

The Management of Ethnic Diversity and Comparative City Governance in Canada¹

Christian Poirier

School of Political Studies
University of Ottawa
poirierc@uottawa.ca

Canadian Political Science Association Annual Conference,
Session E2 (b), Municipal Responses to Ethnocultural Diversity,
June 3, 2004, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg.

Abstract

It is clearly recognized today that Canadian cities are more and more multicultural. This process of the cultural diversification of the Canadian population is, in large part, the direct result of immigration policies from the federal and provincial governments. These two levels of government have also developed, over time, specific policies and models that attempt to deal with issues of integration and the management of difference. However, we know relatively little about the roles played by municipalities in this area. We propose to examine these questions by comparing the experiences of Montreal and Ottawa. Three main dimensions are examined : the formulation and implementation of public policies (in terms of discourse and programs/activities), the issues linked to governance (administrative and political structures, relations with citizen and groups), and the relationships with other levels of government. We will then be able to reflect on some of the larger issues raised by this study, notably questions about the role of the city as a political actor and about the space for policy initiative that exists at the local level in the Canadian political system.

Introduction

There is general agreement today that, not only are the large Canadian cities more and more multicultural, but that urban issues in Canada are necessarily linked to ethno-cultural issues. The processes of cultural diversification of the Canadian population are, in large part, the result of explicit policy choices on the part of the federal and provincial governments to strongly encourage immigration for reasons that are both demographic and economic. These two levels of government have developed, over time, specific policies aimed at the integration of immigrants and the management of diversity. Municipalities also play a role, although we know far less about the political and policy roles that they play in this area.

The objective of this article is two-fold : indicate the interest of examining the municipal role in the management of diversity and illustrate the hypothesis that, at least in part, municipal actions can be understood in terms of the basic theoretical orientations taken in regard to ethno-cultural diversity. By focusing on the municipal role we are not suggesting that this is the most important social actor in influencing the integration of ethno-cultural diversity. Rather we are assuming a broad governance perspective in which we recognize the multiplicity of social actors whose activities influence the direction of societal decisions. We are not saying that municipalities are the central actor but we are arguing that their actions are not irrelevant and that it is important to examine the municipal role as part of an understanding of the management of diversity.

By the management of diversity we mean simply that each of the different sets of social actors have certain policy tools that they can use to influence the patterns of integration of ethno-cultural groups. This does not mean that there is an assumption that municipal governments have the greatest influence over these patterns, or even that they have a predominant influence, but rather that the relationship to diversity being analyzed in this article is the policy orientation of municipalities and their choice of policy tools. Multiethnic cities have to manage the interrelationships developing over time between the various cultures of their populations. The idea of the management of diversity therefore focuses upon the areas of responsibilities of municipalities and the ways in which these of responsibilities impact on the patterns of integration of ethno-cultural groups. To take only one example, municipal governments are responsible for local policing and local policing policies (hiring within the police, liaison policies with community groups, training programs for police, etc.) have an impact on relations between the different ethno-cultural communities.

We are also not assuming by the term “management” that municipal policy is necessarily the result of rational planning. Indeed, municipal activity has very often been precipitated by events seen as crises, such as police shootings of members of ethno-cultural communities or tensions between ethnic groups. Our objective in this article is to illustrate that fundamental policy orientations influence the actual activities going on at the local level, but it is certainly not to suggest that these are the product of a proactive process of comprehensive policy formulation.

We are interested in the way the municipal government defines or articulates its policies on diversity, in addition to actually looking at the concrete policies. Both discourse and program activity are important and we have attempted to look at both. The discourse is important as part of the politics of recognition, as a way of establishing their interest in the question of diversity and as a way of articulating their policy goals. But we must also look at program activity as discourse and policy are not necessarily identical.

There is a relatively small but growing Canadian literature on municipal public policy in this area², within a larger international literature on the processes of integration of immigrants and members of ethno-cultural communities³. There has not been much comparative work on urban public policy in Canada ; most of the studies relate to one specific community or to one specific city⁴. In addition, research on immigration issues necessarily gets involved in constitutional issues and this can marginalize the local level. Clearly, the question of the management of diversity is one where federalism and intergovernmental issues are extremely important. Immigration is, according to the BNA Act, an area of shared jurisdiction (Article 95). Quebec plays an active role in this area and, through a series of agreements between the Quebec and the federal governments, Quebec selects the candidates (with the exception of refugees and family reunification which are federal responsibilities), determines the number of immigrants and is responsible for their integration. Ontario also plays a role, although a less active one, in attracting qualified immigrants and in the integration of ethno-cultural communities. As we shall see later on, municipal governments are increasingly involved, particularly those large cities that attract the vast majority of recent immigrants⁵. The policies for the management of diversity that have been adopted by the different levels of government are sometimes complementary and sometimes contradictory.

This article will compare the policies for the management of ethno-cultural diversity in Montreal and Ottawa. The choice of these cities is based on three criteria : existence of diversity, recent political restructuring and well developed intergovernmental relations. First of all, both are clearly influenced

by ethno-cultural diversity. From 1997 to 2001, 78,3% of the immigrants that came to Quebec settled in Montreal⁶. Overall, 13% of new immigrants to Canada chose Montreal. In 2002, the new City of Montreal, with a total population of 1,8 million (the second largest in Canada) is made up of 26% immigrants. 35% of the overall population is of origins other than Canadian, Quebecois, French, British or Aboriginal and 19% are of a visible minority. In Ottawa, immigrants made up, in 2002, 21% of the population. Nearly 30% of the population is of origins other than Canadian, Quebecois, French, British or Aboriginal while 15% are of a visible minority. The total population of Ottawa is 791, 300, making Ottawa-Gatineau the fourth largest metropolitan area in Canada.

In addition, both cities have recently undergone major restructuring - through municipal amalgamations - and this has led not only to reorganizing their internal administrative and political structures but also to rearticulating the ways in which citizens relate to, and identify with, these cities. In both cases, transition committees played a role in this restructuring.

The new City of Montreal came into being on January 1, 2002, as the result of legislation by the Quebec government, amalgamating the twenty-eight municipalities of the former Montreal Urban Community⁷. The city is divided into twenty-seven "arrondissements"⁸ which are both parts of the new city and distinct political entities. The arrondissement is described as the point of contact for the citizen in his or her relations with the new city structure and it is responsible for significant areas of activity, including garbage collection, fire prevention, culture, leisure and community development. Political representation in the new city is therefore dual ; on the one hand the Mayor and the city council made up of seventy-three councillors and, on the other, the twenty-seven arrondissement councils made up of the municipal councillors representing the arrondissement at the municipal level plus additional elected councillors in those arrondissements with less than 60 000 population. In the case of Montreal, the municipal amalgamation would appear to be both a centralization and decentralization of political power.

The new city of Ottawa came into being on January 1, 2001, with the amalgamation of the eleven local municipalities that had made up the former Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton. The new city is divided into twenty-one wards. There are no infra-municipal structures like the arrondissements of Montreal or the community councils of Toronto. The new city has expanded and formalized the network of advisory committees that existed previously and that are defined either in terms of policy areas (transportation, forests, cycling, poverty, etc.) or of categories of citizens (youth, elderly, French-language services, equity and diversity). To some extent Ottawa's amalgamation can be

seen more as incremental change than as a complete restructuring in that the former Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton was already responsible for over 80% of all local public spending. The two major areas of responsibility that were added to the former regional level were local planning and recreation. This is not to underestimate the extent of reorganization that took place but rather to situate Ottawa in comparison to other cities.

The third reason for choosing Montreal and Ottawa is that both cities are continually involved in the complex sets of interrelations, both conflictual and harmonious, that exist between the different levels of government - federal, Quebec and Ontario. In Montreal the relationship of the local political elites to the Quebec government has always been one of ambivalence, of both distance and connection. Often feeling abandoned or misunderstood by the Quebec government, the Montreal elites have argued for greater recognition of the social, cultural and economic role of Montreal, the metropolis of Quebec. Indeed, there was some movement on the part of the Quebec government, as for instance in the fact that the Ministry of Municipal Affairs, during the second half of the 1990's, was renamed the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and the Metropolis. Also, the contract signed in January 2003 between Montreal and the Quebec government gave significant political as well as fiscal autonomy to the city. However, the new government of Jean Charest (the Liberal party took power in April 2003) is now reconsidering the whole range of its urban policies and the relations between the two levels are extremely tense.

The fact that the Quebec government imposed municipal amalgamation has created considerable discontent at the municipal level, a discontent further fuelled by the wide-spread feeling that these changes were unilaterally imposed upon an unwilling population. If relationships between Montreal and the federal government are somewhat more distant, the recent proposals by the federal government⁹ that indicate a more active federal role in urban issues have been generally well received by the Montreal political leadership and this could eventually have an impact on relations between the Quebec government and Montreal.

The politics of intergovernmental relations are very different in Ottawa. As the national capital and the seat of the federal government, it is the federal government that is very close and the province more distant. Relations with the federal government are, however, ambivalent. The City of Ottawa has a problem of developing an autonomous local identity, independent from that of the capital. The strong role played by the National Capital Commission (NCC) makes this even more complicated for the city. The federal agency has, as part of its mandate, the development of the image of the capital and the strengthening of the capital as a meeting place for all Canadians. It has major

powers in terms of land use in the city and the development, as well as the management, of museums and parks. The NCC has therefore been an important actor in the creation of an identity for Ottawa, and not necessarily an identity that the City of Ottawa wants to have. However, as in Montreal, the recent federal statements about interest in urban affairs have met with general approval.

Relations between Ottawa and the Ontario government are more distant and more clearly antagonistic. There is a partisan overlay to current relations, with the Ontario Conservative government seeing Ottawa as a bastion of the opposition, owing in part to the mayor's previous role as a Liberal MPP but also to the City's near defiance of the province on the implementation of Ontario Works. These relations were not improved during the period of the Transition Team as the team was clearly seen to be dominated by Conservatives and determined to implement a conservative agenda. Since then the downloading of activities (social housing, public transportation, etc.) by the provincial government to municipalities has certainly fuelled the feelings of frustration on the part of the Ottawa council. A recent example of provincial-municipal conflict emerged when the province blocked the municipal decision to restructure the ward boundaries, a decision that was seen by municipal officials as having been motivated by partisan goals, those of protecting rural councillors more sympathetic to the neo-liberal views of the provincial Conservatives.

Our analysis has four parts. We begin by presenting the basic models for the management of ethno-cultural diversity that lie behind government actions. In the second part we look generally at the development of municipal involvement in this policy area. This leads us, in the third section, to a more systematic comparison of our two cities along three dimensions : the actors, structures and activities, the discourses produced in terms of models for managing diversity and, finally, the nature of relations with other levels of government. In the fourth and concluding part we look more generally at the question of the extent of local autonomy in this policy area. We attempt to show how this issue, the management of diversity, does in fact illustrate the system of local governance, the development of local identities and the evolution of intergovernmental relations in Canada at the present time¹⁰.

Models of Public Management of Ethno-cultural Diversity

Ethno-cultural diversity is increasingly prevalent but the way it is treated in different contexts differs widely. It is useful to compare two major orientations

to the public management of ethno-cultural diversity and to the status and definition of public space : the assimilation and the pluralist approaches¹¹.

The assimilation approach argues that cultural specificities should be part of the private sphere and that public space should be “neutral”. Individuals should learn to identify with the model of the socio-cultural majority through a process of acculturation designed to allow them to operate successfully in the “neutral” public space. The integration of a newcomer - the juridico-political goal being naturalization - is thus judged by his or her ability to identify with the culture of the new country. The principle of individual equality, the recognition of individual rights and the right not to be discriminated against are all parts of the rhetoric of universal citizenship and of the indivisibility of rights and duties and this discourse is seen as a way to build social capital. This assimilation approach can take two forms : radical assimilation and civic universalism.

The radical assimilation model proposes a monocultural perspective : the minority group is accepted by the host society on the condition that it gives up any attempt to be distinctive and that it completely accepts the life styles and values of the dominant group, both in the public and the private spheres.

The model of civic universalism is more flexible. If the public realm is seen as an area where all citizens should be on an equal footing in relation to the rules and values of collective life, differences are tolerated and even encouraged in the private sphere. Indeed public institutions can support the promotion of difference (for example in encouraging ethno-cultural groups to become more aware of their own culture). Difference (in moral choices, religious beliefs, behaviours, tastes) is not denied but is confined to the private sphere. This model operates on a clear distinction between public and private space, on a separation between the political status of the individual and his or her personal identity and by an opposition between the host culture and the culture of origin.

In distinction to these approaches, the pluralist model is based on the recognition and valuing of cultural identities in public institutions. The diversity in the private sphere is to be reflected in the public realm through the collective recognition of difference. Society is therefore understood to be an agglomeration, or a mosaic, of communities. This approach is based on the idea of not limiting the expression of cultural differences to the private sphere but, on the contrary, guaranteeing them a place in the public realm, in political representation and in the various institutions. Social cohesion is achieved not by the elimination or reduction of difference but by its institutionalization. This model proposes a distinction between citizenship and nationality (one can be a citizen without sharing the particular identity of the nation that is a majority

within the country) and promotes a politics of identity which encourages ethno-cultural groups to push for institutions, public policies and programs to adapt to cultural diversity. The pluralist approach has two variants : a multicultural model and an intercultural model. Multiculturalism as a political project takes the position that the search for the common good and for social justice must take account of the cultural conceptions of all the minority groups living in the same space. The richness of cultural diversity is affirmed and valued, as is cultural relativity (no culture can pretend to be superior to others). The multicultural ideal takes difference into account in the political sphere, in ways that include the granting of collective rights to specific minorities¹².

The intercultural model emerged as a result of criticism levelled both at the universalism and the multicultural models¹³. Its central question is the following : how to remain different while sharing certain common reference points ? Universalism is criticized for trying to ignore difference and for proposing the homogenization of ideas and life styles in the name of an abstract citizenship while multiculturalism is seen as developing communities and groups totally separated from one another, with no common references¹⁴. The intercultural model was seen as being half way between civic universalism and multiculturalism. Interculturalism is multiculturalism with the construction of strong common reference points. Working from the objective of building ways of negotiating and mediating shared spaces, interculturalism implies - and this stems from the "inter" - interaction, exchange, reciprocity and the elimination of barriers. It also implies - here the reference is to the "cultural" - recognition of identities, life styles and various symbolic representations. Public leaders, in this approach, neither oblige minorities to live in the same way as others, nor to live on the margins of society. Taking account of ethno-cultural diversity and identities should not be to the detriment of shared references. The immigrant and the host society should both adapt to each other.

It is, of course, important to recognize that all these models are ideal types, constructed for analytical clarity. In reality - and this will be evident in this article - the models are much more mixed and assimilation strands exist in pluralist policies as some pluralist tendencies in societies promoting assimilation. In fact, societies are trying to find solutions to three interrelated, yet contradictory, pressures : the satisfaction of the demands for recognition and for identity on the part of ethno-cultural groups, the construction of a collective dimension in societies that goes beyond ethnic specificity and, finally, the development of egalitarian and democratic institutions. In doing so, the different models of public policy influence the choices made and, along with the impact of specific circumstances, the approaches we have described lead to different combinations of policies.

The development of questions of migration as issues for local public policy

The policy context regarding the issue of immigration has evolved substantially in Canada¹⁵. Immigration was first seen as a question relating to the work force and public policy was situated in terms of international relations and of economic development. Without entirely losing this focus, immigration came to be seen, in the period after the 1960's and 1970's, as part of social and cultural policies. In addition to attracting immigrants that will contribute to Canadian economic growth, public policy must increasingly look at issues linked to ethnic cohabitation. It is only fairly recently that municipalities have explicitly entered the field of managing ethno-cultural relations and their initiatives have not been the result of formal agreements on decentralization and have not been traditional areas of local action. Indeed, the idea of a window of opportunity (John Kingdon's policy window¹⁶) that is seized by local elites to address the issue of ethnic diversity is something that results from pressure from organizations and associations defending and promoting ethno-cultural groups, from incentives offered by the provincial and federal governments or from support and encouragement from other public and para public bodies.

The municipalities that have developed initiatives relating to the integration of immigrants all have considerable numbers of ethno-cultural associations, either associating people from the same ethno-cultural group or bringing together a variety of people around issues of anti-racism, human rights and/or anti-discrimination. Many local governments have supported these associations in order to create service delivery capacity that is more culturally sensitive and that may prevent conflicts from arising ; municipal action can therefore be seen as a mixture of strengthening the groups and of trying to avoid a radicalization of their discourse and their actions. A number of local elected officials have been particularly sensitive to the demands of these groups and, as part of the recognition of their demands, have included the issue of cultural diversity in the construction of local identities and in the political legitimacy of the municipal level of government. Federal policy on multiculturalism also had a significant impact on the mobilization of ethno-cultural communities. Particularly in the period after the 1970's and 1980's, the Secretary of State for multiculturalism (now part of Canadian Heritage) wanted to build the capacity of the immigrant community to take collective responsibility for dealing with the causes of inequality and for developing mobilization strategies - including judicial recourse - in order to be able to exercise their rights at all levels of government.

Relations between provincial and municipal governments in the twentieth century were marked by increasing centralization on the part of provincial governments, centralization that was, for the most part, not only accepted but also desired by the municipalities. In general, municipal officials were content to have responsibilities move to the provincial level and no longer represent a local financial commitment. This situation began to change towards the end of the 1970's and 1980's, driven by a number of factors. The principal reason relates to the crisis of the welfare state and the resulting downloading of responsibilities without financial compensation from federal to provincial governments and from provincial to municipal governments¹⁷. Provincial governments have justified this with discourses stressing either provincial partnership with the local level (for example, the Quebec Immigration policy of 1990¹⁸) or arguments about municipal autonomy and the importance of local action. A clear example of this latter can be seen from Quebec's regional development policy which speaks of moving from a welfare state to a state supportive of regional and local actions. In addition, provincial governments, starting with Alberta and followed by many other provinces, have amended their municipal legislation to give broader definitions of the municipal capacity to act. Local elites also modified their discourse and began to push for formal recognition of the local level of government, with more responsibility and greater financial autonomy.

In addition, some municipalities took initiatives in areas that had not been traditional areas of activity and, in this way, illustrated a desire to be a more autonomous level of government. The creation of regional governments in Canada, starting with Toronto in 1954 but accelerating during the 1960's and 1970's (the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton was created in 1968 and the Montreal Urban Community in 1969), also influenced the municipal capacity to act. Regional governments, because of the growing ethno-cultural diversity in the large cities, began to take initiatives in this area. The Montreal Urban Community was clearly motivated by attempts to reduce tensions stemming from crisis situations between the police, the public transit commission and ethno-cultural communities. Indeed, in many municipalities including Ottawa, activity relating to the management of diversity is linked to issues of policing, often arising from specific incidents ; the municipal responsibility for police is therefore an important element.

The advantage of municipal government comes not so much from its direct capacity to act but from its capacity to bring together the full range of social actors. Municipal governments are key actors in local governance systems and their strength is their capacity to network and to convene. By decentralizing in order to reduce the size of the senior levels of government,

some responsibilities were given to municipal governments and many others were privatized to civil society organisations. Public action at the local level therefore involves all these organisations and it is the convenor and networking capacity of local governments that determines their policy capacity.

The Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM), the official spokesperson for Canadian municipalities, also facilitated municipal action for the management of diversity in identifying not only problems, but also solutions. In 1986, the FCM adopted its first policy statement on interracial relations¹⁹. In order to facilitate municipal activity, the FCM published a series of pamphlets starting in 1987. The first of these underlined the necessity for municipal action because, despite existing laws and policies (such as the federal policy on multiculturalism, the Charter, provincial laws, etc.), discrimination on the basis of race and unequal access to institutions remained significant problems²⁰. The FCM put forward a program that has been taken up by a number of municipalities interested in the management of diversity²¹. The FCM's basic argument was that good interracial relations can translate into greater economic development and an enhanced quality of urban life and this argument has been incorporated into municipal discourse. Cities should be leaders in this area, argued the FCM, because they are the first point of contact for citizens and for ethno-cultural communities but also because they are major employers and major facilitators of community action. For the FCM, the improvement of interracial relations is a municipal responsibility²².

Recently, the FCM has reiterated its position in arguing that ethno-cultural diversity is one of the major policy areas for Canadian municipalities : "A major part of the impact of immigration is felt at the local level, and it is the local initiatives and programs that assure the success of our national immigration policies²³". This led the Federation to call for official recognition of the increased municipal responsibility in the area of immigration : "The municipal governments should be at the table with the federal and provincial governments when decisions are being made about immigration and refugee policies and programs²⁴". The FCM discourse has gone from one of encouraging municipalities to become involved in this policy area (in the 1980's and 1990's) to one of insisting upon intergovernmental recognition of the municipal role (in the 2000's). At both times, the FCM put forward solutions that can be picked up and adopted by the member municipalities, in this way facilitating the opening of a policy window by municipal governments.

Two diverse cities, two similar systems of public action?

Our comparison of Montreal and Ottawa covers three major dimensions of the management of ethno-cultural diversity : actors, structures and activities ; the creation of discourse ; the intergovernmental context.

Actors, structures and activities

It would appear that our two cities differed in the level at which activity in this policy area started. In the case of Montreal, the regional level (the former Montreal Urban Community) started activities in the mid 1980's with the City of Montreal following in the early 1990's. In the case of Ottawa, it was the former City of Ottawa that initiated activity and this was slowly picked up by the former Regional Municipality of Ottawa - Carleton. However, in both cases, it is the former central city that was the most active in issues relating to diversity.

The Montreal Urban Community (MUC) created an advisory Committee on Intercultural and Interracial Relations in 1985 and, in 1990, issued a Declaration on intercultural and interracial relations. The public transportation agency (Société de transport de la CUM) provided intercultural training to its drivers and established a program of employment equity in 1987. The MUC police did likewise. The City of Montreal created its Advisory Committee on Interracial and Intercultural Relations in 1990 (in 1995, the name changed to the Advisory Committee on Intercultural Relations), with a mandate to advise and make recommendations to City Council. The Committee created sub-committees in the following areas : economic development and employment, social development, institutional action plan, community relations and promotion of cultural diversity. The City of Montreal also established an Office of Intercultural Relations charged with implementing recommendations and ensuring follow-up. The office was responsible for the coordination of activities within the municipal administration as well as the relations between the City and its ethno-cultural communities. Selected elected representatives were also given responsibilities in the area of intercultural relations, particularly as part of the executive committee.

Activities undertaken by the City of Montreal include the following : establishment of a program of employment equity for municipal employees ; financial and technical (largely space) support for ethno-cultural associations ; information and translation/interpretation services ; activities to raise awareness (workshops, intercultural days, debates, publicity campaigns, information in local newspapers, displays in libraries, visits to schools, work with media) ; financing festivals and multicultural celebrations ; consultations with ethno-cultural communities about ways of adapting municipal services, participation

in municipal coordinating activities ; integrating multiculturalism into leisure and sports activities ; adoption of a Declaration on Intercultural and Interracial Relations and a Declaration against Discrimination and Racism. Montreal's civic parties have also incorporated a concern for this issue, presenting candidates coming from ethno-cultural communities²⁵.

The new City of Montreal has stated that the management of diversity and the elimination of barriers will be a priority. It intends to replace its Advisory Committee on Intercultural Relations with an Intercultural Council. This Council will have the responsibility of advising the City Council and the executive committee - either on its own initiative or stemming from a request from the city - on services and policies designed to facilitate the integration and the participation of members of ethno-cultural communities in the political, economic, social and cultural life of the city²⁶. In addition, the Intercultural Council will hear delegations, solicit opinions and initiate research, either directly or indirectly.

The Montreal Summit, held in June 2002 to define the principal orientations for the city in its first years of existence, discussed the issue of ethno-cultural diversity. This kind of event, similar to the public consultation in Ottawa, is important as it mobilizes civil society and therefore puts pressure on the City to define its position and to put forward clear directions for its own actions. At the Montreal Summit, a session dealing with "Equity, Accessibility and Diversity" synthesized the results of twenty-seven arrondissement summits and fourteen sectoral summits. The report from this session focussed on the need for municipal decision-making to take account of the diversity of the population²⁷. The report argued that ethno-cultural diversity must be a central element in the economic, cultural and social planning both of the new city itself and of its partners²⁸. In order to actively involve the ethno-cultural communities in building the new city, the report proposed an expanded action plan including greater attention to the training of employees (in order to be sensitive to diversity) and an active support of ethno-cultural organizations²⁹.

Other proposals included support for the creation of employment - creating enterprises, notably for visible minority youth³⁰, information and support in order to facilitate greater access to sources for financing projects, encouragement for cultural events and multicultural festivals, the requirement for private companies that hold city contracts to establish employment equity programs and encouragement from the city of Montreal to all companies to do likewise. Financial resources were to be allocated for these activities. The report from the Summit session on diversity argued that the City of Montreal should play a very strong role as a catalyst for activity and as a creator of links between different actors³¹.

The former City of Ottawa had first set up an advisory committee on visible minorities in 1982³². The committee was composed of fourteen voting members from the community and two non-voting members of City Council. The City also had an administrative structure in the early 1990's that dealt with human rights and employment equity. This structure was originally set up in 1976 to deal with equal employment opportunities for women and its mandate changed in 1990, influenced by the Ontario legislation on employment equity, to include all the groups designated by the Ontario legislation of that period : the Aboriginal population, people with disabilities, members of racial minorities and women.

The recognition of diversity became an issue at the regional level during the transition year to the new city of Ottawa³³. Diversity, along with the role of the voluntary sector and the representation of youth, emerged relatively late in the transition process as part of community driven concerns about the narrow definition the transition team was giving to the question of public participation and the role being envisaged for civil society. The Diversity and Community Access Project Team presented two reports in December 2000, *Diversity makes Sense* and *Diversity and Community Access*. These reports emphasized issues of access to services and of the responsiveness of services to a diverse population, as well as the issue of equitable municipal employment. The reports argued that the population of Ottawa was in the process of changing rapidly and that the new City must ensure that all services and programs should be responsive to the changing population of the City, from health services to recreation and from social services to emergency services.

The new City of Ottawa set up an enlarged network of advisory committees, including one on Equity and Diversity (EDAC). The Committee, which met for the first time in August 2001, covers a number of dimensions of diversity. It deals with issues relating to the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered community, to those of the Aboriginal population and to issues of gender equality. However, based on Committee membership, ethno-cultural diversity is its principal focus. The Committee's terms of reference include working towards the elimination of discrimination within the City of Ottawa, advocating on behalf of racially and ethnically diverse groups, developing a strong lobbying network with other organizations and promoting a better understanding of different cultures³⁴. Four sub-committees were set up : Communication strategy, Outreach, Vision Statement and Employment Equity, Multicultural Day.

However, the functioning of the Equity and Diversity Committee has not been without problems. Indeed, all of the advisory committees of the new City have questioned their roles and their relations with the City staff and

elected officials. There have been a number of meetings of the Chairs and Vice-Chairs of all the Advisory Committees trying to work out the difficulties of the present system, including issues of resources, links between staff and committees and links between the various committees. As one of the members of the Equity and Diversity Advisory Committee states : “How can we advise if we don’t know what the issues are ?³⁵”.

The City of Ottawa is currently completing an extensive planning process and this, as with the documents from the Montreal Summit, offer a useful illustration of the extent to which the issue of diversity is visible on the public agenda. The City’s Official Plan has been revised and, along with this, the City has developed a Human Services Plan, an Arts and Heritage Plan, an Economic Strategy and a Corporate Strategic Plan. The Ottawa 2020 Official Plan gives limited visibility to the issues of diversity. Six general principles guide the plan and the second of these principles, “Ottawa as a caring and inclusive community”, has diversity as one of its sub-goals : “The people of Ottawa respect and celebrate cultural and social diversity, and have access to services that are responsive to special and differing needs³⁶”.

The Human Services Plan took diversity somewhat more seriously in drawing up its plan. A consultant was hired to write a report, drawing on the results of a round table, on phone consultations and on a literature review. The report stated that the Human Services Plan (HSP) represents an opportunity for the City of Ottawa “to address diversity in a responsive and meaningful way³⁷”, arguing that, in the past, the City of Ottawa has responded to diversity only in an ad hoc manner. The Plan outlines five major policy themes that “Ottawa must address to progress towards its vision for the year 2020³⁸” and the first of these is diversity and inclusion. The definition given to diversity is large, but the description makes it clear that the priority is ethno-cultural diversity. The document celebrates diversity (“In recent years, more people and cultures than ever have made Ottawa their home, bringing the knowledge and talent to drive economic prosperity along with cultural riches from around the world³⁹”) but also recognizes inequalities and barriers (“Policy, however, has been slow to catch up with the reality of the City’s fast changing ethnic, cultural and demographic makeup⁴⁰”, “Labour force participation rates for Ottawa’s immigrant population remain lower than those for Canadian born residents, highlighting access, social network and information challenges⁴¹”).

Within the administrative structures of the City, the Ottawa Police have been relatively active on issues of diversity. In 1993 a hate crimes unit was established and in 1995 a unit dealing with diversity and race relations. In March 2000 a Community and Police Action Committee was established in order to improve relations between the police and visible minority communities

by creating intervention teams made up of police officers and members of ethno-cultural communities. The Chair of the Equity and Diversity Committee is also chair of this Committee. The Ottawa Police have also undertaken a very active campaign to recruit more members of ethno-cultural communities as members of the police. This campaign includes extensive use of the media but also direct contacts with ethno-cultural communities.

The work of community-based groups has been essential in pushing the City of Ottawa to take more account of ethno-cultural diversity. For example, a forum was organized by a coalition of Local Agencies Serving Immigrants (LASI), the Ottawa Community Immigrant Services Organization (OCISO), the Social Planning Council (SPC) and the National Capital Alliance on Race Relations (NCARR) in April 2001 to evaluate community needs in order to better recognize diversity. The forum was extremely well attended and made the point that this is an issue of increasing saliency in Ottawa.

The analysis of discourse : different models for the management of diversity

By analysing the activities of Montreal and Ottawa, the ways in which they describe their policy objectives, it is possible to understand the fundamental approach that each takes in relation to the management of diversity. Montreal's model is closer to that of interculturalism whereas Ottawa's is closer to multiculturalism. In both cases the model is not pure and there are traces of different approaches within each city but, at the same time, there are observable differences between the dominant approaches in Montreal and in Ottawa.

The Montreal Summit emphasized intercultural relations and links between the ethno-cultural communities and the city as a whole :

In the area of intercultural relations, the City is an important leader in issues dealing with the recognition of the diversity of the population, the socio-economic integration of those groups deemed visible minorities and the value added by the cosmopolitan character of Montreal⁴².

The interculturalist model is also present in the publicity campaign "Nous sommes tous Montréalais". The visual representation shows a variety of people representing different ethno-cultural communities, with the idea that all of those groups share a common Montreal identity. The links between them are what forms their commonality. Montreal is the strong common reference point ; it links the different groups.

At the same time, the Montreal discourse also contains some references closer to universalism. The documents prepared for the Montreal Summit refer

to citizenship and universal rights. All sectors of the population must be able to fully exercise their citizenship. The policies for managing diversity are only one part of a broader policy aimed at creating a universal citizenship. There is no longer a conception of the individual as being a member of a specific culture ; the reference is to citizens having the same rights and duties as other citizens.

Multiculturalism references are also present, although less strongly. The session on diversity at the Montreal Summit recommended the creation of activities “for social groups having specific needs⁴³”. In addition, the decentralizing tendencies towards the arrondissements mean that policies become more varied ; the city can be simultaneously putting toward intercultural, universal and multicultural policies. For example, certain arrondissements have developed policies with separate hours for swimming for Muslim women, a policy clearly influenced by multiculturalism.

Ottawa’s discursive universe plays on two registers, one multicultural and one universal. The Official Plan, as we indicated earlier, includes a commitment to diversity but this coexists with a description that insists on the equality, and identity, of all the citizens : A Caring and Inclusive Community ; Personal safety and security - All people feel safe in their homes and communities ; Access to the Basics - All people have access to adequate income, food, clothing, housing, transportation, health services and recreation ; Citizen engagement-Everyone has the opportunity to fully participate in the life of their community⁴⁴.

At the same time, the Human Services Plan is influenced more by a multicultural approach : “The City and its people have identified an opportunity to build on the City’s diversity by welcoming difference in the City’s citizens, communities and neighbourhoods and by making changes to allow difference to flourish⁴⁵”. The document of the Equity and Diversity Committee also reflect a multicultural approach, arguing for financial and other support to specific ethno-cultural groups, and for the creation of a Multicultural Day. The Ottawa Police refer to a “cultural mosaic”, clearly a multicultural approach with the idea of communities coexisting side by side. Even the Official Plan includes the idea of a city of distinct liveable communities each with its own identity and pride of place⁴⁶.

There are also intercultural references in the Ottawa discourse. The Human Services Plan refers to the importance of links between the various ethno-cultural communities. “The City must provide active support for diversity through strategies which: built inclusion, create shared points of contact, and build a shared commitment to the City as a place in common - in other words, a home⁴⁷”. And the Equity and Diversity Committee also talks of encouraging formal and informal contacts between community groups in order to promote a

better understanding of different cultures. But despite these references, the dominant approaches in Ottawa are those of multiculturalism and of universalism. In the case of the universal references, Ottawa and Montreal are somewhat different ; in the case of Ottawa the references are to equality without any recognition of ethno-cultural diversity whereas in the case of Montreal, the references are how to recognize diversity while creating public space defined by a common citizenship. The recognition of diversity takes a variety of forms in the two cities but the dominant approach is interculturalism in Montreal and multiculturalism in Ottawa.

The intergovernmental context

The basic objective in this section is to understand to what extent the models used by our two municipalities are the result of the policies of other levels of government. In both cases it is the provincial level of government that is the dominant influence, not surprisingly given provincial jurisdiction over municipal institutions. The intent is to understand to what extent municipal actors have discretion or to what extent they are constrained by the policies and/or the activities of the Quebec and Ontario governments.

Montreal has a number of joint activities with the Quebec government that relate to ethno-cultural diversity. There are agreements between the Government of Quebec, specifically with the Ministry of Relations with Citizens and Immigration and the City of Montreal for activities relating to the integration of new immigrants, agreements that will soon be extended to the arrondissements. There is also an intergovernmental agreement for support to interculturalism in the area of cultural activities. In addition, Montreal participates in the coordinating activities organized by the Quebec government, notably those bringing together agencies working with refugees and immigrants and those dealing with visible minority youth.

As well as involving Montreal in specific activities, the Government of Quebec has a strong influence on Montreal on the level of discourse. Traditionally, Quebec has articulated a very clear intercultural discourse. However this intercultural discourse is in the process of evolution. Already in 1991 with the establishment of the moral contract and the importance given to the common public culture, a movement towards a universal approach appeared and this intensified in 1996 when the Quebec government stopped using the term “cultural communities” introduced in the 1970's. The Ministry of Cultural Communities and Immigration became the Ministry for Relations with Citizens and Immigration and the Intercultural Week became the Quebec Citizenship week. The government encouraged the promotion of multiethnic organizations

rather than associations based on single ethno-cultural groups. According to the Ministry for Relations with Citizens and Immigration, government policy is to promote the understanding of the rights and responsibilities of all citizens without discrimination⁴⁸. The discourse is of civic participation and good civic relations, rather than intercultural relations. As was discussed earlier, this evolution from interculturalism to universalism influenced Montreal, both in discourse and activities.

The influence of the federal government, and its policies of multiculturalism, is extremely limited in Montreal. Heritage Canada and the Canadian Human Rights Commission are occasionally mentioned as playing a role in local activities but, generally speaking, the federal government does not play an important role in the area of the management of diversity in Montreal.

In the case of Ottawa, as we have seen, the Ontario legislation of the 1990's on employment equity was critical for the activities of the former city of Ottawa. Given that the present Ontario government abolished the legislation on employment equity and has given little or no priority to the recognition of diversity, it is not surprising that the provincial influence at the current time is not towards the greater recognition of diversity. However, this does not mean that provincial policy has no influence on the approach adopted at the municipal level ; the previous New Democratic government in Ontario did use a multicultural approach and certainly this did influence the municipal approach. There may also be some influence from the federal government in terms of its multicultural approach. However, it is difficult to distinguish between provincial and federal influences, given that both use an approach dominated by multiculturalism.

The Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) is currently calling for joint action, including the federal government, in the area of the management of ethno-cultural diversity. In June 2002 the FCM encouraged its members, the provincial and territorial associations, as well as the provincial and territorial governments to work with the federal government in order to support municipal committees on interracial relations, employment equity, training programmes for intercultural sensitivity as well as other initiatives in interracial relations⁴⁹. This would indeed be a change from current practice, involving a much stronger role for the federal government and therefore a shift in existing intergovernmental relations. At the present time it is primarily the provincial governments, alone with local organizations, that influence the municipal approaches. Whether this present situation could evolve is the subject of our concluding section.

Conclusion : thoughts on local governance and the management of diversity

Several lessons can be drawn from our comparison of the ways in which Montreal and Ottawa think about, and act on, the management of ethno-cultural diversity. The first, and somewhat obvious lesson, is that concern for this issue is very much related to the extent of diversity in the population. Ottawa is only just beginning to take this issue seriously and this clearly corresponds to the recent rapidly increasing diversity of the population.

If municipal interest relates primarily to demographic reality, this should lead to increasing municipal action and, indeed, to increasingly autonomous municipal action as the large cities in Canada are considerably more diverse than their provincial populations. However, this is not necessarily the conclusion that emerges from our comparison and, indeed, municipal orientations would seem to continue to be heavily influenced by provincial government policies and discourses.

It may well be that the recent municipal amalgamations will begin to alter present political dynamics based on very limited municipal autonomy. There are hints of this in the Montreal experience where decentralizing to the arrondissements may lead to more varied policies in regards to ethno-cultural diversity and therefore to policies less influenced by the orientation of the Quebec government. However, the impact of amalgamation on the management of ethno-cultural diversity is ambiguous ; on the one hand it creates a larger municipal administration that must deal with the full range of diversity present across its territory but, on the other, the politics of the amalgamated areas may be more dominated by suburban interests, which have tended to be less committed to the active recognition of diversity.

Both our cases are difficult to interpret from this point of view, although for different reasons. The Montreal amalgamation is difficult to analyse as both decentralization (to arrondissements) and centralization (to the new city and to the urban region) are simultaneously taking place. In Ottawa, amalgamation is more clearly centralizing to the level of the new city but, given that the issue of ethno-cultural diversity is only just beginning to be dealt with seriously by the Ottawa municipal government, it is difficult to evaluate whether amalgamation will increase local policy capacity or reduce the sensitivity to the diversity that is largely present in the central urban core.

This leads to another conclusion : that municipal activity in the area of the management of diversity relates to the general level of municipal capacity and organization. One must therefore look more broadly at the evolution of the place of municipal government in the Canadian intergovernmental system if we

are to understand the likely evolution of the capacity of municipalities, even those as large as Montreal and Ottawa, to create effective systems of governance of ethno-cultural diversity. The Montreal Summit called for the City of Montreal to be a catalyst and an animator of networks, and so do the Ottawa plans, but playing this kind of governance role requires a stronger place in the Canadian intergovernmental context than that which currently exists for municipalities.

Montreal is one of the five Canadian cities along with Vancouver, Calgary, Winnipeg and Toronto that have been meeting as the C5 group of Mayors to lobby for a stronger role for municipal government. They have argued for more federal support for urban issues, and these arguments have had some weight. They have not been alone in making these arguments ; the TD Bank, the FCM, the Liberal caucus through the Task Force chaired by Judy Sgro as well as a variety of university-based researchers have also called for greater federal activity in urban issues. The City of Toronto has played a particularly active role, adopting a document “Towards a New Relationship with Ontario and Canada”, developing a Charter for Toronto and a Model Framework for a city charter, establishing a web site as part of a national campaign (with Vancouver, Winnipeg, Saskatoon, Ottawa and Halifax) entitled “Canada’s Cities: Unleash Our Potential” and working with the Association of Municipalities, both directly and through the FCM Big City Mayor’s Caucus⁵⁰.

It is not yet clear whether there will be any change, much less a major change, in intergovernmental relations or in the financial support given to municipal governments. Our conclusions on the likelihood of truly active local systems of governance of ethno-cultural diversity, with municipal governments playing central roles as catalysts and animators of networks must therefore be tentative. Montreal will probably continue to evolve along the lines of the Quebec model of universalism but very likely with increasing variations on this policy if the arrondissements evolve towards an increasingly active role in the management of diversity. Ottawa will struggle with the recognition of diversity and likely vacillate between approaches based on multiculturalism and those giving more emphasis to creating links between ethno-cultural groups or to the articulation of common reference points for the entire community. Indeed, this remains the final lesson of our comparison : municipalities are taking a role in the management of ethno-cultural diversity and their actions relate at least in part to models or interventions that differ in their objectives and in their approaches. Comparative research needs to continue in order to understand better the impact of the different models and the ways in which policy outcomes affect the lives of urban Canadians. Our comparison of Montreal and Ottawa has hopefully made a contribution to this important question.

Notes

¹ This paper is part of a broader postdoctoral research financed by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. This research is supervised by Caroline Andrew who also contributed to the paper.

² See, among others : Baha Abu-Laban and Tracey M. Derwing (Ed.), *Responding to Diversity in Metropolis. Building an Inclusive Research Agenda*. (Edmonton : Prairie Centre of Excellence for Research on Immigration and Integration, 1997) ; Yasmeen Abu-Laban, "Ethnic Politics in a Globalizing Metropolis : the Case of Vancouver," in Timothy L. Thomas (Ed.), *The Politics of the City : A Canadian Perspective*. (Toronto : ITP Nelson, 1997 : 77-96) ; David W. Edgington and Thomas A. Hutton, *Multiculturalism and Local Government in Greater Vancouver*. (Vancouver Centre of Excellence, RIIM Working Paper Series n° 02-06, March 2002) ; Annick Germain and Damaris Rose, *Montreal. The Quest for a Metropolis*. (Toronto : John Wiley and Sons, 2000) ; Annick Germain and Francine Dansereau (Ed.), *Les pratiques municipales de gestion de la diversité à Montréal*. (INRS- Urbanisation, Culture et Société, March 2003) ; Denise Helly, *Le Québec face à la pluralité culturelle 1977-1994. Un bilan documentaire des politiques*. (Sainte-Foy : Presses de l'Université Laval/IQRC, Documents de recherche no 36, 1996) ; Denise Helly, "Politiques à l'égard des minorités immigrées," *Sociologie et société*, (1994) 26.2 : 127-144 ; Micheline Labelle and Daniel Salée, "La citoyenneté en question : l'État canadien face à l'immigration et à la diversité nationale et culturelle," *Sociologie et Sociétés*, (1999) XXXI.2 : 125-144 ; Peter S. Li, *Destination Canada. Immigration Debates and Issues*. (Don Mills : Oxford University Press, 2003, « Chapter 8 : Immigrants and the City » : 145-162) ; Beth Moore Milroy and Marcia Wallace, *Ethnoracial Diversity and Planning Practices in the Greater Toronto Area. Final Report*. (CERIS Working Paper Series n° 18, 2002) ; S. Paré, W. Frohn and M.-E. Laurin, "Diversification des populations dans la région de Montréal : de nouveaux défis de la gestion urbaine," *Canadian Public Administration*, (2002) 45.2 : 195-216 ; Myer Siemiatycki, Tim Rees, Roxana Ng and Khan Rahi, *Integrating Community Diversity in Toronto : On Whose Terms ?* (CERIS Working Paper Series n° 14, March 2001) ; Marcia Wallace and Frances Frisken, *City-suburban differences in government responses to immigration in the greater Toronto area*. (Toronto : Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto, 2000). It is important to note that the federal government created, in 1996, the Canadian Metropolis project and linked it to the international Metropolis project, a forum for research on public policy relating to migration, cultural diversity and the integration of immigrants in cities. There are four Metropolis-funded research centers in Canada (in Montreal, Toronto, Vancouver and the Prairies) and the Metropolis website gives references to much of the research that has been generated from these four centers.

³ Adrian Favell, *Philosophies of Integration. Immigration and the Idea of Citizenship in France and Britain*. (Londres : Macmillan, 1998) ; Virginie Guiraudon, *Les politiques d'immigration en Europe*. (Paris : L'Harmattan, 2000) ; Hans Vermeulen

(Ed.), *Immigrant Policy for a Multicultural Society. A Comparative Study of Integration, Languages and Religious Policy in Five Western European Countries*. (Bruxelles : Migration Policy Group/IMES, 1997). By “immigrant” we are referring to someone who has emigrated to Canada and was therefore born outside Canada and by “member of an ethno-cultural community” a person belonging to one of the categories of ethnic origin as defined by Statistics Canada and which includes both people who have emigrated to Canada and those born in Canada but who declare that they belong to a particular ethno-cultural community. Ethnicity is therefore both objective and subjective. For a more detailed analysis of this concept, see : Danielle Juteau, *L’ethnicité et ses frontières*. (Montréal : Les Presses de l’Université de Montréal, coll. Trajectoires sociales, 1999).

⁴ Notable exceptions are David W. Edgington, Bronwyn Hanna, Thomas Hutton and Susan Thompson, *Urban Governance, Multiculturalism and Citizenship in Sydney and Vancouver*. (Vancouver Centre of Excellence, RIIM Working Paper Series n° 01-05, January 2001) ; M. Qadeer, “Pluralistic Planning for Multicultural Cities : the Canadian Practice,” *Journal of the American Planning Association*, (1997) 63 : 481-494 ; Louise Quesnel and Ellen Tate, "Accessibility of municipal services for ethnocultural populations in Toronto and Montreal," *Canadian Public Administration*, (1995) 38.3 : 325-351.

⁵ In 1996, 85% of all immigrants and 93% of those who arrived in Canada between 1991 and 1996 were living in a census metropolitan area, compared to 57% of people born in Canada. Statistic Canada, *1996 Census*. Unless otherwise indicated, all the statistics used come from this source.

⁶ Ministry of Relations with Citizens and Immigration, *Tableaux sur l’immigration au Québec. 1997-2001*, (Government of Quebec, Direction de la planification stratégique, 2002).

⁷ Bill 170, Loi portant sur la réforme de l’organisation territoriale municipale des régions métropolitaines de Montréal, Québec et de l’Outaouais (adopted December 20, 2000) and Bill 29, Loi modifiant diverses dispositions législatives en matière municipale (adopted June 21, 2001).

⁸ We will use the word “arrondissement” rather than neighbourhood or district in order to refer specifically to the new Montreal structure.

⁹ Infrastructure program, Agreement with the provinces on low-cost rental housing, National Homelessness Initiative, Canadian Fund for Strategic Infrastructure, Throne Speech of October 2002, etc. See also: Prime Minister’s Caucus Task force on Urban Issues, *Canada’s Urban Strategy. A Vision for the 21st Century*. (2002).

¹⁰ In terms of methodology, this analysis is based on two kinds of information. The basic source is documentary information on programs, policies and structures. This information was supplemented by direct observation of meetings dealing with the issue of diversity (the advisory committee on equity and diversity in Ottawa and the working group on diversity in Montreal for the “Sommet de Montréal” in June 2002). The web sites for cities, governments and other public bodies were also examined as they are

extremely valuable sources of discourses of identity that can be analyzed to see to what extent they do, or do not, integrate ethno-cultural diversity.

¹¹ For a more detailed and critical analysis, see : Seyla Benhabib, *The Claims of Culture. Equality and Diversity in the Global Era*. (Princeton : Princeton University Press, 2002) ; Steve Fenton, *Ethnicity*. (Cambridge : Polity Press, Coll. Key Concepts, 2003) ; Paul Kelly (Ed.), *Multiculturalism Reconsidered. Culture and Equality and its Critics*. (Cambridge : Polity Press, 2002) ; Marco Martiniello, *L'ethnicité dans les sciences sociales contemporaines*. (Paris : Presses universitaires de France, Coll. Que sais-je?, 1995) ; Bhikhu Parekh, *Rethinking Multiculturalism. Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. (Cambridge (MA) : Harvard University Press, 2000) ; Andréa Semprini, *Le multiculturalisme*. (Paris : Presses universitaires de France, Coll. Que sais-je ?, 1997) ; Fred Constant, *Le multiculturalisme*. (Paris, Flammarion, Coll. Dominos, 2000).

¹² François Houle, "Citoyenneté, espace public et multiculturalisme : la politique canadienne de multiculturalisme," *Sociologie et Sociétés*, (1999) XXXI.2 : 101-123.

¹³ Khadiyatou Fall, Daniel Simeoni and Georges Vignaux, *Mots, représentations : enjeux dans les contacts interethniques et interculturels*. (Ottawa : Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa, 1994).

¹⁴ Neil Bissoundath, *Selling Illusions. The Cult of Multiculturalism in Canada*, Toronto, Penguin, 1994.

¹⁵ For a more detailed analysis, see : Thierry Berthet and Christian Poirier, "Politiques locales d'intégration et immigrants aisés : une comparaison France Québec," *Politique et sociétés*, (2000) 19.2-3 : 181-213.

¹⁶ John W. Kingdon, *Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies*. (New York : Harper Collins, 1995).

¹⁷ Annick Germain and Pierre Harel, "L'autonomie des collectivités locales : entre la crise et le changement," *Revue internationale d'action communautaire*, (1985) 13.53 : 35-45.

¹⁸ Ministry of Cultural Communities and Immigration, *Au Québec pour bâtir ensemble, Énoncé de politique en matière d'immigration et d'intégration*. (Government of Quebec, 1990).

¹⁹ Federation of Canadian Municipalities, *Improving Interracial Relations in Canadian municipalities*. (1986).

²⁰ Federation of Canadian Municipalities, *A point of departure. Municipal Administration and Community and Interracial Relations*. (Interracial Relations, 1, 1987).

²¹ The program was in three phases : creation of festivals and multicultural celebrations ; consultation with ethno-cultural groups in order to adapt municipal services ; adoption of programs and policies by municipal councils to promote increased participation of ethno-cultural minorities in the social, economic, cultural and political life of the community.

²² See also: FCM, *Adapting to diversity. The access of multicultural communities to municipal services*. (Interracial Relations, 2, 1988) ; FCM, *Fill the Gap, Intercultural*

and interracial training in municipal administrations. (Interracial Relations, 3, 1990) ; FCM, *Take down the barriers: equality in employment*. (Interracial Relations, 4, 1991) ; FCM, *Program for Innovative Employment. Recognition of Cultural Diversity*. (Interracial Relations, 5, 1992).

²³ FCM, *Policy Statement on Interracial Relations*. (June 2002 : 2).

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 2.

²⁵ Carolle Simard, "Les élus issus des groupes ethniques minoritaires à Montréal : perceptions et représentations politiques, une étude exploratoire," *Politique et Sociétés*, (2003) 22.1 : 53-78.

²⁶ City of Montreal, *Conseil Interculturel de Montréal*. (2001 : 1).

²⁷ City of Montreal, *Thème 3: Métropole agréable à vivre, solidaire et inclusive*. (Sommet de Montréal, June 2002 : 4).

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 9.

²⁹ For example, deconcentrate the Office of Intercultural affairs to the arrondissements, train facilitators (mediators) in the arrondissements, undertake activities promoting intercultural links and fighting against discrimination, sexism and homophobia.

³⁰ It should be noted that there exists a program for ethno-cultural entrepreneurship in the Mayor's Foundation for Youth.

³¹ City of Montreal, *Thème 3: Métropole agréable à vivre, solidaire et inclusive*. (Sommet de Montréal, June 2002 : 23).

³² Caroline Andrew and Mythili Rajiva, "Qui peut exister? La construction des acteurs sur la scène politique municipale," in Dyane Adam (Ed.), *Femmes francophones et pluralisme en milieu minoritaire*. (Ottawa : Les Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa, 1996 : 36-37).

³³ Marc Gervais, *Public Record of the Ottawa Transition Board*. (Ottawa : Ottawa Transition Board, 2001).

³⁴ Equity and Diversity Advisory Committee, *Terms of Reference*. (City of Ottawa, 2002).

³⁵ Interview with a member of EDAC, October 15, 2002.

³⁶ City of Ottawa, *City of Ottawa Official Plan: Preliminary Draft*. (June 2002 : 3).

³⁷ Elizabeth Kwan, *Diversity and the Human Services Plan for the City of Ottawa*. (October 21, 2002 : 1).

³⁸ City of Ottawa, *Ottawa 20/20: Human Services Plan. Priority on People. Draft*. (December 2002 : 8).

³⁹ *Ibid.* : 9.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.* : 10.

⁴¹ *Ibid.* : 10-11.

⁴² City of Montreal, *Thème 3: Métropole agréable à vivre, solidaire et inclusive*. (Sommet de Montréal, June 2002 : 22).

⁴³ *Ibid.* : 20.

⁴⁴ City of Ottawa, *Official Plan*. (2).

⁴⁵ City of Ottawa, *Human Services Plan*. (10).

⁴⁶ *Ibid.* : 3.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.* : 11.

⁴⁸ Ministry of Relations with Citizen and Immigration, *Plan Stratégique 2002-2004*. (Government of Quebec, 2001 : 20).

⁴⁹ FCM, *Policy Statement on Interracial Relations*. (June 2002 : 4).

⁵⁰ City of Toronto, *Establishing a New Relationship with the Federal and Provincial Government: Progress Report*. (Toronto Staff Report).

Works Cited

- Abu-Laban, Baha and Derwing, Tracey M. (Ed.). *Responding to Diversity in Metropolis. Building an Inclusive Research Agenda*. Edmonton : Prairie Centre of Excellence for Research on Immigration and Integration, 1997.
- Abu-Laban, Yasmeen. "Ethnic Politics in a Globalizing Metropolis : the Case of Vancouver." in Thomas, Thimoty L. (Ed.). *The Politics of the City : A Canadian Perspective*. Toronto : ITP Nelson, 1997 : 77-96.
- Andrew, Caroline and Rajiva, Mythili. "Qui peut exister? La construction des acteurs sur la scène politique municipale," in Adam, Dyane. *Femmes francophones et pluralisme en milieu minoritaire*. Ottawa : Les Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa, 1996 : 36-37.
- Benhabib, Seyla. *The Claims of Culture. Equality and Diversity in the Global Era*. Princeton : Princeton University Press, 2002.
- Berthet, Thierry and Poirier, Christian. "Politiques locales d'intégration et immigrants aisés : une comparaison France Québec." *Politique et sociétés*, (2000) 19.2-3 : 181-213.
- Bissoundath, Neil. *Selling Illusions. The Cult of Multiculturalism in Canada*. Toronto : Penguin, 1994.
- City of Montreal. *Conseil Interculturel de Montréal*. 2001.
- City of Montreal. *Thème 3: Métropole agréable à vivre, solidaire et inclusive*. Sommet de Montréal, June 2002.
- City of Ottawa. *City of Ottawa Official Plan: Preliminary Draft*. June 2002 : 3.
- City of Ottawa. *Ottawa 20/20: Human Services Plan. Priority on People. Draft*. December 2002.
- City of Toronto. *Establishing a New Relationship with the Federal and Provincial Government: Progress Report*. Toronto Staff Report.
- Constant, Fred. *Le multiculturalisme*. Paris, Flammarion, Coll. Dominos, 2000.
- Edgington, David W., Hanna, Bronwyn, Hutton, Thomas and Thompson, Susan. *Urban Governance, Multiculturalism and Citizenship in Sydney and Vancouver*. Vancouver Centre of Excellence, RIIM Working Paper Series n° 01-05, January 2001.
- Edgington, David W. and Hutton, Thomas A. *Multiculturalism and Local Government in Greater Vancouver*. Vancouver Centre of Excellence, RIIM Working Paper Series n° 02-06, March 2002.
- Equity and Diversity Advisory Committee. *Terms of Reference*. City of Ottawa, 2002.

-
- Fall, Khadiyatoulah, Simeoni, Daniel and Vignaux, Georges. *Mots, représentations : enjeux dans les contacts interethniques et interculturels*. Ottawa : Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa, 1994.
- Favell, Adrian. *Philosophies of Integration. Immigration and the Idea of Citizenship in France and Britain*. Londres : Macmillan, 1998.
- Federation of Canadian Municipalities. *Improving Interracial Relations in Canadian municipalities*. 1986.
- Federation of Canadian Municipalities. *A point of departure. Municipal Administration and Community and Interracial Relations*. Interracial Relations, 1, 1987.
- Federation of Canadian Municipalities. *Adapting to diversity. The access of multicultural communities to municipal services*. Interracial Relations, 2, 1988.
- Federation of Canadian Municipalities. *Fill the Gap, Intercultural and interracial training in municipal administrations*. Interracial Relations, 3, 1990.
- Federation of Canadian Municipalities. *Take down the barriers: equality in employment*. Interracial Relations, 4, 1991.
- Federation of Canadian Municipalities. *Program for Innovative Employment. Recognition of Cultural Diversity*. Interracial Relations, 5, 1992.
- Federation of Canadian Municipalities. *Policy Statement on Interracial Relations*. June 2002.
- Fenton, Steve. *Ethnicity*. Cambridge : Polity Press, Coll. Key Concepts, 2003.
- Germain, Annick and Harel, Pierre. "L'autonomie des collectivités locales : entre la crise et le changement." *Revue internationale d'action communautaire*, (1985) 13.53 : 35-45.
- Germain, Annick and Rose, Damaris. *Montreal. The Quest for a Metropolis*. Toronto : John Wiley and Sons, 2000.
- Germain, Annick and Dansereau, Francine (Ed.). *Les pratiques municipales de gestion de la diversité à Montréal*. INRS- Urbanisation, Culture et Société, March 2003.
- Gervais, Marc. *Public Record of the Ottawa Transition Board*. Ottawa : Ottawa Transition Board, 2001.
- Guiraudon, Virginie. *Les politiques d'immigration en Europe*. Paris : L'Harmattan, 2000.
- Helly, Denise. "Politiques à l'égard des minorités immigrées." *Sociologie et société*, (1994) 26.2 : 127-144.
- Helly, Denise. *Le Québec face à la pluralité culturelle 1977-1994. Un bilan documentaire des politiques*. Sainte-Foy : Presses de l'Université Laval/IQRC, Documents de recherche no 36, 1996.
- Houle, François. "Citoyenneté, espace public et multiculturalisme : la politique canadienne de multiculturalisme." *Sociologie et Sociétés*, (1999) XXXI.2 : 101-123.
- Juteau, Danielle. *L'ethnicité et ses frontières*. Montréal : Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal, coll. Trajectoires sociales, 1999.

-
- Kelly, Paul (Ed.). *Multiculturalism Reconsidered. Culture and Equality and its Critics*. Cambridge : Polity Press, 2002.
- Kingdon, John W. *Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies*. New York : Harper Collins, 1995.
- Kwan, Elizabeth. *Diversity and the Human Services Plan for the City of Ottawa*. October 21, 2002.
- Labelle, Micheline and Salée, Daniel. "La citoyenneté en question : l'État canadien face à l'immigration et à la diversité nationale et culturelle." *Sociologie et Sociétés*, (1999) XXXI.2 : 125-144.
- Li, Peter S. *Destination Canada. Immigration Debates and Issues*. Don Mills : Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Martiniello, Marco. *L'ethnicité dans les sciences sociales contemporaines*. Paris : Presses universitaires de France, Coll. Que sais-je?, 1995.
- Milroy, Beth Moore and Wallace, Marcia. *Ethnoracial Diversity and Planning Practices in the Greater Toronto Area. Final Report*. CERIS Working Paper Series n° 18, 2002.
- Ministry of Cultural Communities and Immigration. *Au Québec pour bâtir ensemble, Énoncé de politique en matière d'immigration et d'intégration*. Government of Quebec, 1990.
- Ministry of Relations with Citizen and Immigration. *Plan Stratégique 2002-2004*. Government of Quebec, 2001.
- Ministry of Relations with Citizens and Immigration. *Tableaux sur l'immigration au Québec. 1997-2001*. Government of Quebec, Direction de la planification stratégique, 2002.
- Paré, S. Frohn, W. and Laurin, W.-E. "Diversification des populations dans la région de Montréal : de nouveaux défis de la gestion urbaine." *Canadian Public Administration*, (2002) 45.2 : 195-216.
- Parekh, Bhikhu. *Rethinking Multiculturalism. Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. Cambridge (MA) : Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Prime Minister's Caucus Task force on Urban Issues. *Canada's Urban Strategy. A Vision for the 21st Century*. 2002.
- Qadeer, M. "Pluralistic Planning for Multicultural Cities : the Canadian Practice." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, (1997) 63 : 481-494
- Quesnel, Louise and Tate, Ellen. "Accessibility of municipal services for ethnocultural populations in Toronto and Montreal." *Canadian Public Administration*, (1995) 38.3 : 325-351.
- Semprini, Andréa. *Le multiculturalisme*. Paris : Presses universitaires de France, Coll. Que sais-je ?, 1997.
- Siemiatycki, Myer, Rees, Tim, Ng, Roxana and Rahi, Khan. *Integrating Community Diversity in Toronto : On Whose Terms ?* CERIS Working Paper Series n° 14, March 2001.

-
- Simard, Carolle. "Les élus issus des groupes ethniques minoritaires à Montréal : perceptions et représentations politiques, une étude exploratoire." *Politique et Sociétés*, (2003) 22.1 : 53-78.
- Vermeulen, Hans (Ed.). *Immigrant Policy for a Multicultural Society. A Comparative Study of Integration, Languages and Religious Policy in Five Western European Countries*. Bruxelles : Migration Policy Group/IMES, 1997.
- Wallace, Marcia and Frisken, Frances. *City-suburban differences in government responses to immigration in the greater Toronto area*. Toronto : Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto, 2000.