

Canadian Multiculturalism Policy  
and Ethnicity

By

Jung Ae JANG

THESIS

Submitted to

School of Public Policy and Management, KDI

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

MASTER OF PUBLIC POLICY

2002

Professor Hun Joo Park

In the name of Jesus the compassionate, the merciful

## Abstract

### Canadian Multiculturalism Policy and Ethnicity

By

Jung Ae JANG

The fact that there are a number of differently multicultural communities in Canada renders a single multicultural policy across the country untenable. The differences between forms of multiculturalism correspond to a very real difference between the grounds on which cultural diversity is negotiated. The idea of a single *pan-Canadian* nation as Pierre Elliott Trudeau and others articulated it contained a citizenry possessing an almost incalculable variety of cultural backgrounds. The idea of being Canadian, had to involve the acceptance of a common *modus operandi* for the public life of the country as a whole. The horizons of this shared form of interaction were constitutionally entrenched as a "common set of values" in the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. Such a society could never accommodate Quebec or Aboriginal Peoples because it premised on a single constellation of societal expectations that animates interaction among cultural communities in all parts of Canada. One can identify this specific point as the explicit reason for the failure of Canadian constitution to reconcile federalism with nationalism.

Nonetheless, multiculturalism remains one of the essential political dimensions of Canada. At the center of multiculturalism. First, the term was used to describe a society characterized by ethnic or cultural heterogeneity. Second, multiculturalism is associated with an ideal of equality and of respect between different groups within the same society. Third, the governmental politics, be it federal or provincial, since 1971, the year when Trudeau

government intervened to legitimate in this field are related to this policy.

Faced with the Canadian dilemma, it is imperative that one set sights of reconciling diversity and equality beyond one single context. In order to manage this issue effectively, one must acknowledge at least these three societal communities, each of which is multicultural in its own right, and in its own way. Recognizing these entities would be an important step to acknowledging that at the beginning of twenty first century it is no longer feasible to think of "one country, one multicultural context." There is something to be gained from a pluralism of styles as well as from a pluralist style.

This thesis has tried to show that there are several distinct multicultural contexts in Canada and that in order for the federal framework to include all Canadians in a meaningful way, this reality requires constitutional recognition. But it still remains to address the question of just how to recognize societal communities, in what form, and by what means. While a fully developed answer to this question cannot be provided here, it is perhaps useful to explore briefly some of the issues which would clearly need to be a major change in the substance of Canadian federalism.

The notion of sovereignty has been briefly discussed in this thesis. It is important to this discussion because there has been a strong sense among Canadians and now Quebecois that they have been excluded from the constitutional development of Canada. They have felt that far from Anglophone Canadians seeking their consent, they have had no choice but to be one of ten equal provinces or to protest. A new royal Proclamation might be a first step in restoring the trust between Quebec and Anglophone Canada which was seen as the fruit of Confederation. It would recognize Quebec as a societal community within Canada and explicitly acknowledge it as a unique multicultural entity.

To acknowledge Aboriginal Peoples and Quebec as a societal communities in Canada would require a number of important problems to be overcome: the differences between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal forms of sovereignty; the constitutional feasibility of a non-contiguous territorial Aboriginal societal community being recognized within a territorial federation; and the reconciliation of diversity and differently culturally diverse contexts with equality. These are major challenges. Constitutional recognition of societal communities as fundamental elements of Canada through a new Royal Proclamation would open the door to a lengthy process of healing, searching and re-acquaintance.

Contents:	page
Introduction-----	1
I. Duality of Canadian Cultural Identity-----	2
II. Immigration and the Evolution of Multicultural Canada-----	10
1. Discriminatory Immigration Policy in Canadian History-----	10
2. From the Repressive Philosophy to a Positive Approach: Modification of the Discriminatory Immigration Law----	14
III. From Assimilation to Integration-----	16
1. Aboriginality and Multiculturalism-----	16
2. Multicultural Ethnic Landscape-----	22
Conclusion-----	30
Bibliography-----	32



## Introduction

Canada was the first country to adopt an official multiculturalism policy. Recently, the federal multiculturalism policy and politics have attracted a great deal of debates and controversies in Canada, which revealed the fragility of the social compact or compromises underlying the Canadian immigration policies. This thesis is an attempt to examine the problem of social fragmentation in Canada with particular regard to the Canadian Multiculturalism policy and ethnicity, a self-defining characteristic of Canada's modern and postmodern history. As Margaret Atwood reminds us, Canadians are not aboriginals; they are immigrants even though they have been living in Canada for many generations.

Underlying the multiculturalism policy is a belief in the primacy of the individual in all areas of public life. "Each and every citizen was to be encouraged to express his or her heritage as a part of the Canadian 'mosaic'. Despite this lofty goal, "multiculturalism has never been anything less than controversial"(Breton, 2000: 155). It has been seen by some as in the country of Quebec.

Nonetheless, multiculturalism remains one of the essential political dimensions of Canada. It has resonated in the problematic of biculturalism between the French Canadians and English Canadians in the 1960s. At the center of the problematic or debates, there are three competing definitions of multiculturalism. First, the term was used to describe a society characterized by ethnic or cultural heterogeneity. Second, multiculturalism is associated with an ideal of equality and of respect between different groups within the same society. Third, the governmental politics, be it federal or provincial, since 1971, the year when Trudeau government intervened to legitimate in this field has been involved continuously with the multiculturalism policy.

The issue is not whether there will be conflict in Canada or not. Conflicts

exist, and their resolution remain quite illusive. The question is how Canadians can continue to foster among themselves a dialogue about social justice that respects French Canadians, English Canadians, Aboriginals and newcomers.

In resolving this puzzle, this thesis focuses on French Canada and Aboriginals because they are considered as one of the most important and sensitive ethnic groups in Canadian multicultural politics. French Canadians in Quebec are one of the two founding peoples of Canada along with English Canadians. Quebec has been at the centre of the politics of origin and evolution of the Multiculturalism policy in Canada.

The possible alternative or resolution of the Multiculturalism problem and that of French Canada cannot be sufficiently understood without its relation with the Aboriginals in Canada and the majority of the English Canadian population. The purpose of this paper is to investigate to what extent the political manifestation of multiculturalism has realized its objective and ideal: i.e. unity in diversity, equality of ethnic groups in Canada, and etc. To what extent all these ideals of multicultural society have been effectively carried out is the key concern of this thesis.

## I. Duality of Canadian Cultural Identity

Canada has become "one of the most ethnically diverse countries of the world, ranking next to the United Kingdom, Singapore and the United States" (Pendakur and Hennebry 1998: 1). According to a census, less than 30% of all Canadians (numbering 28,528,125) reported identified themselves as only Aboriginal(2%) or only French(10%) or only British(17%) in origin. In contrast, 26% reported having origins other than Aboriginal, British, or French, or Canadian, and another 26% reported multiple ethnic origins.

The most frequently reported ethnic origins other than British, French are, in descending order of importance: German, Italian, Aboriginal, Ukrainian, Chinese, and Dutch; each of these origins was reported by over 900,000 people

in 1996. Generally speaking, Europeans are much more likely than Asians to report multiple ethnic origins. Half of all Aboriginals also reported a background composed of both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal ancestors.(Gingras:111)

There is no simple way to summarize the Canadian ethnic setting, because the ethnic landscape is remarkably different in each part of the country and therefore inevitably engenders diverse and often conflicting needs and aspirations. And it poses a real challenge to the Canadian political system. To fully understand the scope of this challenge, one should note that more than half of all Canadians under 15 years of age have ethnic origins other than Aboriginal, British, French or 'Canadian' and that proportion of adult minorities is projected to double between 1996 and 2016.

Any research on Canadian ethnic relations requires paying attention not only to ethnicity but also to language, and this is no simple undertaking. French has been spoken in Canada without interruption for about 400 years, but only in 1970 has it become an official language of the federal institutions and in 1981 an official language of the country, with the adoption of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.<sup>1)</sup>

---

1) CANADIAN CHARTER OF RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS

Official Languages of Canada

16.(1)English and French are the official languages of Canada and have equality of status and equal rights and privileges as to their use in all institutions of the Parliament and government of Canada. (2)English and French are the official languages of New Brunswick and have equality of status and equal rights and privileges as to their use in all institutions of the legislature and government of New Brunswick. (3)Nothing in this Charter limits the authority of Parliament or a legislature to advance the equality of status or use of English and French. 16.1(1)The English linguistic community and the French linguistic community in New Brunswick have equality of status and equal rights and privileges, including the right to distinct educational institutions and such distinct cultural institutions as are necessary for the preservation and promotion of those communities. (2)The role of the legislature and government of New Brunswick to preserve and promote the status, rights and privileges referred to in subsection(1)is affirmed. 17.(1)Everyone has the right to use English or French in any debates and other proceedings of Parliament. (2)Everyone has the right to use English or French in any debates and other proceedings of the legislature of New Brunswick. 18.(1)The statutes, records and journals of parliament shall be printed and published in English and French and both language versions are equally authoritative. (2)The statutes, records and journals of the legislature of New Brunswick shall be printed and published in English and French and both language versions are equally authoritative. 19.(1)Either English or French may be used by any person in, or in any pleading in or process issuing from,

Describing the linguistic composition of Canada is truly a problematic mission. To begin with, language has to be distinguished from ethnic origin: for example, in Ontario, there is a Francophone multicultural association coexisting with a French-Canadian association. Next, somebody's principal language is not necessarily this person's mother tongue. Many individuals switch languages over the course of their life.

The British and French ethnic groups represented 90% of the Canadian population in 1871 and 90% of the population spoke French or English most

---

any court established by Parliament. (2)Either English or French may be used by any person in, or in any pleading in or process issuing from, any court of New Brunswick. 20.(1)Any member of the public in Canada has the right to communicate with and to receive available services from, any head or central office of an institution of the Parliament of government of Canada in English or French, and has the same right with respect to any other office of any such institution where(a)there is a significant demand for communications with and services from that office in such language; or(b)due to the nature of the office, it is reasonable that communications with and services from that office be available in both English and French. (2)Any member of the public in New Brunswick has the right to communicate with, and to receive available services from, any office of an institution of the legislature or government of New Brunswick in English or French. 21.Nothing in sections 16 to 20 abrogates or derogates from any right, privilege or obligation with respect to the English and French languages, or either of them, that exists or is continued by virtue of any other provision of the Constitution of Canada. 22.Nothing in sections 16 to 20 abrogates or derogates from any legal or customary right or privilege acquired or enjoyed either before or after the coming into force of this Charter with respect to any language that is not English or French.

#### Minority language Educational Rights

23.(1)Citizens of Canada (a)whose first language learned and still understood is that of the English or French linguistic minority population of the province in which they reside, or (b)who have received their primary school instruction in Canada in English or French and reside in a province where the language in which they received that instruction is the language of the English or French linguistic minority population of the province, have the right to have their children receive primary and secondary school instruction in that language in that province. (2)Citizens of Canada of whom any child has received or is receiving primary or secondary school instruction in English or French in Canada, have the right to have all their children receive primary and secondary school instruction in the same language. (3)The right of citizens of Canada under subsections(1) and (2) to have their children receive primary and secondary school instruction in the language of the English or French linguistic minority population of a province (a)applies wherever in the province the number of children of citizens who have such a right is sufficient to warrant the provision to them out of public funds of minority language instruction; and (b)includes, where the number of those children so warrants, the right to have them receive that instruction in minority language educational facilities provided out of public funds.

often in the home in 1996, but this constancy is misleading: it "masks the very different evolution experienced by English and French-speaking communities across the country".(Lachapelle 1999:2)

The number of people with French as their mother tongue has continually increased since the arrival of the French explorers and was of the order of 6.7 million in 1996, but their proportion of the total Canadian population has dropped to only 24%. Many speakers of French do not have French as their mother tongue. The net result is that 8.9 million (23%) spoke French most often at home.

Francophones, however, are not distributed evenly across Canada: between 86% and 90% of all Francophones live in Quebec. Depending on the definition used, 82% to 83% of all habitants of Quebec are Francophones and in no other province are Francophones a majority.

Outside Quebec, the largest Francophone minority is found in Ontario (between 300,000 and 500,000), but the relative weight of the smaller Acadian population of New Brunswick is greater (almost a third of the provincial population). The assimilation of Francophones is a major source of concern, especially in areas where they are in minority and where marriage with non-Francophones is quite frequent.

The symbolic and instrumental recognition of French as an official language is relatively recent. This may account for the fairly small proportion of bilingual Canadians: only 17% in 1996, over half of them living in Quebec. In Canada, personal bilingualism varies considerably, with a high of 38% in Quebec, 33% in New Brunswick, less than 12% anywhere else, with a low of 4% in Newfoundland. Of all Canadian cities, Montreal has the largest English-French bilingual population.

Living as a French Canadian in Canada is not always satisfying nor comfortable from the point of view of ethnicity. French Canadians are one of the founding peoples of Canada. They were first conquerors of Canada and at the same time they became conquered. As Gingras says<sup>2)</sup> French Canadians

---

2) Gingras compares the French Canadian Identity to the symbol "between tree and bark":

Se trouver 'entre l'arbre et l'écorce', c'est occuper une position inconfortable. C'est le lot presque inévitable d'une minorité comme celle des Canadiens français[...] La plupart des partis politiques voit les communautés minoritaires comme des revendicatrices jamais satisfaites, tandis que les candidats de ces mêmes partis misent en ces revendications pour

consider themselves as a being caught between "l'arbre et l'écorce". Political parties regard them as a group "demanding and never satisfied" and take use of their demand and make it a cause for their election. The demand of French Canadians was received and reflected in the creation of the Royal Commission of Bilingualism and Biculturalism. And this act was the origin of the Act of Multiculturalism in Canada. Therefore duality or dualism was the nucleus of Canadian ethnicity problem.

Until the 1960s, the 'dominance of the two charter groups has never been seriously challenged because of French natural increase and high levels of British immigration (Porter 1965: 61). But "most analysts of Canadian society have tended to equate ethnicity and politics in Canada with English-French relations" (Palmer 1991: 3). Ever since the conquest by the British in 1760 and despite colossal political, social and economic pressures, Canadians of French ancestry have resisted linguistic, cultural and political assimilation.

In reaction to uncertainty in general and to threats to their habits and customs in particular, as early as 1764, an unified front of French-Canadian secular and religious leaders came up with compromise proposals to establish a modus vivendi with the British in dealing with the political, legal, religious, and commercial tensions associated with the Conquest. Generalized beliefs developed about what was desirable for the community's future, particularly with the respect to freedom of religion and reinstatement of French civil laws (*Coutume de Paris*): the ideology of "la survivance" (survival) was born. Members of the community supported their spokesmen who made claims on behalf of the community: the Canadian settlers abandoned by France became a sociological nation.

Whatever the numerous factors that account for the sociological differences associated with the ethnic diversity, the result of this French-Canadian survival has been that, historically, education, income, status, and other good things of life have not been equally distributed among Canadians of French and British origins (Porter, 1965) and that Canadians were aware of it.

Through considerable efforts and constant struggles, many though by no

---

tenter de se faire élire. Les communautés minoritaires francophones sont écartelés entre Québécois et Canadiens anglais qui semblent se relayer à tantôt les ignorer, tantôt les mépriser, jamais à les considérer comme des partenaires à part entière. (Gingras 1998:11)

means all of the inequalities have progressively satisfied. On the federal scene, one of the most noteworthy gains by French Canadians has been adoption of the Official Languages Act in 1969. However, "the lack of overall government commitment to implementation of the Act is distressing" even in 2000, reports the Commissioner of Official Languages (2000: 8).

By the way, the civil rights movement in the United States and the war in Algeria inspired Québec's "Quiet Revolution". This "Quiet Revolution" was a kind of reforms during the period following "the election of a Liberal government in Québec in 1960 when the modernization, expansion and bureaucratization of the Québec State apparatus gave rise to the development of a Québécois social identity". (Winter 2001: 176)

As Winter says, it was the transition from French-Canadian language and religion based identity to Québécois "national" identity. Furthermore, it reinforced the concentration of French culture and language to the province of Québec.(Jutéau 1993).

The power of Québécois nationalism, based on the territorial basis, opposed to French Canadian nationalism, led to the creation of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism by the federal government in 1963. The commission was established on "the assumption that Canadian society was composed of two linguistic and cultural groups whose fundamental relationship needed clarifying."(Winter:176) While giving priority to a culturalist interpretation of dualism in Canada, the commission also took into account forms of structural dualism based on territoriality—implemented through the separation of two parts of Canada— Lower and Upper Canada in 1789—and the recognition of two official legislatures in the Constitution Act of 1791.

Nevertheless, throughout the time of investigation, the terminology used by the commission shifted from the equality of groups to the equality of languages and cultures as Juteau says.<sup>3)</sup> This shift can be explained by an increasing number of Canadians that did not belong to one of the two founding peoples.

---

3) Juteau says in his article, "Du dualisme canadien au pluralisme quebecois":

Canadiens français et Canadiens anglais deviennent des francophones et des anglophones. De l'égalité entre deux peuples qui ont fondé la Confédération canadienne, l'on passe, dans le rapport préliminaire de la Commission d'enquête, à l'égalité entre les deux langues et deux cultures au sein d'un Etat bilingue et biculturel. (Juteau 2000: 17)



Slowly gaining political influence the other ethnic groups had become a "third force" in Canadian politics(Winter:177). Winter said that their voice had provoked the members of the Bilingual and Bicultural Commission, while reitering their perception of Canada as bicultural country to "take into account the contribution made by the other ethnic groups to the cultural enrichment of Canada"(Canada, Bilingual and Bicultural Commission, Volume IV 1969).

The concept of equality of two peoples, shifted to that of two languages and two cultures, was influenced by the apparition of the third force of Aboriginals and other immigrant groups in Canadian politics. It seems that the structure of two forces is transformed to that of multiple forces. Regardless of the apparition of the multiple forces, there has been always a dichotomy of structure, culture-nature which is always ready to be transmuted to the dualism of subject-environment.<sup>4)</sup> This dualism redefines self as culture and other as nature. This dichotomy seems to succeed the European dualism. The European dualism, where the political conflicts hardly collide with the will of redefining economic functions and structures, is related to a particular conception of the society. The society where 'spirit', so to speak the chiefs, those who are at the top of the society, dominated social 'body' in the rigid structure with stability.

In North-America, that dualism tends to be transformed from a strongly hierarchical structure to a society where individual is free and responsible. Therefore the structure of confrontation in a blocked society is transformed to a dualism which reactivate ancestral anguish related to a relation society-barbarity and individual-environment. This duality is found in the relation between British and French Canadians and between these two founding peoples and Aboriginals. Imbert, calling this dualism as "geocultural", analyzes that it is doubled with the historical duality of French Canada-English Canada.<sup>5)</sup>

---

4) Patrick Imbert says:

Ainsi, les autochtones faisaient partie de la nature jusqu'au début du XXe siècle dans la conception d'une majorité de gens du monde occidental. De nos jours (comme autrefois pour un spécialiste comme Taylor), les Autochtones sont perçus comme ayant une culture différente des autres Nord-Américains. Cette culture autochtone définit la nature d'une autre manière que nous, selon un rapport non antagoniste.(Imbert:1999)

5) Mis à part le clivage entre cultures européennes et cultures autochtones, le dualisme géoculturel du difficile rapport sujet-environnement se double d'une dualité culturelle historique Canada français-Canada anglais issue de la conquête de la Nouvelle-France par



The double duality is found in Canada. It is derived from the historical particularity of Canada. In the American history, scientific and practical rationality embraces immense space in the calculation depending on the legal code for the service of economic and political welfare of the population. Different from Americans, Canadians came from their traditional community to go into the invention of an identity by which an individual become a free citizen, who was capable to dominate space. This social liberation was not effective to the Aborigines who were very often victims of the dominating dualism. For example, to get French arms, the Aborigines should have converted to Catholics. And the Iroquois allied to English Protestants and Dutch people could eliminate the Hurons.

In the relations between French and British Canadians, this kind of duality is found, while Canada began actively recruiting non-British immigrants during its "wheat boom" of the early 20th century, it only became "multicultural" in the post-World War II period (Winter:175). Changes in the world system led to increasing opposition towards "Anglo-conformity" (Gordon 1964). This term reflects the assumption that "immigrants assimilate to the British group," which was until then Canada's dominant ideology (Burnet and Palmer:223).

What did influence Canada's response towards the ethno-cultural diversity. First, the same economic growth that led Germany to recruit "guest workers" from southern Europe forced Canada to open its borders to immigrants coming from places other than the traditional sources in the Northern and Central Europe (Winter:176). Second, decolonization in the "world revolution" in human rights, demonstrated by the proceedings of the Nuremberg Trials, the civil rights movement in the United States and the war in Algeria inspired Quebec's "Quiet Revolution" and paved the way for the political emergence of Canada's Aboriginal people as "First Nations" during the late 1970's and 1980's. In following chapter, this paper will examine the procedure of this change from the British oriented society to the multicultural one in the light of the historical survey of the Canadian immigration and its policy.

---

l'Angleterre. (Imbert:290)

## II. Immigration and the Evolution of Multicultural Canada

### 1. Discriminatory Immigration Policy in Canadian History

The politics of modern immigration of Canada has begun with the Confederation in 1867. The number of the immigrants was 10,666 in 1867 133,624 in 1883. The elaboration of the national politics in 1878 by the Conservatives has made immigration in Canada.<sup>6)</sup>

During some years, provinces participated in the Canadian politics in the immigration through the federal-provincial meeting. In 1869, the first law on the immigration resulted from the collaboration between the two levels of government.

This immigration law that the Parliament adopted in 1869 defined the medical examination requirement which essentially prevented the entrance of the miserables and the handicapped to the country (Whitaker, 1991).

In 1867, immigration and agriculture were associated because it was clear in the spirit of the political responsables that immigrants would be farmers. For the time being, the federal government was responsible for the flow of immigration. Federal Government emphasized its control on immigration in 1872. In 1878, the

---

6) At the very outset, it was defined that immigration and agriculture were the field of common competence. In article 95 of l'Acte de l'Amérique du Nord britannique, we can recognize it.

#### Agriculture and immigration

95. Dans chaque province, la législature pourra faire des lois relatives à l'agriculture et à l'immigration dans cette province ; et il est par la présente déclaré que le parlement du Canada pourra de temps à autre faire des lois relatives à l'agriculture et à l'immigration dans cette province ; et il est par la présente déclaré que le parlement du Canada pourra de temps à autre faire des lois relatives à l'agriculture et l'immigrarion dans toutes les provinces ou aucune d'elles en particulier ; et toute loi de la législature d'une province relative à l'agriculture ou à l'immigration n'y aura aucun effet qu'aussi longtemps et que tant qu'elle ne sera incompatible avec aucune des lois du parlement du Canada (Acte de l'Amérique du Nord britannique, 1867, cited in Rémillard, 1985 : 486).

federal government partially modified the exclusive bond between immigration and agriculture because it wanted to attract industrial labor. During the period, this link was strengthened. The colonization of the West became the priority for the Federal State. Federal State worked with the railroad company, Canadian Pacific(CP) to attract specially immigrants. Furthermore during the year of 30, the royal commission of inquiry concluded that the Canadian Pacific and the National Canadian were very important agents of the immigration at that time. At the turn of the century, Canadian Pacific played the role of serving for recruit and immigration(Burnet, 1978).

The year of 1896 was that of hinge symbolized by the victory of the Federal Liberal Party of Wilfrid Laurier. The victory of Laurier had as consequence the nomination of Clifford Sifton in the title of Minister of Internal Affairs, one of the responsibilities of which was immigration. It was his fundamental responsibility.

Since the elaboration of the national politic, the Federal State has defined immigration policy in the function of the market, giving a lot of initiatives to the private companies. Sifton without cutting the bridge with private companies centralized operation concerning immigration endowed Canadian State bureaucracy better organized.

Under his leadership, the Canadian state signed even the secret agreement with German navigation companies guaranteeing some for each immigrant recruited. Sifton wanted to populate the West with the population of the peasant origin and he was afraid of the immigration of the industrial labor. The hierarchy of the country was defined: all the individuals who came from the British Isles and the United States were considered non-immigrants, the French, Belgians, the Danish and then Scandinavians, the Swiss, the Finnish, and finally, Russians, Ausro-Hungarians, Germans, Ukrainians, the Polish. Even though these groups were hierarchically categorized according to the place of their country origin, they were all classified as "assimilatables", which was a kind of social honor and prestige at that period of time. In contrast, the "non-desirables" were defined as the groups non-assimilatable: Italians, the Slavish of the South, Arabians, Greeks, the Jewish, Asians and Gypsies.

During the years preceding World War II, there was a very strong wave

against the groups which were not of the Britain origin. The First World War and Russian Revolution only strengthened xenophobia against Eastern Europe and Germany, even though they were classified as "assimilatable".

In 1906, a new federal law on immigration reinforced. The categories of exclusion were extended to include patients of repugnant illness, weak-spirit people, beggars, prostitutes and pimps. In short, all the individuals who were deemed to be a threat to the health of the society, to the security of the State and the public treasure.

From 1906 to 1919, the modification of the law of 1906 and various other decrees expanded the categories of people for exclusion. "Amoral" women and girls were prohibited to enter to Canada in 1910. The following year, a decree from the ministry focusing on inhibition of "black" immigrants was not adopted. But the discrimination against these people was insidiously implemented by the utilization of various medical criteria.

Asians received little hospitable treatment. 100 dollars in tax was imposed on Chinese immigrants from 1884, and the tax amount increased to 500 dollars by 1903. The "Caucasian" hostility against Chinese immigrants was very strong because of the fear of Chinese workers taking coveted jobs and potentially displacing Caucasians. These forms of exclusion and discrimination were new.

Already in the first half of the 19th century, the immigrants from Ireland were treated as an outcast. Poor, Catholic, looking for industrial jobs specially after 1847, these Irish were not well received by most of the Anglo-Saxon protestants. Notably, in the years from 1830-1834 and 1845-1849 during which Irish immigration were respectively from 185,952 and 230,094.

After this wave of Irish immigrants, Jewish, Italian, Eastern European and Asian immigrants came to Canada. As I mentioned earlier, it seemed that Canadian authority tried to "avoid the immigration of the industrial workers and give privilege to the British immigrants and farming population"(Whitaker, 1991).

After the First World War, the discriminatory policy started anew. In 1922, the new law on immigration practically abolished special tax for the Chinese. But it regulated "the quota for the number of admissible persons coming from China, Japan and Africa"(Ward, 1978). It was 1947 that this law was replaced by the less discriminatory rule. Let us remind that in 1922 one year before the

law on Asian and African immigration, Canada adopted a law fostering the integration of 100,000 British people. During the years of 30, Canada was extremely for the immigration of the Jewish European contingents who had escaped from the persecution of Nazi to Europe.

The new law of 1947 aimed at correcting "discriminating measures of the past"(Whitaker, 1991). From 1950 to 1965, the new Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration was in charge of the application of the new Canadian immigration policies. A distinction was made between two categories of people at that time: sponsored immigrants and independent immigrating population.

Meanwhile, the new law of 1952 maintained the principle that immigration was a privilege. Very large discriminatory power was attributed to the officials and to the ministry. The measures of exclusion, deportation, and detention could be applied without any calling procedure. Once again, immigration population was categorized and put to hierarchy: 1)at the top one could find British subjects, those from Commonwealth and persons from United-States and France; and then 2)immigrating population non-sponsored from certain countries of Western Europe. 3)immigrants sponsored from Europe, America and Middle-East 4)immigrants from other countries and those who looking for sponsor the members of the family. Thus the law of 1952 was assorted essentially by the measures of exclusion and inhibition.

One of the most flagrant case of the discriminations of the 1950's was that of the measure taken against the persons of Chinese or East European origin suspected as communists. From 1946 to 1958, 29,671 immigration applications were rejected for reasons of national security. For example, the immigration application of Irene Debrin, a Russian woman who was born in Beijing, China and lived in South America for most of her life, was rejected even if though she was offered a the professorial position in Slavic Languages department at the University of British Columbia. The official reason for the visa rejection was that of the security of the State.

## 2. From the Repressive Philosophy to a Positive Approach: Modification of the Discriminatory Law of Immigration

In 1969, Diefenbaker government modified the law of 1952. Independent immigrants were chosen more than the past in the function of criteria of competence rather than in that of national origin. One accorded to all the people the right to sponsor without restriction the members of their immediate family.

These new regulations of 1969 marked change of the policy and eventual elimination of all the discriminating criteria. From 1966 to 1977, the Ministry of Labor and Immigration was set up, It was replaced by the Ministry of Employment and Immigration in 1977. Since 1993, Canadians have had the Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration.

Other modifications were made in 1967. The system in function with competencies of individuals was installed. Government eliminated the hierarchy of nations of origin. Finally, it created the Committee of appeal for immigration, which attributed more power to the counsel of revision.

Meanwhile, the most important phase was passed in 1970 when Robert Andras, Minister of Labor and Immigration was responsible for the publication of the *Livre vert de l'Immigration ( Green Book of Immigration )*. More than 1,400 memoirs were presented in the hearing organized by the Ministry. 8 years later, the federal Parliament adopted new law on immigration, which exist today regardless of some modifications.

This law sealed the change of the orientation of the federal State and the passage from the repressive philosophy to the positive approach. It constitutes also the first trial of planification: henceforth, the Ministry began to announce in advance the number of persons whom the Minister would accept with the accord with provinces, companies, syndicates and professional organisms.

The law of 1978 was based on the principle as follows: first, the fact that

immigration should be exempt from any kind of discriminatory measure, which was the principle implicitly recognized in the article 15 of the Canadian Charter of the Right and Liberty; Federal State should consent to follow the objectives of the demographic, cultural and humanitarian order fostering the gathering of the families; finally, federal State pays attention to promote and not only to facilitate the visits of the foreigners but also to encourage the help and the justice in the international level. In this perspective, Canada created in 1978 new non-hierarchical category of immigrants which was that of refugees. Finally, let us take note of the role of Quebec state in the matter of immigration. The article 95 of AANB, as I mentioned earlier, have defined immigration as common field of competence. Nevertheless, Canadian provinces became less and less interested in the matter of immigration. Even Quebec stopped to intervene from 1883. It was only in 1969, through the creation of the Ministère de l'Immigration du Québec(MIQ) that the Quebec province played a new important role in this matter (Lacroix, 1994).

Quebec established in 1969 Centres d'Orientation et de Formation des Immigrants(COFI). During all the years of 70's, series of accords between federal State and Quebec province were signed in order to make possible to the province of Quebec participate more in the choice and reception of immigrants. There are three major accords: first, that of Lang-Coutier in 1971, that of Bienvenue-Andras in 1975, lastly, that of Cullen-Couture in 1978.

The accord in 1971 permitted Quebec agents to furnish the informations on the province. That of 1975 forced federal State to consider the opinion of the province on the matter of immigration. Finally, in 1978, thanks to that of Cullen-Couture nobody could come there without the accord of the province. For the first time, after 100 years, this accord restored to the province the power in the matter of selection.

In 1991, as a sequence to the report published in 1990, under the direction of the Minister Monique Gagnon-Tremblay and entitled *Au Québec pour bâtir ensemble*, an accord Canada-Quebec was signed. This accord known in the name of accord Gagnon-Tremblay-MacDougall has reinforced the accord of 1978 and the powers of Quebec State in selecting the immigrants and consecrated the principle according to which Quebec is exclusively responsible for the reception



and integration of the persons on this territory. So, Quebec played again the role of catalyst in the question of the sharing of power between provinces and the federal. At the end of the 20th century, 17% of all immigrants came from Europe, while Asia's share was up to 57%. The immigration intake varies every year during the last five years for which detailed data is available (1992-1996), it has totalled over one million and averaged to almost 234,000 per year. In 1996, there were about five million immigrants living in Canada, in addition to 170,000 of the total Canadian population. The United Kingdom has been a steady source of immigration and in 1996 it was still true that the largest group of living immigrants were born in the British Isles (13%), almost twice as numerous as the Italians (7%). Next came immigrants from the United States, HongKong, India and China(around 5% each).

While it is true that considerable cultural diversity existed among Aboriginals before the arrival of Europeans, the assortment of cultures represented in the northern half of north America has become much more intricate. In addition to the number of different cultures present, their geographical distribution has never been more complex.

### III. From Assimilation to Integration

#### 1. Aboriginality and Multiculturalism

In Expo 67 of Montreal, millions of visitors came to join in the festivities. At that time, Canada was expected to enjoy full sense of unity in celebrating the Centennial of Confederation. The year 1967 was the year of the Centennial celebration of Confederation, and Canadians were supposed to rejoice in the overarching sense of unity that seemed to permeate the cultural life of the moment. "Canadians persuaded themselves that their nation had finally put its house in order, that difference could exist in unity and that the way ahead was the way of shared hope and prosperity"(Wadland 2001: 31).

But the factors reshaping the lives of Canadians, and of Canada as a nation,



immediately following 1967, sometimes in response to cataclysmic events in other places like Vietnam, or China, or Czechoslovakia, or France sometimes because, at home, voices silenced in their own history by power indulgent of itself suddenly spoke out in protest. The Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism was established by the Liberal government of Lester b. Pearson in 1963.<sup>7)</sup> The Commission was conceived in the pre-Centennial era of bipolar, i.e. English/French notions of diversity, yet the bulk of its published proceedings and analysis emerged after 1967.

While it was clearly responsible for improving French language instruction in the provincial public school systems across Canada, and while it spawned the Official Languages Act of 1969, the Commission was chiefly valuable in the context of this paper for the fourth volume of its report. The Cultural Contribution of the "Other Ethnic Groups" also appeared in 1969. Aboriginal people are scarcely mentioned in any of the volumes, yet when their voices are recorded their concerns are predictable:

A special problem brought into sharp relief by the concept of two founding peoples is of course the situation of the Canadian Indian and Eskimo. Their unique position was put most poignantly in Sudbury by an Indian woman who asked the evening meeting, "Why is the Indian always forgotten? This was the first culture and this was the first language in Canada. We are told that the BNA Act was between the French and the English—where was the Indian during this time?" In Toronto... the chiefs who were present after recalling that many Indians speak French, summed up their fate in this way: "If the French people think they lost a lot of their rights since Confederation, what should the Indian say? They lost their whole land." One of the participants in the discussion protested about school text-books: "Our children learn that Indians are all savages." Finally, the increasing assimilation of the Indians who are forced to leave the reserves for economic reason was the object of another statement: "As soon as an Indian wants to succeed in Canadian life he must assimilate."<sup>8)</sup>

---

7) It was chaired by Andre Laurendeau, Editor-in -Chief of *Le Devoir*, and Davidson Dunton, former Chair of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and President of Carleton University. The Commission published six controversial volumes in fulfillment of its mandate.

8) Canada, Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, A Preliminary Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1965), 49-50.

After acknowledging that "We found great sympathy in 'white' audiences for the plight in which Canada's two indigenous peoples find themselves, as the relentless march of North American industry and technology moves into territories once exclusively their own."<sup>9)</sup> The Commissioners still found the contributions of settlers worthy of a special volume, virtually omitting altogether any mention of First Nations peoples. The omission was actually addressed and justified in these terms:

Our terms of reference contain no allusion to Canada's native populations. They speak of "two founding races", namely Canadians of British and French origin, and other ethnic groups, but mention neither the Indians nor Eskimos. Since it is obvious that these two groups do not form part of the "founding races", as the phrase is used in the terms of reference, it would logically be necessary to include them under the heading "other ethnic groups". Yet it is clear that the term "other ethnic groups" means those peoples of diverse origins who came to Canada during or after the founding of the Canadian state and that it does not include the first inhabitants of this country... However, the Commission considers it a duty to remind the proper authorities that everything possible must be done to help the native populations preserve their cultural heritage, which is an essential part of the patrimony of all Canadians.<sup>10)</sup>

This remarkable sleight of hand accepts that settlers may preserve themselves as a nation in the lands appropriated from those to be excluded from the definition of the nation but who are identified as an "essential" part of the nation's "patrimony." A unique opportunity was provided, almost simultaneously with the centennial year of Canada's birth, to acknowledge and to validate a partnership without which the nation's earliest settlers would never have survived. The circumstances in which Canada finds itself today vis a vis First

---

9) Ibid.

10) Canada, Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. General Introduction. Book I: The Official Languages(Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1967), xxvi-xxvii.

Nations peoples speak eloquently to the fact that this opportunity was not merely overlooked, but effectively discarded.

Institutionalized multiculturalism, rightly recognized around the world as a humanitarian invention of Canada, was the offspring of the Laurendeau-Dunton report. It was announced as federal policy in 1971 and one year later Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau brought Stanley Haidasz, the first Minister of State for Multiculturalism commenced its work in 1973. The new policy was not without political sidebars.

Among other things, it was intended to soften prairie opposition to bilingualism. Yet, and despite its rich and complex ethnic history, "the multiculturalism policy did not achieve a high profile in western Canada"(Palmer, 1991: 23). It was much more successful in major cities like Toronto with large and (particularly after liberalization of immigration regulations in 1967 and the new Immigration Act of 1976) rapidly diversifying immigrants populations of more recent arrival.

In English Canada rural depopulation was paralleled by extraordinary urban growth. As immigrants (many of them refugees) from less developed countries grew in number, multiculturalism conjoined the voices of ethnicity, but with a decidedly urban edge. The impact of the creation of the Parti Quebecois under the leadership of Rene Levesque in 1968 and its assumption of power in 1976 was dramatically underscored by the violent events surrounding the October Crisis of 1970. Quebec had announced to Canadians, and to the rest of the world, that it would determine its own direction on culture and language. "Interculturalism" became its designated policy, meaning that the new voices of race and ethnicity would, after Bills 22 (1974) and 101 (1977), be French-speaking.

Developments in Quebec and in federal politics on multiculturalism were matched toe to toe by the increasing cultural and political activism of the First Nations. To a large extent this was a response to the Trudeau government's White Paper of 1969 which advocated cancellation of the Indian Act and the treaties, ostensibly in the interest of fostering equality: Indians would be treated as individuals, rather than as communities, in a free and equal democratic society.<sup>11)</sup>

---

11) John Wadland, 37:2001

It becomes increasingly difficult to understand how the diversity of settlers could have been privileged over the diversity of indigenous First Nations "when the terms of the White Paper are coupled with the language of the Commissioners in the Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism."<sup>12)</sup> The paradox was certainly not lost upon the Native inhabitants of Canada. It became absolutely clear that they would have to fight to win recognition of their rights as Aboriginal people living in their own land. According to Dickason, there would be "no need for special status or Aboriginal rights, meaning that services for Aboriginal people would be transferred from the federal to the provincial governments"(Dickason, 363-365).

"Resistance to the White Paper of 1969 was swift and vocal. It coincided almost precisely with the rise of the American Indian Movement (AIM) and with the publication of Dee Brown's *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee* (1971), an eloquent and deeply moving history of the American West from a Native perspective that became a runaway bestseller. Probably more than any other single factor, *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee* aroused North Americans in general to the true nature of the atrocities endured by Indians since contact.

The response to this awakening was measured in Canada by a number of important developments. For example, the first Native Studies Department in a Canadian University was established at Trent in 1969. The National Indian Brotherhood, now the Assembly of the First Nations (AFN), was formed in 1968.<sup>13)</sup> In the famous Calder case of 1973, the Nisga's Nation won recognition in the Supreme Court of Canada for the principle of Aboriginal rights, forcing the Trudeau government to abandon the logic of its White Paper(Dickason, 324-325).

Section 25 of the Canadian Constitution Act of 1982 records the reversal of Trudeau's position in a language so forceful that several provincial premiers attempted to block it:

The guarantee of this Charter of certain rights and freedoms shall not be construed so as to abrogate or derogate from any

---

12) Wadland, 38:2001

13) The current chief of the AFN is former chief of the Grand Council of the Crees of James Bay, Matthew Coon-Come.

aboriginal, treaty or other rights or freedoms that pertain to the aboriginal peoples of Canada including

(a) any rights or freedoms that have been recognized by the royal Proclamation of October 7, 1763. and

(b) any rights or freedoms that now exist by way of land claims agreements or may be so acquired.

This is reinforced by Section 35 of the Charter which states:

(1)The existing aboriginal and treaty rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada are hereby recognized and affirmed.

(2)In this Act, "aboriginal peoples of Canada" includes the Indian, Inuit and Metis peoples of Canada.

(3)For greater certainty, in subsection (1) "treaty rights" includes rights that now exist by way of land claims agreements or may be so acquired.

(4) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, the aboriginal and treaty rights referred to in subsection (1) are guaranteed equally to male and female persons

The Inuit response to the White Paper was the establishment, in 1971, of the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada (ITC). By 1978, the ITC had developed a proposal for the creation of a self-governing territory called Nunavet, "Our Land".

It is easy to understand why Aboriginal people were angry in 1969, seeking remedies to protect themselves against the erasure to which political policies and assumptions of the day seemed virtually to condemn them. What may seem less obvious is why the federal government (in particular) responded so quickly and so emphatically in the years leading up to the Charter of 1982, apparently reversing its own ideological premises and acceding to the demands of the First Peoples. The answer lies on the land.

For most Native cultures the land, the water and the air combine to constitute the source of all life and spirituality. However, for many Canadians, land, water and air have become mere commodities to buy and sell in the marketplace or in which to wash or bury the offal of capitalist material

production. To these people, the land means "resources" - oil, gas, metals, wheat, forest, furs, fish, and so on. Native peoples across Canada have long understood the implications for their cultures of the relationship between their land and natural resource development. At the same time we can recognize that Aboriginal activism, nationalism and environmentalism were driven in large part by resource issues.

The present crisis in Afghanistan reminds us that energy issues are with Canadians yet and with the realization that the Middle East is becoming increasingly problematic as a supplier, and as its own reserves are inadequate, the United States has made clear its intention to look increasingly to its immediate northern and southern neighbors to guarantee the fulfillment of its needs. This means that Canada's relationship with the Aboriginal peoples within its borders will become an increasingly more strategic element in the nation's international affairs.

## 2. Multicultural Ethnic Landscape

Underlying the policy of Multiculturalism and the framework it supports is a belief in the primacy of the individual in all areas of public life. Each and every citizen was to be encouraged to express his or her heritage as a part of the Canadian "mosaic"(Breton:156). Despite this lofty goal, multiculturalism has never been anything less than controversial, having been seen by some as detracting from the rightful place in the country of Quebec, of Aboriginal Peoples by others, and of the real capacity of individuals to become truly "Canadian" by others still(Breton:156).

A number of writers have articulated views about the philosophy and effectiveness of multiculturalism in Canada and elsewhere. A constantly expanding literature on the subject of multiculturalism illustrates the importance and meaning of this policy in Canadian Immigration history.

There are at least three multicultural contexts in Canada: Quebec, Anglophone Canada and Aboriginal Peoples. The central question in Aboriginal/non-Aboriginal relations in Canada following European settlements has always been "is the goal a single society with one basic model of

belonging, or is the goal a kind of parallelism—a side by side coexistence—or some intermediate position?"(Cairns:47)

The same question has perplexed American policy makers. "A central policy issue in Indian Affairs (in the United States) has always been whether Indian tribes should remain separate or whether they should be assimilated into the larger society."

The assimilation policy, especially when implemented as an assault on Indian culture, only served to reinforce a stubborn sense of Indianness. Because the assimilation policy was never the policy of the Indian people, although it had some support. It was white, majority, government policy. Its hegemony was always more apparent than real(Hamilton:15).

Indian children ran away from residential schools, and were beaten when they were forcibly returned. Banned customs, such as the potlach, were practised in secret. Indians "were not supine victims of white legislation. That the (potlach) law went largely unenforced was in great measure a result of native resistance, even defiance(Cole and Chikin:183).

As Cairns reminds us, there was a gap between the public, visible behaviour of Indian people, and an underground life that constituted a kind of defiance of white rule and Indian subject status.(Cairns:66) *Citizen Plus* was drafted by the Indian Association of Alberta, under Harold Cardinal's leadership, and it had the support of the National Indian Brotherhood. It was presented to the federal Cabinet in the railway committee room. "In a scene that deserves to be preserved in oil paints on a giant canvas, Indian leaders stood majestically in feathered headdresses and white deerskin garb and presented the cabinet with an alternative (*Citizens Plus*). It was an affirmation of faith in their Indian identity. After a century of being engulfed by a white tidal wave, they were still different, and they were not about to let themselves be pushed into oblivion.(Platiel:1-2)

After the "Act to encourage the gradual civilization of the Indian tribes in the Canadas" was passed in 1857 by the legislature of the United Canadas, with the purpose of the "gradual removal of all legal distinctions between the Indians in the province and Her Majesty's other Canadian subjects". Successive post-Confederation amendments of the Act, including the consolidated Indian Act



of 1876, repeated the relevant provisions. As Arthur Meighen explained to the House of Commons in 1918, the Indian seeking enfranchisement "must have ceased to follow the Indian mode of life, and ...must satisfy the Superintendent General that he is self-supporting and fit to be enfranchised."(Taylor:143-4). Frustration over the small numbers voluntarily seeking enfranchisement led to an amendment in 1920 that allowed compulsory enfranchisement. The provision was deleted in 1922 and reinstated in 1933, and remained in the Act until 1951. It does not appear to have ever been used.(Cairns:49)

As Cairns says, until the late 1960s, the basic government policies toward Aboriginal peoples minimized the long-run significance of cultural Aboriginality, and aimed for a common Canadianism. This melting-pot philosophy was especially clear for the Metis. They were treated as ordinary citizens, with minimal exceptions, who were intermingled with the larger society. Similar treatment was accorded the Inuit, who were neither brought under the Indian Act nor provided with their own Inuit Act, in spite of a 1939 Supreme court decision that they were under federal jurisdiction, based on s. 91 (24) of British North America Act of 1867, "Indians, and Lands Reserved for the Indians." Policy toward Metis could be called assimilation by neglect, which very frequently resulted in abject poverty, marginalization, and social disintegration.

In Alberta, in 1936, four-fifths of Metis children were without schooling. Although some Metis continued to make a reasonable living on the land up to the 1950s, as had previous generations, many of them, with good reason, were often envious of the treatment accorded their Indian neighbors.

Toward the eskimo, policy was not assimilation but neglect. If we read Jenness's *Eskimo Administration: II Canada*, evidently we can find the feeble presence of government. Until the Second World War and the subsequent Cold War, which led to the construction of radar lines in the North, the federal government ruled with a light, almost nonexistent hand. Prior to the establishment of the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources in 1953, contact was mainly limited to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, missionaries, whalers, the Hudson's Bay Company, and a few other traders. Even when the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources in effect became the department responsible for Inuit affairs in the 1950s, no Inuit Act



emerged. Inuit were considered to be full citizens and any special federal responsibility was defined as "an extra service and not an alternative to normal citizenship."

The relations between the Canadian government and the Indian people were almost a complete contrast to its historic neglect of the Inuit until 1950s. To use "assimilation" as a container for a century or more of government policy toward Indians strikes one observer as a contribution to confusion. According to Michael Posluns, to do so is to make "assimilation" as an "all-encompassing" term that huddles disparate meanings and policies under its too capacious rubric. Further, any suggestion that the "Government of Canada had a consistent policy for more than six months or from one agency to another will come as a surprise to many."

At the level of inter-agency differences of a decentralized administration, shifts over time, and fluctuations in optimism/pessimism over whether the policy could work, Posluns is correct. However, at the level of high policy, of official rhetoric, of the conventional wisdom, "assimilation" imposes order, consistency, and continuity on the government's view of its goal. To discard the word because of its ambiguities would do more than good to our understanding.

At the risk of oversimplification, historically the goal of post-Confederation reality was assimilation. The seeming contradiction was bridged by the premise that territorial separation was a preparation for assimilation. Assimilation was premised on an inequality of power relationship. It was also premised on a touching faith in social engineering by poorly qualified school teachers and a small cadre of untrained administrators working for peripheral branch of government. The guiding thought was based on the belief that the Indian peoples were to be the recipients of change, not the choosers.

On the other hand, "there was an heroic and at the same time mistaken simplicity in the normative pretensions of 'assimilation'. 'They' would eventually be like 'us', and little more need be said, because this conviction manifested an egalitarianism which no reasonable Australian could question." This goal of a magnificent departure from certain kinds of colonial racism, this emphasis on 'equality' proved to be racist in a different way - its failure to acknowledge the right to be different.

The emphasis on equality became the fundamental ideology of Canadian Multiculturalism Policy:

AND WHEREAS the Government of Canada recognizes the diversity of Canadians as regards race, national or ethnic origin, colour and religion as a fundamental characteristic of Canadian society and is committed to a policy of multiculturalism designed to preserve and enhance the multicultural heritage of Canadians while working to achieve the equality of all Canadians in the economic, social, cultural and political life of Canada;

(1) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Government of Canada to:

(a) recognize and promote the understanding that multiculturalism reflects the cultural and racial diversity of Canadian society and acknowledges the freedom of all members of Canadian society to preserve, enhance and share their cultural heritage;

(b) recognize and promote the understanding that multiculturalism is a fundamental characteristic of the Canadian heritage and identity and that it provides an invaluable resource in the shaping of Canada's future;

(c) promote the full and equitable participation of individuals and communities of all origins in the continuing evolution and shaping of all aspects of Canadian society and assist them in the elimination of any barrier to such participation

(d) recognize the existence of communities whose members share a common origin and their historic contribution to Canadian society, and enhance their development;

(e) ensure that all individuals receive equal treatment and equal protection under the law, while respecting and valuing their diversity;

(f) encourage and assist the social, cultural, economic and political institutions of Canada to be both respectful and inclusive of Canada's multicultural character;

(g) promote the understanding and creativity that arise from the interaction between individuals and communities of different origins;

(h) foster the recognition and appreciation of the diverse cultures of Canadians to promote the reflection and the evolving expressions of those cultures;

(i) preserve and enhance the use of languages other than English and French, while strengthening the status and use of the official languages of Canada[...]

(Canadian Multiculturalism Act, July 1988)

The emerging paradigm, still in the making with Multiculturalism policy, the parallelism paradigm displays considerable sensitivity to the desire of Aboriginal peoples and immigrants from all over the countries for some positive recognition, including self-governing powers, but pays less attention to what holds Canadians together, to what prevents them from being strangers.

The Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism was established by the Liberal government of Lester B. Pearson in 1963, chaired by Andre Laurendeau, Editor-in-Chief of *Le Devoir*, and Davidson Dunton, former Chair of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and President of Carlton University. The Commission was conceived in the pre-Centennial era of bipolar notions of diversity, yet the bulk of its published proceedings and analysis emerged after 1967. While it was clearly responsible for improving French language instruction in the provincial public school systems across Canada, it spawned the Official Language Act of 1969.

Canada had to cope with major cleavages and elements of "dualism" struggle over their collective identity, and debate over alternative strategies to build some form of "post-national" unity and identification. Civic nations are not free from the need to employ ethnicizing discourses in order to justify the closure of their communities.

This is especially evident in the constitutional failure to recognize Quebec's distinctiveness—a failure that is often rationalized by allegations that Quebec's independentist aspirations are deeply tribal and regressive. In order to identify to what degree Quebec's "ethnic" nationalism is an indispensable counter-image for the construction of English Canada as an open, pluralist state-nation further research is needed.

The interpretation of multiculturalism has been reinforced in the last twenty years. With the emphasis on equal rights rather than on specifically defined cultures, multiculturalism in the 1990's became increasingly linked to the idea of citizenship (Kymlicka and Norman 1994). At the same time, various attempts to integrate Quebec into the Constitution failed. The Meech Lake Accord of 1987, of which the centerpiece was the recognition of Quebec's

distinctiveness, while granting the "distinct society" status to Quebec, remained non-ratified by the provincial parliaments of Newfoundland and Manitoba.

It would have provided constitutional protection against the centralizing and universalizing tendencies of Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. In particular, it would have allowed collective rights to trump over individual rights where Quebec's language and culture were seen to be endangered.

Ultimately, it was the procedural obstruction of Elijah Harper, an Aboriginal member of Manitoba Legislature that caused the agreement to collapse on June 23 1990. Harper refused to approve the Accord on the grounds that it put Quebec's needs ahead of those of Canada's Aboriginal peoples.

This powerful demonstration of the emergence of "First Nations" on the political scene led to changing political allegiances. Previously Francophone Canadians had shown strong support for Aboriginal issues. However, polls in the 1990s indicate that after the failure of the Meech Lake accord and the 1990 Oka crisis-land disputes between Mohawks and a Quebecois Municipality-Quebeckers tend to take a harder line than before. Anglophone Canadians, by contrast, seem to have become more sympathetic to Aboriginal issues(Laczko 1997:6-7).

Finally, despite all efforts, in 1992, the struggle to accommodate constitutionally multiplicity of often contradictory claims raised not only by Quebec and First Nations but also by the federal government, the remaining provinces and various interest groups (women, ethnic groups, disabled, etc) ended in vain(Winter: 180).

While multiculturalism became officially enshrined through the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the 1988 Canadian Multiculturalism Act, the constitutional debates of the late 1980s and 1990s also witnessed increasing concerns about Quebec's nationalism being "ethnic" and incompatible with the "civic" and liberal understanding of the Canadian state-nation.

According to MacKay, commentators claimed that the 1987 Meech Lake Accord proposed an "implicit hierarchy of rights"(Mackay:76). Granting collective rights to Quebec was viewed as preferential treatment for a relatively privileged group-the white male French-speaking bourgeoisie-over other Canadian minorities, such as women, more recent immigrants, and Aboriginal

peoples(Mahoney 1988).

Doubts were also raised whether an independent Quebec would respect the rights of minority groups living in its territory. Especially the rights of "Allophones" and English-speaking Quebecers seemed at risk (Hartney 1995).

Michael Ignatieff aligns Quebec's struggle for recognition with the "ethnic" nationalism he observes in Yugoslavia, Kurdistan, Ukraine and Germany. According to him, Quebec's secessionism is not only illegitimate but also highly dangerous. Since French-speaking Canadians do not face oppression or even at the risk of extinction and only civic nationalism seems to be compatible with liberalism, democracy and peace(Ignatieff 2000:133).

This view seemed to be justified when Quebec's Premier Jacques Parizeau blamed "money and the ethnic vote" (meaning Anglophone Quebecers and immigrants) for losing the latest referendum on sovereignty in October 1995. The outcome of the referendum, where only 50.6 percent of Quebec's population voted against the province's independence, showed the deep cleavages in Canadian and Quebecois society. The close outcome has led to a wave of "post-referendary racism" against Francophone Quebecers in English-speaking media(Potvin 1998).

Even in Acadia, "otherwise sensible and intelligent people have lost their perspective on these matters. They invoke apocalyptic scenarios of segregation and violence [...]. It is not uncommon to hear commentators point ominously to Bosnia or South Africa, as if we were on some slippery slope to civil war or apartheid"(Kymlicka 1998:4).

In fact, a number of prominent English Canadian and American intellectuals have accused Quebec nationalism of having "ethnic heart" and hosting the dangers of "ethnic cleansing" (Cook 1995:245) as well as civil war.

The picture is quite at odds with social reality in Quebec where, since 1975, article 43 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* recognizes the cultural rights of ethnic minorities (Government of Quebec 1978) and where "interculturalism", a policy with slightly different philosophical presumptions than multiculturalism, has been adopted in the late 1970s without raising much debate or contradiction (Juteau 1996).

Why are the semantics of Quebecois "ethnic" nationalism so compelling?

Weariness due to the failure to solve the Quebec question "once and for all," and scepticism evoked by the fine line between ethno-racial definitions of community—as shown by the German case—can only partly explain the widespread opposition to articulations of Quebecois nationhood.

On the contrary, Quebec's full-fledged support for the free trade negotiations in 1998 reveals that its nationalism is far from being "pre-modern" or regressive. Instead of celebrating this as a progressive expression of Quebec's "opening to the world," many English Canadians viewed Quebec's "market nationalism" (Courchene 1986) as an act of treachery. They felt that Quebec lacked loyalty at a point when (English) Canadian identity was threatened to be jeopardized by the cultural and economic supremacy of its dominant American Other. Hence, "the anglophone left had never been so outspokenly negative about Quebec before" (Longstaff 1932:37).

When Quebec's nationalists inspired the rediscovery of English Canadian Nationalism in the late 80s, it was doubtful if it was the "ethnic" character of Quebec's nationalism or the sudden liberal orientation of the Parti Quebeucois. In any case, subsequent attempts to think "English Canada" as a "nation" (Resnick 1994) emphasizes the commitment to a liberal and multicultural English Canadian society. They thereby imply a new set of opposing entities: Multicultural Canada versus Quebec (Winter:181).

## Conclusion

The description of socio-demographic factors associated with inter-ethnic contacts confirms that Canada has indeed been multicultural throughout its history, in the sense of a society characterized by ethnic diversity, which is the meaning that most Canadians give to multiculturalism.

Historical analysis does not support, however, the contention that Canada does not have always subscribed to multiculturalism in the sense of an ideology of cultural pluralism. On the contrary, our survey of the experiences of minority ethnic groups clearly indicates that Charles Taylor's notion that the politics of

ethnic recognition can promote participatory citizenship and the search for the common good and Will Kymlicka's view that in some circumstances group differentiated rights may be required to put into operation some basic liberal principles were certainly not part of the dominant set of attitudes until relatively recently, perhaps it is now, but this is another issue.

If Canadians are generally today only more tolerant toward ethnic minorities but also overwhelmingly believe that cultural pluralism has enriched Canadian culture, it is perhaps because the politics of multiculturalism has been a crucial factor in the improvement of inter-ethnic relations. It would nevertheless be very naive to assume that inter-ethnic strains can disappear over only a generation or two.

On the one hand, manifestations of strains in French-English relations have remained common, despite the fact that this aspect of the inter-ethnic landscape has been significantly modified by several landmark events, such as the Quiet Revolution in Quebec, the 1969 federal Official Languages Act, the rise of the independence movement and the adoption of a vigorous language policy by the Quebec government.

On the other hand, numerous reports document the persistence of policies, practices and procedures reflecting systemic racism in both public and private organizations. Opinion surveys confirm that Canadians perceive that racism is still a serious problem in courts and the justice system, the workplace, schools, and with respect to law enforcement. Four Canadians in every ten consider that the policy of multiculturalism has weakened traditional ways of life of Canadians and many of them regret it. Even among ethnic minorities, the politics of ethnic recognition is not unanimously supported. Critics argue that multiculturalism's emphasis on diversity has eradicated all sense of Canadian values, while many newcomers are precisely aspiring to be accepted as mainstream, "unhyphenated" Canadian. Beyond inquiries into the push and pull factors in the decision to immigrate more studies are certainly needed to reveal the expectations of minority ethnic groups toward the management of pluralism.

As a final point, the level of open-mindedness of some Canadians may naturally be affected by exceptional circumstances. The fragility of the gain is clearly illustrated by the increased hostility toward Arabs and Muslims, in the



wake of terrorist attacks against American targets in September 2001; while the manifestations of prejudice were few and uncoordinated, they received much media coverage. The long-term trend is however demonstrated by the immediate and unanimous condemnation of such intolerance by political and religious authorities supported by an overwhelming public opinion.

## Bibliography

Assembly of First Nations. "Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples' Final Report and Recommendations, preliminary Analysis and Commentary." Draft #3, for discussion only. Ottawa, 22 February 1997. Mimeographed.

—. "Self Determination/Termination: Indian-Crown Relations at a Crossroads?" Draft #2, for discussion only. Ottawa, 7 September 1995. Mimeographed.

Bissoondath, Neil (1993). <<A Question of Belonging: Multiculturalism and Citizenship>>, in William Kaplan, *Belonging, The Meaning and the Future of Canadian Citizenship*, Montreal :McGill-Queen's University Press, pp.368-387.

Breton, Raymond(1984). "The production and Allocation of Symbolic Resources: An Analysis of the Linguistic and Ethnocultural Fields in Canada," *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, Vol. 21, no. 2, P. 123-144.

—. *Why Meech Failed. Lessons for Canadian Constitutionmaking*, Toronto: C.D. Howe Institute, 79 P. 1992

—. *Ethnic Identity and Equality. Varieties of Experience in a Canadian City*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, pp. 342-345. 1990.

Burnet, Jean and Howard Palmer(1998). *Coming Canadians: An Introduction to a History of Canada's Peoples*, Toronto: McClelland & Stewart. 254 pages.

Cairns, Alan C. "Aboriginal Canadians, Citizenship, and the Constitution." In



*Reconfigurations: Canadian Citizenship and Constitutional Change. Selected Essays by Alan C. Cairns*, ed. Douglas E. Williams. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1995.

—*Prelude to Imperialism: British Reactions to Central African Society, 1840-1890*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965.

—*Citizens Plus: Aboriginal Peoples and the Canadian State*, Vancouver: UBC Press, 280P. 2000.

Canada. Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. "Ethical Guidelines for Research." *Integrated Research Plan*. Ottawa: Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, 1993.

—*The High Arctic Relocation. A Report on the 1953-5 Relocation*. Ottawa: Canada Communication Group Publishing, 1994.

—*Partners in Confederation: Aboriginal Peoples, Self-Government and the Constitution*. Ottawa: Canada Communication Group, 1993.

—*People to People, Nation to Nation: Highlights from the Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services, 1996.

—*Treaty Making in the Spirit of Co-existence: An Alternative to Extinction*. Ottawa: Canada Communication Group Publishing, 1995.

"Citizens Plus." *Indian-Eskimo Association of Canada Bulletin* 11.3 (1970).

Crosby, Marcia. "Construction of the Imaginary Indian." In *Vancouver Anthology: The Institutional Politics of Art*, ed. Stan Douglas. Vancouver: Talon Books, 1991.

Gibbins, Roger, and Radha Jhappan. "The State of the Art in Native Studies in Political Science." Paper presented at the Tenth Biennial Canadian Ethnic Studies Association Conference. Calgary, AB, 18-21 October 1989.

Gingras, François-Pierre, *Entre L'Arbre et L'Ecorce*, Centre de recherche en civilisation canadienne-fransaise de l'Université d'Ottawa, 1998.

—."Multicultural from the Beginning?", in *Korean Review of Canadian Studies* Vol. 7 2001.

Gordon, M.(1964). *Assimilation in American Life*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Hawthorn, H.B., C.S Belshaw, and S.M. Jamieson. *The Indians of British Columbia: A Study of Contemporary Social Adjustment*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958.

Imbert, Patrick. "Transcender les dualismes", in *Dislocation et Permanence*, Les Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa. 1999.

Indian-Eskimo Association of Canada. *Native Rights in Canada*. Toronto: Indian-Eskimo Association of Canada, 1970.

Ignatieff, Michael(1994). *Blood and Belonging. Journeys into the New Nationalism*, Toronto: Penguin Books.

—.*The Rights Revolution*, Toronto: Anansi, 170P. 2001.

Jenness, Diamond. *Eskimo Administration*. Vol.2, *Canada*. Technical paper no.14. Montreal: Arctic Institute of North America, 1964.

—.*The Indians of Canada*. 2nd ed. Anthropological Series no.15, bulletin 65. Ottawa: National Museum of Canada, 1935.

Juteau, Danielle(2000a). "Du dualisme canadien au pluralisme québécois," in Marie McAndrew et France Gagnon(eds.), *Relations ethniques et éducation dans les sociétés divisées* (Québec, Irlande du Nord, Catalogne et Belgique). Paris/Montreal:L'Harmattan, P. 13-26

Kymlicka, Will. *Finding Our Way: Rethinking Ethnocultural Relations in Canada*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

—.*Liberalism, community, and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press,1989.

—*Multicultural Citizenship: A liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.

—*Multicultural Citizenship*, New York: Oxford University Press, 215 pages. 1995.

Lacroix, Jean-Michel (dir.) (1994). *Canada et Canadiens*, Bordeaux : Presses de l'Université de Bordeaux, 1994(1984), 115 pages.

Lee, Jo-Anne and Linda Cardinal, << Hegemonic Nationalism and the Politics of Feminism and Multiculturalism in Canada >>, in Veronica Strong-Boag, *the Construction of Canada*, Vancouver : University of British Columbia Press.

Porter, John(1965). *The Vertical Mosaic: An Analysis of Social Class and Power in Canada*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Schmidt, Sandra(1999). "Immigration Policy and New Ethnic Minorities in Contemporary Germany," in Karl Cordell(ed.). *Ethnicity and Democratisation in the New Europe*, London and New York, Routledge, P. 91-105.

Schnapper, Dominique(1994). *la communauté des citoyens. Sur l'idée moderne de nation*, Paris, Gallimard, 228 P.

Smith, Melvin H. *Our Home or Native Land?* Victoria: Crown Western, 1995.

Taylor, Charles. *Multiculturalism and "The Politics of Recognition."* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992.

—*Reconciling the Solitudes: Essays on Canadian Federalism and Nationalism*, ed. Guy Laforest. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 208 P. 1993.

—."Why Democracy Needs Patriotism." In *Debating the limits of Patriotism, For love of Country*, Martha C. Nussbaum with Respondents, ed. Joshua Cohen. Boston: Beacon Press, 1996.

—*Multiculturalisme. Démocratie et différence*; Paris, Aubier, 89 pages. 1994.

Trigger, Bruce G. "The Historians' Indian: Native Americans in Canadian Historical Writing from Charlevoix to the Present." In *The Native Imprint: The Contribution of First Peoples to Canada's Character*. Vol.1, To 1815, ed. Olive Patricia Dickason. Leth-bridge, AB: Athabaska University Educational Enterprises, 1995.

—*A History of Archaeological Thought*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

—*Natives and Newcomers: Canada's Heroic Age Reconsidered*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1985.

—"A Present of Their Past? Anthropologists, Native People, and Their Heritage." *Culture* 8, I (1988).

Trudeau, Pierre Elliott. "The Province of Quebec at the Time of the Strike." In *The Asbestos Strike*, ed. Pierre Elliott Trudeau, trans. James Boake. Toronto: James Lewis and Samuel, 1974.

—Remarks made during a question and answer session at a meeting of the Don Valley Liberal Association. Don Valley, ON, 21 January 1972.

—Remarks on Indian, Aboriginal, and treaty rights. Vancouver, BC, 8 August 1969.

Tully, James(1994). "Diversity's Gambit Declined," In Curtis Cook (ed.), *Constitutional Predicament. Canada after the Referendum of 1992*, Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University press, p. 149-198.

—*Strange Multiplicity. Constitutionalism in an Age of Diversity*, Cambridge University Press, 105 pages. 1995.

Whitaker, Reg (1989) *Double Standard. The Secret History of Canadian Immigration*, Toronto :Lester and Orpen Dennys, 134 pages.

Winter, Elke(2000). "Nation et citoyenneté: une perspective wébérienne," in Michel Coutu, et al. (eds.), *Droits fondamentaux et citoyennté. Une citoyenneté*

*fragmentée, limitée, illusoire?*, Montreal: Editions Thémis, P. 87-107.

—."National Unity versus Multiculturalism? Rethinking the Logic of Inclusion in Germany and Canada", in *International Journal of Canadian Studies*, 2001.