urban level, population density coupled with dramatic social change can also be a source of intense social stress (Polèse and Stren 2000, 8). If multiculturalism policies are to be effective, they must address the scalar implications of the policy challenge.

III. Canada's Changing Multicultural Reality: Demographic and Scalar Dimensions

Due to these changes in the source countries of immigrants, Canada has experienced a three-fold increase in its "visible minority"[3] population since 1981 (Statistics Canada 2001b). In 2001, only three of every ten visible minorities were born in Canada (Statistics Canada 2001b). In addition, there has been an upward trend in the relative number of immigrants who are visible minorities with 52 percent, 68 percent, and 73 percent of the immigrants who came to Canada in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s respectively identifying themselves as visible minorities (Statistics Canada 2001b). Furthermore, Statistics Canada projects intensification of the link between the "racial"[4] diversification of Canada and immigration. It predicts that by 2017, if current immigration trends continue, between 19 and 23 percent of the population will be a member of a visible minority group (Statistics Canada 2005).

However, these demographic trends also have important scalar dimensions. Canada's visible minority and immigrant populations (which largely overlap) are concentrated in its three largest city-regions – Toronto, Vancouver and Montreal. These three city-regions receive close to three quarters of all of the immigrants to Canada. In 2002, the Toronto Census Metropolitan Area (CMA)[5] received close to 50 percent of Canada's approximately 230,000 immigrants (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2002). More generally, the Toronto CMA receives nearly three times more immigrants than its share of the population (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2002). Statistics Canada also predicts that immigrants will continue to choose to settle in large urban centres. By 2017, the Toronto region will be home to 45 percent of the entire Canadian visible minority population and will become the

[3] Federal policies and Statistics Canada adopt the *Employment Equity Act* (1986)'s definition of " visible minorities" as "persons, other than Aboriginal people, who are non-Caucasian in race or non-white in colour".
[4] "Racial" is in quotation marks to acknowledge the socially-constructed nature of "race".
[5] A CMA is an urban region that is composed of an urban core and one or more adjacent municipalities. In order to constitute a CMA, the urban region must have a population of at least 50, 000 residents. In order to be included in a CMA, adjacent municipalities must be highly integrated with the urban core. Integration is measured by the flows of commuter using census workplace data (ShiftCentral Inc. 2003, 47).

"visible majority" since non-whites will become a majority there (Statistics Canada 2005). Together, Canada's three largest cities – Toronto, Vancouver and Montreal – will be home to a remarkable three quarters of the country's visible minority population (Statistics Canada 2005).

The other clear scalar trend with resp

minority" category and Toronto was known to be a highly homogeneous city with a largely British and highly Protestant population (Doucet 1999). The demographic shifts in the ethno-cultural composition of Vancouver's population were similarly striking. Vancouver's non-European population – most of which is of Asian ancestry – increased a dramatic 422 percent between 1971 and 1986 (Olds 2001, 85). In Canada, questions of inter-ethnic equity and harmony as well as immigrant integration have very important spatial dimensions.

As we saw in the previous section, Cana

IV. Toward A Typology of Municipal Responsiveness To Immigrants and Ethno-Cultural Minorities

The term “responsiveness” evokes notions of democratic inclusion and accountability

2. Municipal governments may provide *grants* to community organizations, offer *in-kind support* to community organizations (space and staff for instance) and conduct *research* on community needs.

3. Municipalities may develop *employment equity* initiatives to address systemic barriers to immigrant and ethno-cultural minority acces

1) They vary in the extent to which they have been *comprehensive* in their response to immigrants and ethno-cultural minorities. In other words, municipalities vary in the extent to which they adopt a wide *range* of policies (listed above) and in the extent to which these policies are *institutionalized* in the municipal civil service.

2) They vary in their *policy styles* – whether they are *proactive*, *reactive*, or *inactive* in the multiculturalism policy field (Wallace and Frisken 2000; Good 2005; Good 2006). These two elements are related insofar as the institutionalization of suppn4[t

Governance			
Immigrant Settlement Leaders' Assessment	Positive	Moderately Positive	Negative
Policy Types	1-9	5-9	9

"Responsive" municipalities have adopted a wide range of policies (types 1-9), have institutionalized support for these policies, and are proactive in their policy styles. Furthermore, community leaders in the immigrant settlement sector assess the efforts of responsive municipalities to the concerns of their constituents in a positive way. Responsive municipalities have also developed productive governance relationships to support their multiculturalism policy efforts. "Somewhat responsive" municipalities have developed a limited range of policies (types 5-9) to facilitate immigrant and ethno-cultural minority access and equity and have done so reactively – for instance, in reaction to political

The Empirical Terrain: A Diversity of Models of Integration

"Responsive" municipalities

The urban core municipalities – including the *City of Toronto* and the *City of Vancouver* - have been responsive to the needs and preferences of immigrants and ethno-cultural minorities. Their responses have been comprehensive insofar as they have been consistent across municipal departments and agencies, and insofar as these cities have adopted a broad range of policies to accommodate the diversity of their populations. In addition, informal public-private governance coalitions that include multiculturalism policy goals have developed in both responsive municipalities.

The City of Toronto's responsiveness to diversity is reflected *symbolically* in its motto "Diversity Our Strength". In January 1998, the city embarked upon a comprehensive planning exercise to develop a plan of action with respect to 'access and equity' in the newly amalgamated[9] City of Toronto by setting up the *Task Force on Access and Equity*. Toronto City Council approved the *Task Force*'s recommendations in the form of an Action Plan in December 1999. The city's access and equity initiatives flow from this plan.

Furthermore, the City of Toronto's commitment to 'access and equity' is institutionalized in a special unit designed to "manage" these issues - the "Diversity Management and Community Engagement Unit". This unit, which is located in the City Manager's office, supports and monitors the implementation of formal policies but is also a flexible unit that initiates action when unanticipated needs arise. It is designed to be a "catalyst" and "facilitator" of the entire corporation and to serve as a "bridge" between

[9] On January 1, 1998, the current City of Toronto was created by an act of the Ontario Provincial Parliament that merged seven municipalities – six lower-tier municipalities (East York, Etobicoke, North York, Scarborough, Toronto and York) and one upper tier municipality (Metro Toronto) – that constituted the former , federated two-tier Metropolitan Toronto.

council, the civil service and the community (Lee 2003, interview). As such, this unit supports the city's "proactive" policy style.

The City of Vancouver has also institutionalized support for its multiculturalism initiatives in both its Social Planning Department and its Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) office. The social planning function involves addressing social issues that affect the community and disadvantaged groups and individuals in particular. Vancouver's Social Planning Department has a full-time staff position - a "Multicultural Social Planner" - devoted entirely to social planning issues arising out of the city's multicultural nature.

Both responsive cities have developed a wide range of multiculturalism policies. For instance, the City of Toronto adopted a number of "core policies" to guide policy-making and planning in the city including its Workplace Human Rights and Harassment Policy (1998), its Hate Activity Policy and Procedures (1998), its Employment Equity Policy (2000), and its Multilingual Services Policy (200

extensive diversity training programs to city staff on an ongoing basis. Building upon the success of these programs, in 1989, the city established the "Hastings Institute", an arms length not-for-profit, city-owned corporation that provides diversity training to outside organizations – including other municipalities, provincial ministries, crown corporations, not-for-profit organizations, unions and businesses - on a fee-for-service basis. The mayor and four members of council sit on the Hastings Institute's Board of Directors in order to ensure that its directions reflect the city's priorities.

Both the City of Toronto and the City of Vancouver have taken steps to include ethno-cultural minorities in political decision-making by establishing formal advisory committees with multiculturalism related mandates to provide community input into council decision-making. These advisory communities complement efforts to engage immigrants and visible minorities in the municipal electoral process. Advisory committees address important gaps in representation on municipal councils in which ethno-racial minorities are poorly incorporated (Siemiatycki 1998; Good 2005). In Toronto, five access and equity policy advisory committees and two working groups were set up following the *Task Force Report*.[11] Vancouver's current committee is called the Special Advisory Committee on Diversity Issues (2003-present). Taken alone, advisory committees often reflect a reactive policy style. However, in Toronto and Vancouver, because other institutional supports are in place, advisory committees provide a mechanism of community engagement that contributes to the city's ability to assess community needs and to plan for future challenges.

The two cities' proactive approaches to accommodating diversity are reflected best in their community grants programs. Toronto's Access and Equity Grants program provides

[11] The *Race and Ethnic Relations Advisory Committee* and the "Immigration and Refugee Issues" working group are examples.

targeted funding to organizations that represent ethno-cultural minorities. Council increased the funding for access and equity programs significantly in the city's 2004 budget to support emerging immigrant communities - from just over $400,000 to $773,800 (Lee 2005, e-mail correspondence). In 2005, Vancouver directed more than 25 percent of the city's direct service grants (which represent 3/4 of its total budget for grants of approximately 3.4 million) to organizations serving ethno-cultural and immigrant communities (Wong 2005, interview).[12]

Community leaders in both Toronto and Vancouver viewed their respective municipality's level of responsiveness favourably. [13] In addition, in both cities local leaders built governance coalitions that include immigrant representative. In Toronto, a broad-based coalition has developed that includes political leaders, civil servants, members of the business community, leaders in the immigrant settlement sector and others (Good 2005). An important node in the coalition is the Toronto City Summit Alliance, a group of powerful local leaders that have coalesced around the need to address a number of the city's challenges including immigrant settlement goals and to fight for greater urban autonomy. This alliance established the Toronto Region Immigrant Employment Council, whose members have become an important players in a multi-level governance arrangement that includes participants at the city, provincial, federal and community levels. In Toronto, local leaders recognize the inter-relation of

In Vancouver, the city's multiculturalism policies are, in part, a by-product of an economic development "regime" that led the city to proactively encourage investment and immigration from Pacific Rim countries (especially China). Kris Olds describes the "reach and influence" of the local coalition of leaders that support strengthening Vancouver's ties with Pacific Rim countries as "long, sinuous, and hegemonic" (Olds 2001, 92). In Vancouver there were a number of "growing pains" as the city transformed into a Pacific Metropolis with a large and powerful Chinese community. Long-standing residents complained that affluent immigrants were displacing existing residents by driving up housing costs and property taxes as well as changing the cultural and social shape of the community (Edgington and Hutton 2002, 20). However, these strains were managed and supported by a proactive coalition of local leaders in the public and private sectors.

Thus, in both responsive municipalities, multiculturalism policy purposes are supported by both formal (municipal) institutions and by informal institutions in the form of ongoing public-private elite coalitions. Toronto and Vancouver frame their many "multiculturalism policies" as part of an "immigrant settlement" strategy. They are also tied closely to economic development objectives. This local level trend is consistent with the shift in policy discourse in the immigration, multiculturalism, and employment equity areas

Plan in Aberdeen Mall, Richmond's first and highly controversial "Asian mall," [14] which was developed in 1992 as an alternative to Vancouver's Chinatown (Huhtala 2004).

The committee also hosted discussions between residents and developers of Asian malls regarding English signage and service. In response to backlash on the part of long-standing residents, Thomas Fung, a powerful Chinese developer who developed six Asian malls in Richmond decided to tear down and redevelop the Aberdeen Centre at a personal cost of millions of dollars to address the concerns of long-standing residents who complained that it catered to Chinese-speaking residents only. Its commercial tenant agreement now obliges shop-owners to maintain the mall for English language use and prohibits them from erecting permanent Chinese language signs either inside or outside of their stores (Huhtala 2004). Fung's Fairchild Group also created a marketing arm for six Asian-style malls called "Asia West". The marketing arm pushes shopkeepers to accommodate non-Asians by using English on their signs and by carrying clothing in sizes suited to non-Asian (Pynn 1997). Through the cooperation of the city and Thomas Fung, this race relations crisis was transformed into a marketing strategy for the city. Tourism Richmond, a non-for-profit agency that market Richmond uses the Asia West concept in its marketing materials.

The genesis of the Richmond Intercultural Advisory Committee (RIAC), RichmRIAC), Richm

Markham (1988-1995) and the Heritage and Multiculturalism Committee (1988-91). The city reconstituted the former committee in 1995 when it disbanded in the midst of a race relations controversy. The controversy was sparked by comments then Deputy Mayor Carole Bell made that were perceived to be racist by many in the community. Her comments, which were made at a regional meeting[16], were critical of the concentration of Chinese immigrants in Markham. She said: "The growing concentration of ethnic groups is causing conflicts in Markham" and "[t]he weakness of multiculturalism … comes when there is a concentration, when you are getting only one group of people" (Queen 1995). She also added a personal statement: "I wouldn't come to the region and I would go because of it – and I'm saying that truthfully" (Queen 1995). An *ad hoc* committee, which would later become a broader coalition called the Coalition of Concerned Canadians, sprang up after her comments to demand a public apology. Dr. Ken Ng and Marlene Magado, prominent leaders in

stood and applauded Deputy Mayor Bell as she entered council chambers on August 28, 1995, the week after the Coalition of Concerned Canadians made deputations to council in a chambers crowded with its own supporters.

Eventually, then Mayor Don Counsens convened the *Task Force on Race Relations* (1995) to study the issue. Following the *Task Force Report*, the Markham Race Relations Committee was re-established in 1997 to manage ethno-cultural relations on an ongoing basis and to assist in implementing the *Task Force*'s recommendations. The current committee's mandate is to encourage harmonious intercultural relations and, to a lesser extent, to promote organizational change. The committee hosts an annual festival called "The Many Faces of Markham"; engages in public education campaigns; offers diversity training sessions to Town staff; and does "corporate outreach" to strengthen relationships between business, faith groups, and other institutions in Markham and the Town. Although she recognizes the limitations of the city's responses, Magado concedes that the Town has been a great deal more responsive to the concerns of its diverse population since the "Carole Bell incident" (Magado 2004).

Both Richmond and Markham have developed communications strategies to manage ethno-cultural diversity. Richmond advertises regularly in Asian language newspapers and translates city plans and communications on an "ad hoc" basis "as need is perceived and resources are available" (Townsend 2004, interview). One interesting initiative of Richmond's corporate communications department is its media watch program, which is contracted out to a firm called Chinese InforMedia Services at a cost of $15,000-$20,000 per year (Townsend 2005, e-mail correspondence). The service monitors articles written in Chinese about Richmond in the three daily Chinese newspapers for accuracy and potential

controversies or misunderstandings and reports to the city twice per month. In addition to pre-empting ethnic relations crises, this service serves as an important tool by which to gauge

Furthermore, where the will to accommodate exists, civil servants (in line departments) expressed that they do not know who the leaders of the community are (Basi 2004, interview). Many informants described a highly diverse and even divided South Asian immigrant community making statements such as there are many South Asian "interest groups" and the community is "very political". A Superintendent with the RCMP mentioned that intra-group violence is a problem within the South Asian community – in his words "there is fighting in Temples, if they're not shooting at each other in the streets…" (Hall 2004, interview). The South Asian community appears to lack the "social capital" to organize to pressure the municipality to respond due to in-group divisions.

Thus, somewhat responsive municipalities vary in the extent to which lasting public-private governance relationships have emerged with the goal of developing the capacity to accommodate and manage change in the ethno-cultural demographics of their populations. In the two most responsive of the "somewhat responsive" municipalities in the sample – Markham and Richmond – productive relationships have developed around the goal of fostering positive race relations between the largely Chinese immigrant community on the one hand and the long-standing (and largely white) community on the other. Limited public-private relationships also developed in Surrey at the departmental level. Leaders of community organizations tend to view Richmond and Markham's level of responsiveness to ethno-cultural diversity in a positive light whereas, in Surrey, the leader of its largest immigrant settlement agency does not have access to local political officials (Woodman 2004, interview).

Unresponsive municipalities

The *City of Mississauga* and the *City of Brampton* have both been unresponsive to the

The “somewhat responsive” municipalities in the sample – including Richmond, Markham and Surrey - have also adopted elements of *structural multiculturalism*. However, the scope of their policies is more limited and they adopted them reluctantly and often in reaction to race relations crises and intercultural misunderstandings. Their approach is perhaps more accurately labeled *diversity management multiculturalism*. They do not proactively address structural barriers to immigrant access to services and inclusion in governance. Rather, they react to new concerns on an “as needed” basis. “Unresponsive” municipalities have been inactive, taking a “laissez faire” approach to multiculturalism. Their limited responses, which include symbolic supp

measures of integration – including, for instance, rates of naturalization (Kymlicka 1998) at the *national scale*. Similarly, Irene Bloemraad's (2006) work, which compares immigrant integration in Canada and the United States, suggests that Canada's multiculturalism policies contribute to the political incorporation of immigrants – the extent to which they naturalize, run for office and are represented in legislatures. Her work is based on both large quantitative data sets (which establish the broad patterns) and in-depth interviews with immigrants and immigrant leaders. Through her interviews, she is able to demonstrate how multiculturalism policies matter to political incorporation. She finds that multiculturalism policies provide both the symbolic and material resources that immigrants need to become active in the political sphere (Bloemraad 2006, 236). Her research suggests that supporting community organizations and recognizing ethno-cultural identities leads to a greater *desire* and *ability* on the part of immigrants to participate in political life. Multiculturalism policies appear to matter to immigrant integration.

However, the political incorporation of immigrants is uneven across Canadian jurisdictions and space. If federal multiculturalism policies facilitate immigrant political incorporation through their symbolic recognition of ethno-cultural minorities and, at a practical level, through funding of immigrant and ethno-cultural minority organizations then we should observe the effect of these federal policy decisions at the municipal level. In fact, many of the organizations that Heritage Canada funds through its multiculturalism program are based in the GTA and in GV. However, at the local level immigrants and ethno-cultural minorities are poorly and unevenly incorporated into political life. For instance, although the proportion of visible minorities in all of the municipalities' populations in this sample are close to 50 percent, their representation on local councils ranges from 0 to 25 percent of local

fact, in one “unresponsive” municipality – the City of Brampton - a city councillor who himself is an immigrant from Jamaica, painted a picture of extreme alienation on the part of visible minorities in the community (and the Black community in particular) due to several reasons including, for instance, a perceived lack of employment visible mia city2n eait

Planning responsibilities – one of the central delegated authorities in the municipal realm - also have important implications for community inclusion. For instance, municipal zoning decisions affect whether immigrants are able to organize their families in a way that is consistent with their culture. Many immigrants would like cities to accommodate their practice of living with their extended family and, therefore, would like municipalities to permit "secondary suites" (Gibson 2004, interview).

Planning conflicts have been a particular source and reflection of social stress in a number of municipalities in the sample. These conflicts, however, do not only involve accommodating immigrants' preferences into decision-making. Rather, municipal planning decisions affect how long-standing residents will perceive immigration and multiculturalism policy as well. For instance, we saw in Richmond and Markham that multiculturalism policies were adopted in response to *backlash* on the part of the long-standing community much of which was manifested through local planning conflicts. In these locales long-standing residents reacted to the development of Asian malls, the lack of English-language signage in these mall developments and concerns about "monster homes" that challenged the planning norms in the municipalities. This example demonstrates that in some localities, incorporating immigrants into local communities requires a response that facilitates compromises between the "host" community and immigrant communities. The way in which planning conflicts unfolded in Richmond and Markham also illustrate the important role that municipalities can play in resolving such conflicts. Physical proximity to ethnic relations conflicts allows municipalities to convene the community to develop solutions. For instance, as we saw above, the City of Richmond contacted Asian mall developer Thomas Fung to alert him to concerns on the part of long-standing residents about his developments and a

solution developed through this informal channel. Municipal ethnic advisory committees serve as a tool to convene the community on an ongoing basis. In many ways, municipalities are uniquely placed to respond to emerging and sometimes explosive community debates about multiculturalism.

The place-specific disputes discussed above illustrate a more general point - that multiculturalism policy challenges take fundamentally different forms in various local communities. Moreover, according to Kristin

suggest that, in the interest of policy effectiveness, all three levels of government have a role to play in multiculturalism. However, who should do what? Clearly, only municipal governments can adapt their own corporate structures and services to accommodate diversity. However, even here upper levels of government might play a role. Policy consistency could be increased if provinces were to introduce standards for multiculturalism policy efforts at the municipal level that were sufficiently flexible to allow municipalities to tailor their programs to local needs. There is evidence to suggest that at least some municipal governments would welcome a greater level of formal responsibility in multiculturalism policy development and implementation. For instance, local leaders in the City of Toronto connect immigrant settlement and other multiculturalism policy challenges to a broad-based urban autonomy movement (Simich 2000; McIsaac 2003; Toronto City Summit Alliance 2003; The Broadbent Group 2005). Many would like to see delegation of these responsibilities to the municipa

especially the "responsive" ones that engage proactively with their communities, city officials possess unparalleled knowledge about their communities' needs and challenges that could be valuable in the design of federal programs.[18] In addition, the federal government develops and administers policies that support immigrant integration and ethno-cultural equity in a variety of departments all of which have implications "on the ground" in cities. Municipal leaders are uniquely positioned to observe how the effects of these decisions intersect.

Responding coherently to multiculturalism challenges and addressing place-specific challenges is complicated by the Canadian federal system in which provinces tend to guard their responsibility for "municipal institutions" jealously. Nevertheless, recent developments in Ontario suggest that direct federal-municipal funding in this policy area might become possible in the future where the political will exists. For instance, the new City of Toronto Act – the *Stronger City of Toronto for a Stronger Ontario Act* that came in effect in 2007 - allows the city to enter into intergovernmental agreements with the federal government directly. Furthermore, the Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement (2005) acknowledges the importance of municipal governments in the immigrant settlement policy field and singles out Toronto.

VI. Concluding Thoughts

Although Canada's multiculturalism model of immigrant integration has been challenged in recent times, the limited empirical research suggests that it has been relatively

[18] Recognition of the importance of place-specific knowledge to the successful integration of immigrants is why the federal government established and funds a number of research centres in major cities across Canada under the umbrella of the Metropolis project.

successful. Over time, federal policy-makers have adapted the model to the changing demographic reality of immigration to Canada.

However, a central challenge today is to address the spatial consequences of the model and associated policies and their uneven adoption across jurisdictions in Canada. Municipal governments vary significantly in their multiculturalism policy efforts. In fact, these differences are significant enough to constitute distinct local "citizenship regimes". Although some might dismiss the importance of municipalities and their policy responsibilities and consequently also the significance of their multiculturalism policy efforts, this paper demonstrates otherwise. There are barriers to immigrant and ethno-cultural minority access to municipal services and governance institutions that lead to a sense of alienation among immigrants in local communities. Remarkably, immigrant leaders in all municipalities discussed in this paper believe that municipal multiculturalism policies are required.

It is also clear that multiculturalism policy challenges take particular forms across different communities. A major question for policy-makers at all levels is how to address this unevenness as well as the question of which level of government should do what. What role should municipalities play in the overall multiculturalism citizenship regime? One option is for provinces to establish standards for municipalities in the multiculturalism and immigrant settlement policy fields. However, these standards and formal responsibilities would have to be accompanied by fiscal transfers to municipalities to support their efforts.

Nevertheless, intergovernmental cooperation is also needed to ensure the continued viability of Canada's multiculturalism policies. Policy gaps in the multiculturalism efforts of other level of government are manifest in cities in an immediate way. Furthermore,

municipalities cannot address barriers to immigrant integration in areas outside their areas of responsibility. For instance, their ability to address the pressing issue of access to trades and professions and employment policy in general requires the cooperati

City of Markham. 2002. Report to finance and administration re: multi-lingual interpretive services. November 4. To mayor and me

Kobayashi, A. 1993. Multiculturalism: Representing a Canadian Institution. In J. Duncan and D. Ley. Eds. *Place/Culture/Representation*. London: Routledge Press.

Kymlicka, Will. 1998. *Finding our way: Rethinking ethnocultural relations in Canada*. Toronto: Oxford University Press Canada.

___. 2001. *Politics in the vernacular: Nationalism, multiculturalism, and citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ley, David. 2007. Multiculturalism: A Canadian Defence. Research on Immigration and Integration in the Metropolis, Vancouver Centre ofExcellence, Working Paper Services, No. 07-04, March.

___, Peter Murphy, Kris Olds and Bill Randolph. 2001. Immigration and housing in gateway cities: The cases of Sydney and Vancouver. Research on Immigration and Integration in the Metropolis (RIIM), Vancouver Centre of Excellence, Working paper series, no. 01-03.

Lightbody, James. 1995. Surviving city politics. In his edited *Canadian Metropolitics: Governing Our Cities*. Toronto: Copp, Clark.

Logan, John R. and Harvey L. Molotch. 1987. *Urban fortunes: The political economy of place*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.

McIsaac, Elizabeth. 2003. Nation building through cities: A new deal for immigrant Settlement in Canada. Ottawa, ON: Caledon Institute of Social Policy, February.

Magnusson, Warren. 2005. Are municipalities creatures of the provinces? *Journal of Canadian Studies*. Spring, 39, 2.

Olds, Kris. 2001. *Globalization and urban change: Capital, culture, and Pacific Rim mega-projects*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

Ornstein, Michael. 2000. Ethno-racial inequality in the City of Toronto: An analysis of the zaMms

cities: Comparative urban policy in a global context.

Appendix 1: List of Interviews

Note: All interviews were conducted by Kristin Good and were in-person unless otherwise indicated.

Abrahams, Phillip. Manager, Intergovernmental Relations, City of Toronto, February 18, 2004.
Ashton, Brian. Councillor, City of Toronto, October 13, 2004.
Augimeri, Maria. Councillor, City of Toronto, September 20, 2004.
Barnes, Linda. Councillor, City of Richmond, April 29, 2004.
Basi, Ravi. Multicultural Outreach Librarian, Newton Library, Surrey Public Library, May 20, 2004.
Bray, Keith. President and CEO, Markham Board of Trade, January 12, 2005.
Brown, Susan. Senior Policy Advisor, Labour Force Development, Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, City of Toronto, December 4, 2003.

Iannicca, Nando. Councillor, City of Mississauga, January 19, 2004.
Jamal, Audrey. Executive Director, Canadian Arab Federation (CAF), Toronto, December 2, 2003.
Jeffrey, Linda. MPP Brampton-Centre, February 2004.
Jones, Jim. Regional Councillor, City of Markham, February 27, 2004.
Kohli, Rajpal. Advisor, Equal Employment Opportunity Program, City of Vancouver, April 28, 2004.
Lee, Rose. Policy Coordinator, Diversity Management, Strategic and Corporate Policy/Healthy Cities Office, City of Toronto, November 17, 2003.
Leiba, Sheldon. General Manager, The Brampton Board of Trade, May 27, 2005, telephone interview.
Louis, Tim. Councillor, City of Vancouver, June 11, 2004.
Magado, Marlene. Chair, Markham Race Relations Committee, Markham, February 17, 2004. Follow-up interview on October, 2004.
Manning, Garnett. Councillor, City of Brampton, October 5, 2004.
McCallion, Hazel. Mayor, City of Mississauga, April 13, 2004.
McCallum, Doug. Mayor, City of Surrey, May 20, 2004.
McIsaac, Elizabeth. Program Manager, Maytree Foundation, Toronto, January 26, 2004.
Melles, Amanuel. Executive Director, Family Neighborhood Services, Toronto, January 21, 2004.
Merryweather, Brian. Manager, Human Resources, Human Resources Division, Finance, Technology & Human Resources, City of Surrey, June 22, 2004.
Mihevc, Joe. Councillor, City of Toronto, December 5, 2003.
Mikitrick, Annie. Executive Director, Surrey Social Futures; School Trustee, Surrey; Member of RIAC, May 27, 2004.
Mital, Umendra. City Manager, City of Surrey, June 22, 2004.
Moscoe, Howard. Councillor, City of Toronto, September 23, 2004.
Moore, Elaine. Regional Councillor, City of Brampton, September 7, 2004.
Nuss, Marie. Executive Director, Brampton Neighbourhood Resource Centre, Brampton, February 19, 2004.
Pantalone, Joe. Councillor and Deputy Mayor, City of Toronto, September 13, 2004.
Rae, Kyle. Councillor, City of Toronto, September 23, 2004.
Richmond, Ted. Coordinator, Children's Agenda Program, Laidlaw Foundation, January 7, 2004.
Sales, Jim. Commissioner of Community Services, City of Markham, March 2, 2004.
Sanghera, Balwant. Chair of RIAC, President of Multicultural Concerns Society of Richmond, May 4, 2004.

Detachment, May 19, 2004.

Townsend, Ted. Manager, Communications & Corporate Programs, City of Richmond, May 10, 2004.
Usman, Khalid. Councillor, City of Markham, March 2, 2004.
Vander Kooy, Magdelena. District Manager, East Region, Toronto Public Library, City of Toronto, December 9, 2003.
Vescera, Mauro. Program Director, The Vancouver Foundation, March 11, 2005, telephone interview.
Villeneuve, Judy. City Councillor, City of Surrey, June 22, 2004.
Welsh, Timothy. Program Director, Affiliation of Multicultural Societies and Service Agencies of BC (AMSSA), May 13, 2004.
Wong, Baldwin. Multicultural Social Planner, City of Vancouver, May 3, 2004.
Wong, Denzil. Councillor, City of Toronto, September 27, 2004.
Wong, Milton. Chancellor, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, January 12, 2005, telephone interview.
Woodman, Lesley Ann. Executive Director, Surrey-Delta Immigrant Services Society, Surrey, June 24, 2004.
Woodsworth, Ellen. City Councillor, City of Vancouver, May 26, 2004.
Woroch, Patricia. Executive Director, Immigrant Services Society of British Columbia, June 21, 2004.

Anonymous Participants:
Board Members of the Multicultural Inter-Agency Group of Peel (MIAG), Mississauga, November 24, 2003.
4 Civil Servants, City of Mississauga, November 27, 2003.
Civil Servant, Toronto Public Health, December 9, 2003.
Executive Director of an Immigrant Serving Organization, York Region, December 16, 2003.
Civil Servant, Human Resources, City of Markham, March 2, 2004.
Civil Servant, Peel Region, March 9, 20.8(a)22h oTc0.0004 Tw[(it0.0012 Tc0.0001 Tw[(Wong, Dervant,)5.4(Toront)