

## **Canadian cities and international migration: comparing local responses to diversity**

Prepared for presentation at the 81<sup>st</sup> Annual General Meeting  
of the Canadian Political Science Association  
Carleton University, Ottawa, ON

May 28, 2009

(Please do not cite without the permission of the author)

Dr. Livianna Tossutti  
Associate Professor  
Department of Political Science  
Brock University  
St. Catharines, ON L2S 3A1  
ltossutti@brocku.ca

Municipal governments in Canada do not have a formal constitutional role in the immigration and settlement policy domain, but they are responsible for developing essential public services, programs and facilities in cities that are home to large immigrant populations. In 2006, almost 95 percent of Canadians born abroad lived in urban centres. These Canadians reported more than 200 countries of origin and almost 150 languages as a mother tongue. The cultural diversity that characterizes urban life is likely to intensify as the immigrant population grew at four times the rate of the Canadian-born population between 2001 and 2006 (Chui, Tran and Maheux 2007).

The decisions that municipal governments make concerning land use, building regulations, economic development, public health, social services, transit, libraries, culture, parks, recreation and protective services, have a profound impact on the reception and settlement experiences of new arrivals. Although these experiences unfold in a local setting, the migration and integration literature has been dominated by comparisons of different countries' immigration and citizenship models (Mahnig 2004). The focus on the state obscures differences in how substate jurisdictions manage international migration and ethnocultural diversity. This paper shifts to the local level of analysis by examining how six municipal governments in three provinces have adapted their corporate policies, programs and structures to address immigration, settlement and ethnocultural diversity issues. It draws on evidence from Official Documents and semi-structured interviews to analyze whether and how these issues are reflected in elected council priorities and advisory bodies, city vision statements and strategic plans, multicultural and anti-racism policies, administrative structures, human resource and corporate communications policies, and public consultation practises. This review provides the database for the development of a three-dimensional typology that classifies cities according to: the normative premises underlying the recognition or non-recognition of immigration and ethnocultural differences in the corporate domain; the breadth of their initiatives; and the bureaucratic locus of authority for these issues. Municipal governments in Abbotsford, Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton, Toronto and Brampton were chosen for this study because they serve some of the most diverse cities in Canada and in their respective provinces.

The paper is based on the premise that a focus on the de facto local role in the settlement and integration of newcomers is long overdue, given the dramatic changes in the demographic composition and resources of recent immigrant cohorts. As a result of the slowdown in emigration from traditional source countries in the post-war period and the removal of race-based immigrant selection criteria in 1967, Asia and the Middle East have replaced Europe and the United States as the principal source regions of immigration. In 1971, 61.6 per cent of newcomers to Canada were from Europe, while only 12.1 per cent of newcomers who arrived in the late 1960s were Asian-born. In comparison, 59 percent of all immigration originated from Asia and the Middle East between 1991 and 2006. For the first time in Canada's history, the proportion of immigrants who were born in Asia and the Middle East surpassed the proportion of European-born residents in 2006 (Chui, Tran and Maheux).

This shift has contributed to the increasingly multiracial character of Canadian cities. In 2006, visible minorities accounted for 16.2 per cent of the country's population, up from 11.2 per cent in 1996. The visible minority population is also growing rapidly; between 2001 and 2006, it grew five times faster than the average population growth rate (Chui, Tran and Maheux). Unfortunately, racism and xenophobia have not disappeared with these trends. According to the 2002 Ethnic Diversity Survey, 35 percent of visible minorities perceived they had experienced discrimination or unfair treatment because of their ethnocultural characteristics. The post 9-11 era also saw an increase in hate-motivated crime and other manifestations of racism (Donaldson 2006: 150). Given these developments, it is important to understand whether and how local decision makers are addressing these issues.

There is mounting evidence that many newcomers are also experiencing socioeconomic marginalization. In 1980, 9.9 percent of the population living in low-income neighbourhoods was composed of recent immigrants; two decades years later, that number had doubled to 19.8 percent (Lightbody 2006: 536). Despite their high levels of human capital, recent arrivals have experienced significant declines in their economic performance compared to previous immigrant cohorts. They encounter problems entering the work force, suffer an income penalty due to the non-recognition of their foreign education credentials and work experience, and often possess inadequate language skills (Grant and Sweetman 2004). Since many immigrants are facing formidable barriers to their social and economic integration, it is critical to examine whether and how municipalities view these issues as falling within their scope of authority, and if so, how they address them within their corporate policies and structures.

The paper does not draw a complete and definitive portrait of each city's overall approach to immigration, settlement and ethnocultural diversity matters, given its restricted focus on the corporate policy domain. It is situated within a larger book project that reviews and accounts for municipal government responses across other functions, including community and social services, parks and recreation, arts and culture, library services, and public health. Although the primary goal of this paper is to develop a classificatory framework of local models, rather than to provide a fulsome explanation of local choices, an attenuated discussion of the causal factors that prompted the adoption or rejection of a particular policy response will be provided when possible.

### **Is there a municipal role in the immigration and settlement policy domain?**

A review of the constitutional and legislative framework in which municipal governments operate establishes their subordinate role in intergovernmental relations (Phillips, Graham and Maslove 1998: 172). Section 92.8 of the Constitution Act, 1867 gives provinces jurisdiction over municipal governments and the power to delegate municipal responsibilities. The absence of a constitutional basis of authority for municipal governments extends to the immigration and settlement policy field. Section 95 of the *Constitution Act, 1867* gives the federal government and the provinces concurrent legislative powers over immigration. The provinces are limited in that any

laws they may pass must not be “repugnant to any Act of the Parliament of Canada.” Matters related to “naturalization and aliens” are within the exclusive legislative authority of the federal Parliament of Canada, as is the final selection and admission of immigrants (with the exception of independent immigrants and refugees selected abroad who are destined for Quebec), the determination of refugee status, and the final selection and admission of temporary residents, live-in caregivers and international students. In practice, the federal government shares its authority with provincial and territorial governments in matters where immigrant settlement and adaptation intersects with provincial areas of jurisdiction (Wallace and Frisken 2000: 15). Prospective immigrants and newcomers are also provided with a range of federally and provincially funded settlement and integration programs and services, before and after their arrival in Canada (Winnemore and Biles 2006: 24).

The Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, 2001 (Section 8) authorizes the Federal Minister to sign agreements with the provinces to facilitate the coordination and implementation of immigration policies and programs. Over the past four decades, a confluence of provincial interest in acquiring more control over immigration and social policy, and the federal government’s desire to reduce the debt and deficit, led the federal government to conclude immigration agreements with nine jurisdictions, and Provincial Nominee Program (PNP) agreements with ten jurisdictions. These agreements and the PNP give the provinces a greater say in the selection and/or servicing of immigrants to their respective provinces (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2009).

Despite the absence of a legal role for municipalities in immigration and settlement matters, local governments do have latitude for policy innovation. While provincial governments are senior partners in their web of relationships with the municipalities, their domination is neither complete nor constant (Andrew 1995: 137). The political dimension of provincial-municipal relationships, the erosion of airtight jurisdictions of authority, and the paradigm shift from government to governance have contributed to this complex policy environment. First, in situations where laws or rules of procedure are vague or nonexistent, the resulting vacuums create room for manoeuvring and innovation at the local level (Frisken 1997; Wallace and Frisken 2000:5). Second, over the past forty years, nation-states have relinquished much of their former autonomy to external forces, whilst cities have had to formulate policies that address the implications of global economic restructuring and migration. This “unbundling of sovereignty” has presented municipalities with new policy challenges and opportunities to develop innovative responses to them (Penninx et al. 2004: 5).

The potential for local government policy innovation has been further buttressed by the belief that government departments must function in more collaborative and flexible ways in their dealings with superiors, subordinates and other levels of government (Leo 2006: 491). Urban governments, with their rich history of collaborating with citizens and the voluntary and private sectors to achieve public goals, are at the forefront of the paradigm shift from government to governance. Finally, the local environments in which immigrants have settled have also undergone major political and economic transformations. In the mid-1990s, the Ontario government embarked on a

program of municipal restructuring and reforms that resulted in the alteration of urban boundaries, the amalgamation of municipalities, the downloading of provincial responsibilities and/or the costs for social housing, public health, land ambulances, social assistance, public transit, water and sewer systems and rural policing to the municipalities, as well as new models of education and social service funding (Frisken 2007; Tindal and Tindal 2007). Although subsequent years have witnessed financial adjustments from the province to the Local Service Realignment arrangements described above, the lasting impact of these structural and financial reforms on newcomers has yet to be explored.

### **Local responses to immigration and settlement: theory and practise**

Single case and comparative studies of local government responses to immigration have revealed wide variations in approaches. Alexander's literature survey of municipal policies toward migrants in 24 European cities and Tel Aviv provided the database to develop a comprehensive framework for comparing local policies affecting labour migrants in the legal-political, socio-economic, cultural-religious and spatial policy domains. He identified five distinct types of local authority attitudes and responses toward their migrant populations, based on the concept of Host-Stranger relations. The Host-Stranger theory expects that local policies reflect attitudes and assumptions about the expected temporal and spatial presence of migrants, and about their ethnic, racial and religious "otherness" (Alexander 2004: 63).

In recent years, European scholars have turned from analyzing the content of immigrant policies to accounting for their development. Most studies at the national level have found that new civil, social and political rights for migrants did not result from bottom-up pressure from social and political actors striving to improve the position of migrants in society, but were the outcomes of the commitment of civil servants and judges working behind closed doors (Guiraudon 1998). Policies and programs designed to facilitate the political, social and economic integration of immigrants have been attributed to initiatives by political elites interested in preserving their own control (Messina 1987). According to this perspective, immigrant policies are reactions to crisis situations such as urban unrest, or they are attempts to address issues such as high immigrant unemployment and spatial segregation that are perceived to threaten urban society as a whole (Mahnig 2004). This bleak portrait of the capacity of migrant organizations to advance their claims at the local level has been challenged by studies in the United Kingdom, where it has been argued that local governments have become important actors in the field of immigrant policy and have accommodated ethnic group demands for input into policy processes (Rex and Samad 1996).

Few studies of local government responses to immigration in Canada have theorised beyond the boundaries of one city and across several issue domains, in the same manner as Alexander's wide-ranging study. The literature has been dominated by single case studies or two-jurisdiction comparisons that describe the political, consultative and administrative structures, programs, services and policies that have been adopted to

respond to immigration and ethnocultural diversity. As in Europe, these studies have revealed wide variations in policy choices between cities with similar levels of ethnic diversity and between neighbouring cities operating within the same provincial context. Some municipal governments were proactive in addressing diversity issues before they emerged as points of conflict between previously-established residents and newcomer groups. These municipalities introduced a wide array of services and programs designated for minorities and newcomers. Other municipalities were much less active or inactive on this front, or only addressed diversity issues following crises that erupted into interracial tensions. Factors that have been linked to more proactive and/or comprehensive local responses to immigration and diversity include the presence of a large visible minority population or a single and cohesive, numerically dominant visible minority group; an established immigrant population; and supportive political and bureaucratic leadership (Tate and Quesnel 1995; Wallace and Frisken 2000; Edgington and Hutton 2002; Good 2005; Frisken 2007).

In general, the few multijurisdictional studies that have been conducted have not been concerned with developing an overarching theoretical framework to describe urban philosophies. Poirier's study of ethnocultural diversity management in post-amalgamation Montreal and Ottawa is one of the few exceptions to the undertheorized nature of much of the literature on this subject (2004: 6-7). His analysis distinguished between assimilationist and pluralist models. The former approach is based on the premise that expressions of cultural distinctiveness should remain in the private sphere and that public space should be "neutral". Assimilationist discourse emphasizes individual equality, the recognition of individual rights and the right not to be discriminated against. The assimilationist model was further subdivided into radical and civic universalist variants. The radical model reflects a monocultural perspective, whereby the minority group is accepted by the host society providing it conforms to the lifestyles and values of the dominant group in the public and private spheres. The civic universalist model distinguishes between public and private space. The maintenance of cultural distinctiveness is acceptable in the private sphere, but not in public institutions. The public realm is an area where all citizens should be equal with respect to the rules and values of collective life, and the recognition of group differences is discouraged (7).

The pluralist model is based on the idea that diversity in the private sphere should be reflected in the public realm, and that society can be understood as a mosaic of communities. This model is also subdivided into multicultural and intercultural variants. The multicultural model values the recognition of difference in the public sphere, including the granting of collective rights to minorities. The intercultural model emerged in reaction to the universalist and multicultural models. Universalism was criticized for trying to homogenize ideas and lifestyles, while multiculturalism was criticized for developing groups in isolation of each other. Although the intercultural model does not oblige minorities to live in the same way, it stresses that the recognition of diversity and identities should not undermine the emergence of common reference points for the immigrant and host society (8).

## Methodology

The paper employs a comparative case-oriented research design in order to review how six municipal governments have addressed immigration, settlement and ethnocultural diversity in their corporate policies, structures, programs and practises, and to classify their approaches on three dimensions. The comparative method is useful for researchers who seek to describe and explain the outcomes of a small number of cases, in a manner that is sensitive to historical chronology and context (Ragin 1987). Toronto, Brampton, Calgary, Edmonton, Abbotsford and Vancouver were selected as case studies because they rank amongst Canada's most diverse cities and are home to relatively large populations of immigrants and visible minorities within their respective provinces (see Table 1, appended to the end of this report). According to the 2006 census, immigrants comprise between 45-50 percent, and visible minorities between 47-57 percent, of the populations of Toronto, Brampton and Vancouver. Between 23-26 percent of the residents of Abbotsford, Calgary and Edmonton were also born abroad. Visible minorities are also a significant and growing presence in Abbotsford, Calgary and Edmonton, constituting between 23-26 percent of those cities' populations (Statistics Canada 2006). For the purposes of the book project, the selection of cases from three provinces will permit an assessment of the impact of the broader political, financial and cultural context in which the cities are situated, while the selection of two cases from each of the three provinces allows the researcher to control for provincial effects.

SEE TABLE 1 HERE

Evidence drawn from official documents and semi-structured interviews with municipal officials will provide an in-depth portrait of municipal outlooks. Indicators of corporate responses include elected council policy priorities, advisory bodies to elected officials, city vision statements and strategic plans, multicultural policy statements, membership in the Canadian Coalition of Municipalities Against Racism and Discrimination, and the establishment of separate administrative structures responsible for developing, implementing and monitoring policies in this issue area. Other indicators include human resources and external corporate communications policies, as well as public consultation practises. Have the cities adopted human resource policies that support respectful intercultural relations in the municipal workplace (e.g. human rights, anti-racism, anti-harassment policies)? Have they developed initiatives to promote the recruitment, hiring and training of visible minorities and/or immigrants (e.g. community outreach initiatives, employment equity, and mentoring and internship programs)? External corporate communications policies are examined for their positions on the translation of municipal documents into non-official languages, the provision of interpretation services in non-official languages, advertising in the ethnic media, and engaging ethnocultural minority and immigrant residents in public consultations. The results of the review are summarized in Table 2, appended to the end of this paper.

TABLE 2 HERE

The review provides the database for a three-dimensional typology that distinguishes between local models of immigration and ethnocultural diversity management. State-level typologies of immigration and citizenship regimes have been criticized for obscuring intrastate differences and for ignoring the dynamic aspects of the process of migrant integration. Since the proposed classificatory framework addresses the first problem, but not the second, it should be viewed as a conceptual space in which municipal government responses can be provisionally situated and then traced over time. The typology's first dimension is based on a global assessment of the normative premises underlying the recognition of immigration and ethnocultural differences in the corporate domain. Employing Poirier's analytical framework, it situates local responses on a continuum ranging from the radical and civic universalist variants of the assimilationist approach to the intercultural and multicultural variants of the pluralist approach. The second dimension taps into the breadth of corporate responses, distinguishing between cities that address immigration and diversity concerns on all or nearly all corporate policy indicators (comprehensive), a majority of indicators (selective) or relatively few indicators (limited). The third dimension identifies the locus of authority for immigration, settlement and ethnocultural diversity issues in the municipal bureaucracy. It distinguishes between cities that have established a separate administrative structure to develop, implement and monitor corporate responses (centralized), and those which assign relatively more discretion to department/unit managers (decentralized).

### **Canadian Cities and International Migration: comparing local responses**

#### *Council priorities and advisory bodies to elected officials*

Despite the significant contribution of immigration to population growth in all six communities, municipal councils in Toronto, Edmonton and Calgary are the only ones that have identified immigration and settlement as priority issue areas, with Toronto and Edmonton adopting formal immigration and settlement policies. In 2001, Toronto city council adopted an Immigration and Settlement Policy Framework which aims to enable the city to work with other orders of government and sectors to ensure that Toronto continues to attract newcomers, to help new arrivals develop a sense of identity and belonging, and to help them participate in the social, economic, cultural and political life of the city (City of Toronto 2001). In 2007, Toronto city council ratified a memorandum of understanding, negotiated with the provincial and federal governments in the previous year, in which the three orders of government agreed to collaborate on research, policy and program development related to immigration and settlement issues affecting the city.

One characteristic of the Toronto region that distinguishes it from other metropolitan areas is that it has absorbed more than one-third of Canada's annual intake of immigrants (Friskin 2007). Its reputation for municipal leadership in this field dates to the early 1970s, when it first adopted policies that addressed the reception and settlement of large numbers of immigrants. Although this responsiveness has been attributed to the multiculturalism policies of senior governments that provided a legal and philosophical context for developing municipal services to aid immigrant settlement and



promote harmonious intercultural relations (Frisken 2007: 174), it does not account for why other Greater Toronto Area municipalities did not adopt similar policies until the late 1980s. The commitment of municipal politicians and officials to these issues continued following the amalgamation of the former municipalities of Toronto, North York, York, Etobicoke, Scarborough, the Borough of East York and the Metro level of government into the new City of Toronto on January 1, 1998. In 1999, council adopted the 97 recommendations in the *Final Report of the Task Force on Community Access and Equity*, as well as the vision statement “Diversity Our Strength.” The recommendations covered policies on: non-discrimination; workplace human rights and harassment; the elimination of hate activity; employment equity; an access and equity grants program; and a multilingual services policy (City of Toronto 2003).

In 2005, Edmonton city council identified immigration and settlement as a strategic priority due to concerns that the city was lagging Calgary in its ability to attract and retain immigrants at a time of significant labour shortages in the energy sector (personal interview, Michael Phair, August 2007). City council commissioned a research report on potential municipal actions to address this threat to economic growth and held public consultations on the report’s recommendations in 2006. In April 2006, council approved a recommendation that the city explore initiatives in the areas of labour attraction, public awareness, information services, community services and human resources. It also asked the administration to examine municipal policy options in the area of immigration and settlement. The administration returned to council with a recommendation in November 2006 that the city pursue a series of immigration and settlement initiatives and adopt a policy framework to guide their implementation. Funding for these initiatives was approved in December 2006 and in May 2007, council approved an Immigration and Settlement Policy. The policy institutionalizes municipal involvement in the settlement of newcomers, sets a direction for departments, and addresses areas related to economic integration, intergovernmental relations, service access and equity, planning and coordination, communication, public awareness and education, community building and inclusion and immigration women (City of Edmonton 2007). The impetus for the policy stemmed from concerns that ethnocultural diversity could exacerbate social exclusion within the broader population, that barriers to accessing service and goods could marginalize newcomer populations, and that the fear of change among well-established groups could lead to stereotyping, discrimination and racist behaviour (City of Edmonton 2006).

Calgary city council has not institutionalized a municipal role in the settlement of newcomers, but it has identified the need for increased funding for cultural diversity and immigration from senior levels of government as a priority area (City of Calgary 2006a). *Fair Calgary: A Commitment to Well Being*, was initiated by the Community and Protective Services Department in 2004 and approved as a corporate social policy by council in 2006. It commits the city to ensuring that its services, policies, practises and programs meet the needs of residents from diverse backgrounds and circumstances. Fairness in dealing with diversity in all its forms is seen to promote social inclusion and cohesion. It considers factors such as locational accessibility, availability, affordability, accommodation of special needs, sufficiency of resources and sensitivity to diversity

(including ethnoracial, age, gender, gender preference diversity markers) as characteristics that contribute to fairness (City of Calgary, Community and Protective Services 2006b; 2006c). It calls on the administration to address service barriers in selected areas and/or for specific demographic groups where necessary and to undertake a policy development process on social inclusion and accessibility (2006c: 2-5).

Five cities have at one time established mayoral and/or council advisory bodies on immigration and settlement issues, although they no longer operate in two cases. The mayors of Edmonton and Vancouver have established advisory Multicultural Councils or Working Groups on Immigration (City of Vancouver 2005). Calgary city council has a working group comprised of three aldermen assigned to the Canadian Coalition of Municipalities Against Racism and Discrimination initiative. Vancouver city council also established an Advisory Council on Diversity Issues in December 2003. Its mandate is to enhance access to city services for Vancouver's diverse communities, including the multicultural, Aboriginal and lesbian/gay/transgender/bisexual communities, and to identify and suggest solutions to gaps and barriers that impede their full participation in all aspects of city life (City of Vancouver Advisory Committee on Diversity Issues 2007).

When Abbotsford was amalgamated in 1995 with the District of Maatsqui, an Intercultural Task Force was established to examine how the new city would respond to diversity. A similar advisory committee was not established following amalgamation. There are currently no advisory bodies to Toronto city council that are dedicated to diversity issues. In 1999, the Task Force on Community Access and Equity recommended the establishment of five community advisory committees, including a Race and Ethnic Relations committee. Its mandate was transferred to the Mayor's Roundtable on Access, Equity and Human Rights, which was charged with advising elected officials on how to achieve the city's access, equity and human rights objectives as they are articulated in the *Final Report of the Task Force on Community Access and Equity* and in the *2003 Plan of Action for the Elimination of Racism and Discrimination*. The roundtable was appointed for the 2003-2006 term, but was not renewed.

### *Vision Statements*

Vision statements convey symbolic messages to internal and external publics about a city's character and values. The review demonstrated that four cities recognized cultural diversity as a key aspect of their communities, and that the size of a city's immigrant and visible minority population was not a consistent predictor of the likelihood that a city would highlight ethnocultural diversity as part of its self-image. Edmonton's *Building the Capital City: Council Special Initiatives 2005-2007* report identifies building a culturally rich and welcoming city as one of its visions (City of Edmonton 2005). *Calgary 2020*, a long-range vision statement approved in 1989, recognizes that Calgary is a city of many ethnic origins and that it accepts the challenge of reaching for the city's multicultural potential (City of Calgary 1998). In January 2004, the city sponsored a large-scale citizen and stakeholder visioning initiative called imagineCalgary, which produced several recommendations related to the educational, economic and cultural integration of newcomers.

Two paired comparisons illustrate the observation that a city's self-image as a diverse community does not always proceed from the size of its immigrant and visible minority population. First, while Abbotsford's *Community Vision Statement* states that "people from many backgrounds will contribute values, knowledge and skills to the development of business, culture, education and recreation" (City of Abbotsford 2005a), the vision articulated by the relatively more diverse community of Brampton emphasizes safety, economic opportunity, efficient services and a high quality of life (City of Brampton 2003). Vancouver's mission statement refers to creating a "great city of communities which cares about its people, its environment and the opportunities to live, work and prosper." The follow-up value statements are universal in nature, emphasizing government responsiveness, excellence, fairness, integrity, leadership and learning (<http://www.city.vancouver.bc.ca/ctyclerk/mission.htm>). In contrast, Toronto's "Diversity Our Strength" motto highlights the city's ethnocultural diversity and the distinct community identities of its pre-amalgamation constituent municipalities (<http://www.toronto.ca/protocol/motto.htm>).

### *Strategic Plans*

Strategic planning documents set out the broad framework that guides more detailed planning processes and decision-making. Five cities identified immigration and diversity as issues in their strategic plans, although there were wide variations in the prominence assigned to the implications of demographic change. Abbotsford's *Official Community Plan 2005* refers to the need to address the requirements of youths, seniors and recent immigrant communities more effectively. It promises to do more to support diversity by encouraging the multicultural community agencies that provide community services, facilitating and communicating intercultural events and programs, and communicating with citizens who have English as a second language (City of Abbotsford 2005b). Brampton's strategic plan, *Six Pillars Supporting Our Great City*, places a greater emphasis on the promotion of local cultural festivals and educational experiences, rather than on the service needs that may be generated by multicultural populations (City of Brampton 2003).

The *Calgary Plan* briefly refers to the *Calgary 2020* vision statement and makes no additional references to cultural diversity or immigration (City of Calgary 1998). In 1995, Vancouver city council adopted *City Plan: Directions for Vancouver*, a broad vision designed to guide the city in its policy decisions, corporate work priorities, budgets and capital plans. City Plan was the product of more than three years of consultation with 20,000 citizens who were first asked in 1992 to share their ideas about Vancouver's future. The visions articulated in the plan do not refer to ethnocultural diversity or interethnic relations (City of Vancouver 2003). Embracing a wealth of cultures and creating a city that is welcoming to newcomers are identified as municipal responsibilities in *Plan Edmonton*, which directs departmental and agency plans over a 10-year planning horizon (City of Edmonton 2006). Toronto City Council's *Strategic Plan: mission statement for the city government* identifies recognizing, accepting and

promoting diversity as a core strength, and refers to the social, economic and cultural benefits that Toronto accrues from its international linkages ([http://www.toronto.ca/strategic\\_plan/goals1.htm#social](http://www.toronto.ca/strategic_plan/goals1.htm#social)).

### *Multicultural Policies and CCMARD Membership*

In 1971, Canada became the first country in the world to introduce an official policy of multiculturalism - a new approach to nation-building that encouraged individuals to affiliate with the culture and tradition of their choice, while retaining Canadian citizenship. All provinces except Newfoundland and Labrador have had a multicultural policy in the form of a statute or statement. Garcea has argued that the multicultural policies that were in place between 1974 and 2004 were the products of the same factors that led to their introduction at the national level: the ethnic revival, minority rights and cultural cosmopolitanism movements, as well as political and policy rationality (2006).

The adoption of multiculturalism at the local level has been more uneven. Abbotsford has a statement on multiculturalism and Vancouver a civic policy dealing with multicultural relations. Common themes in both policies highlight the positive contribution of cultural diversity, the necessity of discouraging prejudice and discrimination, and the importance of service accessibility (City of Abbotsford 1998; City of Vancouver 2005). None of the other cities have adopted multicultural policies, although Calgary, Edmonton and Toronto are members of the Canadian Coalition of Municipalities Against Racism and Discrimination (CCMARD). Formed in 2006 in response to a call from the Canadian Commission for UNESCO, CCMARD is part of an international coalition of cities committed to improving their ability to fight racism, discrimination and xenophobia.

### *Administrative Structures*

Three of the six cities have adopted a decentralized approach to the development and coordination of issues related to immigration, settlement and/or ethnocultural diversity. Toronto, Edmonton and Vancouver are the only municipalities that have established separate administrative structures that develop policies and programs in these areas and which monitor progress on the implementation of these policies across all city units.

The City of Toronto's Diversity Management and Community Engagement Unit (DMCEU) was created in 1999 to advise, develop policy, monitor legislation, coordinate access and equity information, engage in advocacy, provide community support, promote public education, and administer the community grants program. It also has a monitoring responsibility as the City Manager must present an annual report to council on the implementation of the *2003 Plan of Action for the Elimination of Racism and Discrimination*. The *Plan of Action* was prepared by the DMCEU following consultations with the public and stakeholder groups in 2002. The Plan noted the social and economic

disparities that have disproportionately affected Aboriginal people, racial minorities, recent immigrants, people with disabilities, women, lesbians, gay, bisexual and transgendered people, and reinforced the recommendations of the *Final Report of the 1999 Task Force on Community Access and Equity*. Among other goals, the *Plan of Action* commits the city to: removing the barriers of racism and discrimination that exclude individuals and communities from participating equitably in all spheres of life; acknowledging that multiple factors, such as race, gender, disability, sexual orientations, gender identity, place of origin, contribute to discrimination against individuals and communities; and ensuring that non-discrimination, anti-racism, accessibility and equity policies and programs are integrated in the operations of the municipality (City of Toronto 2003).

The DMCEU also coordinates an interdivisional staff team that leads the city divisions in developing the *Action Plans on Access, Equity and Human Rights* that they must develop for the term of council. The City Manager reports on these plans to council and the Auditor General conducts a social audit of the city's performance in achieving these goals. The DMCEU, working with the former Mayor's Roundtable on Access and Equity, also developed the Equity Lens, a pilot project launched in 2007 (City of Toronto 2006). All reports that are signed by the City Manager must include an equity impact statement using the equity lens. The equity lens requires that managers engaged in policy planning determine if diverse groups face barriers and whether the division has reduced or removed those barriers, assess the policy's impact on diverse groups, identify the changes that will benefit diverse groups, identify the human and budgetary resources allocated to the initiative and measure the results.

The unit also works to improve the opportunities for businesses owned by designated groups to compete for city contracts. In 2007, it was compiling a directory of businesses owned by designated groups so that city divisions could increase the representation of these businesses in their purchasing decisions. Enterprise Toronto, a public and private sector alliance managed by the city's Economic Development Office, holds seminars and trade shows to help business owners from designated groups develop their business potential and learn about the purchasing process. The DMCEU also monitors the selection process for the city's agencies, boards and commissions to ensure that appointments reflect the city's diversity.

The DMCEU administers a grants program that enhances the capacity of non-profit organizations, including those in the minority and immigrant and refugee sector. The Community Partnership and Investment Program, established under the former Metro government in the early 1980s, was initially set up to address multicultural issues. Its role expanded when the Task Force on Access and Equity observed that grant programs should address the needs of emerging, under-resourced communities. The city operates 29 different grants programs and holds clinics for community organizations on how to prepare grant applications. The unit is also responsible for helping ethnocultural communities plan and launch events that increase awareness about their unique histories and for managing any issues that may arise.

Edmonton closed its Diversity Initiatives Office in 1997 following a reorganization of the city administration. In 2005, the City Manager established the Office of Diversity and Inclusion (ODI), which is responsible for implementing the city's Immigration and Settlement Policy. The ODI has a mandate to: build a workforce that is reflective of the city's communities; develop policies that recognize the diversity of city customers and citizens; provide training programs that value diversity and inclusion; help staff perform their duties using required diversity competencies; and develop working relationships with senior governments and other external organizations. The office also provides support to the bureaucracy on diversity, inclusion, equal opportunities and human rights issues. It has adopted a broad conceptualization of diversity which recognizes that human differences extend beyond the characteristics of protected groups under the Charter. It works with a cross-departmental Diversity and Inclusion committee to develop department plans rooted in the Diversity and Inclusion Framework and Implementation Plan. Diversity and Inclusion teams operate in each department, examining ways in which policies, practises, programs and services can be modified in a manner that is sensitive to the needs of a diverse workforce and population (Reilly 2009).

Vancouver's Equal Employment Opportunity Program (EEO) works with city departments to create a respectful and welcoming workplace, and to integrate principles of fairness, diversity and inclusiveness in all policies and practices. Its consulting arm, the Hastings Institute, provides training, consulting and resource services to external organizations in the areas of equity, human rights, diversity, literacy, accessibility, workplace accommodation and human rights (<http://www.city.vancouver.bc.ca/eoo/>). The City of Calgary established an Equal Opportunity Division in 1985, but it was closed in 1999 following an administrative reorganization. The smaller cities in the sample have not created new structures to deal with immigration, settlement and diversity issues. According to Abbotsford's former city manager, the city opted not to create a separate multiculturalism division following its amalgamation with the District of Maatsqui, and to treat multicultural issues as horizontal functions that are factored into corporate planning process (personal interview, Gary Guthrie, August 2007).

### *Human Resource Policies*

While all six municipalities have human rights or anti-discrimination policies that comply with provincial human rights legislation, there are substantial variations in their recruitment, employment and training initiatives. Vancouver and Toronto are the only cities with employment policies that encourage the hiring of members of the four groups designated by the federal *Employment Equity Act*. Toronto, Edmonton and Vancouver are the only cities that are operating mentoring and/or internship programs for immigrants.

The City of Vancouver's Equal Employment Opportunity (E.E.O.) Policy, established in 1986, encourages the hiring of qualified people who have been under-represented in the workforce: women, persons with disabilities, visible minorities, and Aboriginal people. Established in 1977, the city administration's EEO Program engages

in community outreach initiatives, disseminates information about equity, inclusion and diversity practises and human rights legislation, coordinates work experience placements with community agencies and educational institutions, collaborates with city departments to reach a more diverse applicant pool and to enhance the accessibility and inclusiveness of city facilities, resources and processes, provides training on harassment prevention, diversity, human rights and literacy, helps resolve harassment and discrimination issues, and promotes best practices in areas related to human rights. The Program reports to city council periodically on the progress made by all city departments (<http://vancouver.ca/eo/policy.htm>).

Toronto's Employment Equity Policy (2000) reflects the practises of the former City of Toronto and Metro governments. It states that citizens are best served by a public service which reflects the diversity of the community, and that this goal should be achieved through employment equity programs that remove barriers and monitor outcomes rather than establish numerical quotas for hiring that mirror the presence of designated groups in the community. The policy aims to remove systemic barriers to full employment with respect to race, ancestry, place of origin, colour, ethnic origin, citizenship, creed, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, age, record of offences, marital status, family status, disability and level of literacy. It also commits the city to work with its employees, unions, employee associations and community organizations representing women, racial minority people, people with disabilities, Aboriginal people and other groups, to develop initiatives that promote equity in the workplace. In 2007, Toronto initiated a two-year pilot project to remove barriers in hiring and promotion processes that affect Black/African Canadian Toronto Public Service employees in exempt and management level positions. The city has also conducted voluntary employment equity surveys (City of Toronto 2000).

Brampton, Abbotsford, Calgary and Edmonton have opted to emphasize equal employment opportunities for individuals. Brampton bills itself as an Equal Opportunity Employer and Abbotsford adopted an Equal Opportunity Policy in 1983 that subscribes "to the broadest definition of equality, one which transcends concepts of race, ethnicity, gender and disability". Abbotsford's equal opportunity policy strives to promote equal access to all municipal services and employment opportunities, to encourage the participation of citizens from all backgrounds in the development of policies, practises and services, to recognize the multicultural make-up of the community and to create a work environment in which people are hired or promoted because of their qualifications and not because of factors unrelated to their ability to do the job" (City of Abbotsford 1983). Edmonton's Equal Opportunities policy is described as a process to ensure that all employees and prospective employees will have equal access to employment, will not be subject to discrimination or harassment based on the protected grounds, and that all employees will be treated in a manner that promotes their self esteem and dignity. The ODI has conducted a voluntary census of the municipal workforce. Calgary's Respectful Workplace Policy (2001) is focussed on maintaining a safe and productive workplace where all city employees are treated with respect and dignity.

The four largest cities in the sample have mounted outreach initiatives to recruit more members of immigrant and minority communities to the municipal bureaucracy, while Toronto, Vancouver and Edmonton run internship and/or mentoring programs. As described above, Vancouver's EEO program delivers public presentations about employment opportunities in the municipal bureaucracy, and coordinates work experience placements with community agencies and educational institutions. In recent years, when Calgary's surging economy had thrust the municipal government into a fierce competition with private sector employers for labour, the city employed several strategies to improve immigrant recruitment. In addition to enlisting the aid of local educational institutions and immigrant service provider agencies to disseminate information about job opportunities, in the summer of 2006 it launched an advertising campaign featuring "diverse" faces. In 2007, it hired an outreach staff member to encourage more minorities to apply to the police force and to combat perceptions within minority communities that it was difficult to find employment with the municipality. The city also introduced a one-year pilot Immigrant Internship program that resulted in the hiring of the candidate to a permanent position in the bureaucracy. The pilot was discontinued when no staff member was designated to run the program on an ongoing basis. The city also helped found the Immigrant Sector Council of Calgary, which meets with immigrant serving agencies and key funders to discuss employment-related issues.

Edmonton's recruitment brochures also emphasize the importance of reflecting community diversity in the municipal workforce. Its Human Resources Branch created an outreach program and hired a human resources consultant to foster a workforce that better represents the region's ethnocultural demographics. The consultant implemented an internship program that has hosted eight interns, some of whom were hired to permanent positions with the city. The consultant has also facilitated job fairs in settlement agencies and other community settings and has provided cultural diversity training and language programs to city units with labour shortages or in units where immigrants have expressed concerns about accessing jobs. The consultant also created a new employment access program that works with a local college and immigrant employment service to deliver job skill and language training, with the aim of increasing the number of immigrants working for transit and medical emergency services (Reilly 2009).

City officials have also worked with the Edmonton Economic Development Commission, local employers and community organizations to launch the Edmonton Region Immigrant Employment Council (ERIEC) in September 2008. The ERIEC was created in response to an economic expansion which attracted tens of thousands of interprovincial and international migrants. Despite the employment opportunities that were available in the region, many immigrants continued to experience higher than average levels of unemployment and underemployment. The ERIEC's role is to address the challenge that immigrants face in finding employment that matches their skills, education and work experience (<http://www.criticallink.ca/docs/ERIEC%20Interim%20Planning%20Phase%20-%20exec%20summary.pdf>).



ERIEC was modeled on the Toronto Region Immigrant Employment Council (TRIEC), a multi-stakeholder group comprised of employers, community organizations, labour, occupational regulatory bodies, post-secondary institutions, assessment service providers and all three levels of government. The origins of TRIEC can be traced to the 2002 Toronto City Summit that was held to assess the region's strengths and challenges. Following the summit, the TCSA was formed and recommended that a council be created to improve immigrant access to employment. Launched in 2003 by the Toronto City Summit Alliance (TCSA) and Maytree, a private charitable foundation, TRIEC's primary mission is to create and champion solutions to better integrate skilled immigrants in the Greater Toronto Region labour market. The local and regional government members of TRIEC include the cities of Toronto and Brampton, the town of Markham and the Regions of Peel, Halton and York (<http://migration.ucdavis.edu/rs/images/uploads/7.TRIEC-Omidvar.pdf>).

The City of Toronto offers internship and mentoring opportunities for immigrant job seekers. Seven internships were established in 2006, three were extended from 2006 to 2007 and 13 new positions were created in 2007 (personal interviews, December 2007). The city hires applicants from Career Bridge, a 4-12 month internship program available to immigrants who have been living in Canada for no more than three years and who have a minimum of three years work experience in their professional field, to non-bargaining unit positions. Between 2004 and December 2007, 118 city employees have provided immigrant job seekers with 4-6 hours per month of mentoring. Mentors provide information about dress and other behavioural issues appropriate for the Canadian workplace, review the mentees' resumes and introduce them to professional networks.

More cross-jurisdictional similarities emerge in policy areas that are legislated by the province. Every province has human rights codes or laws that protect residents against discrimination in employment, accommodation, goods, services and facilities. Consequently, all cities have implemented human rights or anti-discrimination policies that conform to provincial laws. Nevertheless, this has not prevented policy innovation and differentiation at the municipal level. For example, Toronto is the only jurisdiction that has a Human Rights Office, established in response to the 1999 *Final Report of the Task Force on Community Access and Equity*. Furthermore, the city's *Human Rights and Harassment Policy* (1998) goes beyond the Ontario Human Rights Code to list gender identity, level of literacy, political affiliation, membership in a union or staff association, and any other personal characteristic as prohibited grounds of discrimination in employment. The inclusion of literacy level as a prohibited ground was partly motivated by the fact that literacy requirements had excluded members of cultural minorities from municipal cleaning and trades positions. A *Hate Activity Policy and Procedures Statement* was added to the Human Rights Policy following amalgamation in 1998 and an *Employment Accommodation Policy* was established to maintain an inclusive workplace in 2004.

In Alberta and British Columbia, there is an exact correspondence between provincial human rights codes and the policies of their respective municipalities. Calgary's *Respectful Workplace Policy* incorporates anti-discrimination and anti-

harassment measures, and covers all the prohibited grounds under the *Alberta Human Rights, Citizenship and Multiculturalism Act* (City of Calgary, 2001). Abbotsford's *Workplace Human Rights Policy* (1993) prohibits differential treatment of an individual for reasons of age, race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, sexual orientation, physical or mental disability, marital status, family status, political belief, or conviction of an offence that is unrelated to the person's employment or for which a pardon was granted (City of Abbotsford 1993).

### *Corporate Communications and Public Consultation*

The language that municipal governments use to inform residents about their regulations and activities is one indicator of their perspective on how to best integrate newcomers into local communities. Official Language proficiency is an important issue for immigrant adjustment, as many newcomers encounter difficulties entering the labour force due to inadequate language skills (Grant and Sweetman 2004). Recent immigrants are less likely than previous immigrant cohorts to speak English or French at home. About two-thirds of foreign-born non-English, non-French speakers who immigrated before 1961, spoke at least one Official Language at home in 2006. In contrast, about 24 percent of allophones who immigrated between 1991 and 2000, and 19 percent of allophones who immigrated between 2001 and 2006, spoke an Official Language most often at home in 2006 (Corbeil and Blaser 2007).

Communications policies in the six study sites ranged from largely unilingual (English language) approaches modified by limited degrees of linguistic pluralism at the departmental or unit level, to corporate-wide multilingualism in its nascent and mature stages (Tossutti 2009). Abbotsford, Calgary and Edmonton do not have formal corporate policies concerning the translation of written documents into non-official languages. However, in these cities, departments, branches or units that deliver emergency or frontline services translate a limited number of information materials in other languages. For example, Abbotsford issues Punjabi publications on fire and garbage disposal services and places advertisements in the local South Asian newspaper. City Manager Frank Pizzutto cites translation costs and concerns about the city's inability to meet demands for translations from other language groups as the main reasons why the city does not publish more products in non-official languages. Interpretation services for front-desk requests at Abbotsford's city hall are provided on an informal basis by employees possessing written or verbal language skills in 13 non-official languages (telephone interview, December 2008).

As in Abbotsford, the City of Calgary has not instituted a formal corporate policy governing multilingual translations, but this does not mean that all city units have adopted unilingual communications strategies. For example, the Recreation Unit publishes program information in Spanish, Chinese, Tagalog and Punjabi. Calgary's approach to interpretation services, which are offered over the phone through a consolidated 311 phone number that residents can dial for information about non-emergency municipal services, reflects a more pluralist language policy.

In Edmonton, a small amount of information is published in languages other than English, and officials report that it is unlikely the city will adopt a multilingual communications strategy due to the uneven quality of translations and the belief that it may be more effective to reach newcomers through the spoken word or disc media formats. In October 2008 Edmonton published a Newcomers Guide in eight languages (English, French, Spanish, Arabic, Hindi, Mandarin, Punjabi and Vietnamese) that is available on the city's website. In January 2009, it launched the 311 information service, which offers on-line telephone interpretive services in more than 150 languages. This complements the Citizen and New Arrival Information Centre in City Hall, where 311 agents offer in-person support (Reilly 2009).

In an effort to improve the attraction and retention of immigrants in the city, the city partnered with the Edmonton Economic Development Corporation to establish a web portal that furnishes information for newcomers on the support available to them should they move to Edmonton (<http://www.edmonton.com/moving-to-edmonton/newcomer-services.aspx>). Edmonton's Public Involvement Framework also requires that diversity/translation be considered when departments and branches need to solicit the opinions of ethnocultural groups (City of Edmonton 2005).

In 1995, Vancouver's city council adopted a Diversity Communications Strategy. Based on its recommendations, Vancouver implemented a Multilingual Information and Referral Phone Service in four languages. As of August 2007, the city had not developed a corporate translation and interpretation policy, although there were plans to introduce one in the future. Janice Mackenzie, Director of Public Access and Council Services Division, anticipated that a flexible, numerical threshold for determining the language of publication would be established (personal interview, 16 August 2007). As in other cities, the absence of a formal policy did not preclude the publication of materials in non-official languages. Mackenzie says that information about important city-wide policies has been published in Chinese, Filipino, Punjabi, Vietnamese, Spanish, in addition to English. The city publishes a Newcomers Guide in English and four non-official languages (Chinese, Punjabi, Spanish, Vietnamese) and a Guide to Municipal Services in English, Chinese and Vietnamese (City of Vancouver 2005). Both publications are available on the city's website. The City Clerk's Department also keeps an inventory of staff who speak a second language (City of Vancouver 2006).

Toronto and Brampton have instituted formal corporate policies that reaffirm the principle of multilingualism. A Multilingual Services Policy was among the policies approved by Toronto city council following amalgamation (City of Toronto 2003). Prior to January 1998, the former Metro and City of Toronto governments had policies referring to multilingual access and had designated multilingual staff who provided translation and interpretation services. The other municipalities had been providing multilingual services on an informal basis. The *Final Report of the Task Force on Community Access and Equity* recommended that post-amalgamation Toronto maintain and enhance its multilingual capacity by encouraging staff to use the multilingual telephone service, providing printed materials in various languages, identifying and

remunerating staff with language skills, and continuing to use in-house interpreters and community liaison staff (City of Toronto 1999).

The city's Multilingual Services Policy is based on several principles: that ethnic diversity is a source of social, cultural and economic enrichment and strength; that providing multilingual services is an effective way to reach individuals and organizations in diverse communities and to allow them to access services and programs; and that residents are entitled to municipal services and programs which are "racially sensitive, culturally and linguistically appropriate..." (City of Toronto 2002). Patricia MacDonell, Corporate Management and Policy Consultant, Strategic Communications, says that since the city offers a broad range of programs for a diverse audience, decisions about the language of communication are made on a program basis (personal interview, December 2007). However, the policy establishes guidelines for determining priorities for multilingual translation or interpretation services. The factors that decision-makers should consider include home language census data, the language needs of a particular community or neighbourhood, and the nature of the information (e.g. documents that address life-threatening issues are identified as a priority). Whenever public information on citywide issues is translated into another language, it is also translated into French.

The perceived durability of information guides practises for translating web-based documents. Information that remains consistent is more likely to be posted on the city's website in non-official languages in order to manage the legal risks of disseminating vital information that is not current. Toronto's immigration and settlement web portal provides information to prospective immigrants and new arrivals about the city. The information is primarily in English, with links to services providing translated or interpretation resources ([http://www.toronto.ca/immigration/translations\\_imm.htm](http://www.toronto.ca/immigration/translations_imm.htm)). MacDonell estimates that in an average year the city issues full or partial translations of publications in 50 languages. Toronto employs one in-house Chinese translator and additional languages are covered by freelancers. Since 2006, Toronto's corporate advertising policy has required the placement of advertisements in the ethnic media for city-wide campaigns.

Freelancers are employed to provide interpretation services in 12 languages. Access Toronto responds to public requests for information in more than 140 languages, using interpreters provided through Language Line Services. The city plans to implement a multilingual 311 service in June 2009. Toronto is also one of two cities in the sample that have used or require the consideration of interpretation services in non-official languages during public consultation processes. Following Mayor David Miller's election in 2003, the city conducted "Listening to Toronto" public meetings, during which "whisper interpreters" provided interpretation assistance on a one-on-one basis.

In January 2007, Brampton approved a Multilingual Services Policy that aims to increase the amount of verbal and written communication provided in languages other than English to residents who have difficulty communicating in English. In support of the policy, the city offers simultaneous verbal interpretation services at service counters and public information contact telephone numbers city-wide, and advises residents of the

availability of these interpretation services through multilingual statements on regular communications such as tax bills (City of Brampton 2007). The policy establishes a population benchmark for determining the languages of translation, as well as priorities for the translation of written communications. Targeted written communications will be translated into the languages spoken at home most often by at least five percent of the population as indicated in the most recent census, in addition to French. Communications involving resident health and safety are identified as the top priorities. Communications about services having an immediate impact upon residents such as road closures, construction, and tax deadlines, as well as special purpose statements about services having an overall quality of life impact on residents such as recreation and culture, land use planning, are also mentioned in the guidelines. Some written communications may be translated into fewer languages if they do not deal with city-wide issues. For example, if road construction is taking place in a neighbourhood which includes predominantly South Asian or Portuguese residents, those languages may be used in written notices (City of Brampton 2007). Some public service and special purpose communications may be published exclusively in English, but will include a tag line in the targeted languages stating “call (insert number) for assistance in your language”.

Since May 2005, Brampton has offered third party, over-the-phone interpretation services during non-business hours. In September 2005, the Multilingual Customer Service Pilot Project was launched. It covers 150 languages and is offered for callers to high volume departments such as general information at city hall, human resources, the city clerk, career resources, the court house, and information kiosk. In January 2007, a daytime call centre for overflow calls to selected high-volume departments was also established.

## **A Typology of Local Policy Responses**

The review of corporate policies, structures, programs and practises provides the database for the typology of local models of immigration and ethnocultural diversity management (see Table 3, appended to the end of this report). The first dimension is based on an overall assessment of the normative premises underlying the recognition of immigration and ethnocultural differences in the municipal corporate policy domain. Edmonton’s intercultural model recognizes cultural differences on many indicators, but it has been relatively more reluctant to institutionalize these differences in its communications and hiring policies than cities such as Toronto which have adopted a multicultural model. Edmonton city council has established immigration and settlement as priority areas and the city’s vision statement, strategic plan, Office of Diversity and Inclusion, CCMARD membership, recruitment and internship initiatives, public consultation strategies and role in creating the ERIEC illustrate that these issues occupy a central place on the municipal agenda. While these indicators collectively suggest a multicultural approach, Edmonton’s equal opportunity employment policy emphasizes the removal of barriers to the employment of individuals rather than members of designated minority groups.

Furthermore, unlike Toronto and Brampton, it has not opted for a multilingual corporate communications policy.

### TABLE 3 HERE

Toronto is a pioneer in the development of the multicultural model of immigration and ethnocultural diversity management. Its council priorities, vision statement, CCMARD membership, strategic plan, DMCEU, human resource and multilingual corporate communications policies, public outreach practises, and role in founding the TRIEC, illustrate that the recognition of difference infuses nearly all aspects of its corporate philosophy. No other city in this sample has emulated Toronto's approach, although Edmonton and Brampton have been inspired by some of its elements.

Vancouver's approach straddles the multicultural and intercultural models. The city has mayoral and council advisory bodies on multiculturalism, a multiculturalism policy, an employment policy that expressly encourages the hiring of members of disadvantaged groups, and recruitment outreach and work placement initiatives targeted for immigrants and/or minorities. It also provides multilingual interpretation and translation services, and was planning to develop a corporate communications policy that would set guidelines for the use of non-official languages. Unlike Toronto and Edmonton, it has not adopted an Immigration and Settlement Policy, despite the presence of a large immigrant and visible minority population. Nor do its key symbolic and planning documents refer to these issues, showing that Vancouver places comparatively less emphasis than Toronto on the diverse composition of its population.

The civic universalist model best characterizes the corporate policies adopted by Abbotsford and Calgary. Beyond vision statements and strategic plans that briefly acknowledge the multicultural composition of their communities, these cities have not established separate administrative units to address immigration, settlement and ethnocultural diversity issues. Their official stance is to incorporate diversity concerns into existing corporate functions and horizontal planning processes. They issue fewer publications in non-official languages and stress equal opportunities for individuals in their human resource policies. Although Calgary has attempted to improve the recruitment of immigrant and minority residents to the municipal bureaucracy, it does not offer internships or mentoring opportunities for immigrants. Brampton also conforms to the civic universalist model, although the adoption of the Multilingual Services Policy indicates some movement toward the pluralist end of the continuum.

The second dimension examines the breadth of each city's response to immigration, settlement and ethnocultural diversity issues, distinguishing between comprehensive, selective and limited responses. A summary table (see Table 2) shows that Toronto and Edmonton have addressed these issues on all or nearly all corporate policy indicators. The responses of Vancouver and Calgary have been selective, and those of the two smaller cities, limited. The inter-jurisdictional variations cannot be simply attributed to a community's size, demographic composition and historical timing of immigration, since Calgary and Edmonton are comparable on these fronts.

Furthermore, Vancouver, Brampton and Toronto share similar proportions of immigrant and visible minority populations, but occupy three distinct positions on this dimension.

The third dimension describes the locus of authority for immigration, settlement, and ethnocultural diversity issues. Since Abbotsford, Calgary and Brampton have not established separate administrative units that coordinate and monitor these matters, their organizational approaches may be characterized as relatively decentralized. Edmonton and Toronto are situated on the centralized end of the authority spectrum. Both cities have established offices that are functionally located in the Deputy City Manager's or City Manager's Offices, to lead the development, implementation and monitoring of these issues. Both cities are unique in their requirement that all departments address diversity considerations (including ethnocultural diversity) in policy planning. In Vancouver, a central authority periodically monitors departmental progress on hiring members of the designated groups, but the absence of an immigration and settlement policy framework and corporate communications policy means that service groups, departments and programs exercise relatively more discretion in how they address issues related to immigration and ethnocultural diversity. Thus, Vancouver's organizational approach is characterized as "mixed".

## **Conclusion**

The review of municipal corporate policy responses supports previous studies arguing that despite their lack of independent constitutional status and limited financial resources, local governments have room to assume a more prominent role in the development and implementation of immigration, settlement and ethnocultural diversity policies (Good 2004). It has also demonstrated that the absence of precise rules and regulations governing the municipal role in this field has led to the emergence of distinct approaches. These variations exist between cities located within the same province, and between cities with similar levels of ethnocultural diversity, suggesting that political and bureaucratic cultures, rather than provincial contexts and the size of a community's immigrant and visible minority population, largely influence local models of immigration and ethnocultural diversity management. The proposed typology can be used to track policy responses in each city across time and across other municipal functions. The next stage in the larger project of which this paper is a part is to provide a fulsome account of inter and intraprovincial similarities and differences in local models of immigration and diversity management, and to assess their impact on newcomers and minorities in urban societies.

**Table 1 – Diversity Profiles of Cities and Provinces, 2006 census**

	<b>Toronto</b>	<b>Brampton</b>	<b>Ontario</b>	<b>Edmon-Ton</b>	<b>Calgary</b>	<b>Alberta</b>	<b>Vancouv-er</b>	<b>Abbots-Ford</b>	<b>BC</b>
Population	2,503,281	433,806	12,160,282	730,372	988,193	3,290,350	578,041	123,864	4,113,487
Population change 2001-2006 (%)	.9	33.3	6.6	9.6	12.4	10.6	5.9	7.2	5.3
Non-Official Home Language only (% of population)	31.2	27.4	15.1	12.7	13.9	9.1	32	19.1	15.7
Immigrants (% of pop.)	50	47.8	28.3	22.9	24.8	16.2	45.6	26.2	27.5
Immigrated before 1991 (% of immigrants)	47.9	45.9	55.4	57.5	49.6	56	50	54.5	54.1
Immigrated 1991-2006 (% of immigrants)	52.1	54.1	44.6	42.5	50.4	44	50	45.5	45.9
Visible minority population (% of pop.)	47	57	22.8	22.9	23.7	13.9	51	26.4	24.8



**Table 2 – Summary of Municipal Responses: corporate policy domain**

	<b>T</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>V</b>
Immigration/settlement a council priority	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
Advisory body to elected officials	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Vision refers to ethnocultural diversity	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Strategic plan refers to ethnocultural diversity	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Multiculturalism policy	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
CCMARD member	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
Administrative unit dealing with immigration and/or diversity	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
Employment Equity (EE)/Equal Opportunity (EO)	EE	EO	EO	EO	EO	EE
Audit composition of workforce?	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
Anti-Racism/Anti-Harassment/Human Rights Policies	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Recruitment outreach	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Mentorship program for immigrants/minorities	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Internships for immigrants/minorities	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
Corporate communications policy?*	ML	ML				
Language: written communication*	ML	ML	LM	LM	LM	LM
Language: verbal communication*	ML	ML	ML	ML	LM	ML
Ethnic advertising policy?	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Adapted public consultation practises?	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y

\*ML=multilingual; LM=limited multilingual

**Table 3 – Typology of Local Models of Immigration and Ethnocultural Diversity Management**

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Vancouver</b>	<b>Abbotsford</b>	<b>Edmonton</b>	<b>Calgary</b>	<b>Toronto</b>	<b>Brampton</b>
Recognition of difference	Multicultural/ Intercultural	Civic Universalist	Intercultural	Civic Universalist	Multicultural	Civic Universalist
Breadth	Selective	Limited	Comprehensive	Selective	Comprehensive	Limited
Locus of authority	Mixed	Decentralized	Centralized	Decentralized	Centralized	Decentralized

## References

- Alexander, Michael. 2004. Comparing Local Policies toward Migrants: An Analytical Framework, A Typology and Preliminary Survey Results. In *Citizenship in European Cities: Immigrants, Local Politics and Integration Policies*, ed. Rinus Penninx, Karen Kraal, Marco Martiniello and Steven Vertovec, 57-84. Aldershot Hants, England: Ashgate Research in Migration and Ethnic Relations Series.
- Andrew, Caroline. 1995. Provincial-municipal relations: or hyper-fractionalized quasi-subordination revisited. In *Canadian Metropolitanities*, ed. James Lightbody. Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman.
- Association of Municipalities of Ontario. 31 October 2008. *Report of the Provincial-Municipal Fiscal and Service Delivery Review Released*. Toronto: Association of Municipalities of Ontario.
- Castles, Stephen. 1995. How Nation-States Respond to Immigration and Ethnic Diversity. *New Community* 21, no. 3: 293-308.
- Chui, Tina, Kelly Tran and Hélène Maheux. 2007. *Immigration in Canada: a portrait of the foreign-born population, 2006 census*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.  
[http://www12.statcan.ca/english/census06/analysis/immcit/linguistic\\_divers.cfm](http://www12.statcan.ca/english/census06/analysis/immcit/linguistic_divers.cfm)  
[accessed 30 November 2008]
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada. 2009. *Report on Plans and Priorities 2008-2009*. Ottawa: Citizenship and Immigration Canada.
- City of Abbotsford. 1983. Equal Opportunity. In *Human Resources Policy Manual*.
- City of Abbotsford. 1993. Workplace Human Rights. In *Human Resources Policy Manual*.
- City of Abbotsford. 1998. Multiculturalism. *Policy Manual No. 100-1-17*.
- City of Abbotsford. 2005a. *Annual Report*.
- City of Abbotsford. 2005b. *Official Community Plan*.
- City of Brampton. 2003. *Six Pillars: Supporting our Great City*.
- City of Brampton. 15 January 2007. *City Council Minutes*.
- City of Calgary. 1998. *The Calgary Plan – Municipal Development Plan*.
- City of Calgary. 2001. *A Guide to a Respectful Workplace Policy*.

- City of Calgary. 2006a. *Council's Priorities: Looking Ahead, Moving Forward*.
- City of Calgary. 2006b. *Fair Calgary Policy*. CPS 2006-63, Attachment 1.
- City of Calgary. 2006c. *Community and Protective Services Report to the S.P.C. on Community and Protective Services*. CPS 2006-63. November 1.
- City of Calgary. 2006d. *Community and Protective Services Report to the S.P.C. on Community and Protective Services*. CPS 2006-05. January 4.
- City of Edmonton. 2005. *Building the Capital City: Edmonton City Council's Special Initiatives 2005-2007*.
- City of Edmonton. 2006. *Corporate Business Plan 2006-2008*.
- City of Edmonton. 20 July 2007. *Immigration and Settlement Initiatives Update*.
- City of Toronto. 2000. *Employment Equity Policy*.
- City of Toronto. 2001. *Immigration and Settlement Policy Framework*.
- City of Toronto. 2003. *Plan of Action for the Elimination of Racism and Discrimination*.
- City of Toronto. 2006. *Report to Policy and Finance Committee: Utilization of an equity lens and an equity impact statement*
- City of Vancouver. 2003. *How We Plan: Inclusivity in Decision Making*.
- City of Vancouver. 21 September 2005. *Report of Mayor's Working Group on Immigration*.
- City of Vancouver. 28 June 2007. *Annual Report for the Year 2006: Advisory Committee on Diversity Issues*.
- City of Vancouver Advisory Committee on Diversity Issues. 7 June 2007. *Other Report*.
- Corbeil, Jean Pierre and Christine Blaser. 2007. *The Evolving Linguistic Portrait, 2006 Census*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada. <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/bsolc/olc-cel/olc-cel?lang=eng&catno=97-555-X2006001>
- Donaldson, Ian. 2006. Visible Minority Demographic Projections and Multicultural Integration in Canada's Urban Areas. In *Our Diverse Cities*, summer: 146-153.
- Edgington, David W. and Thomas A. Hutton. 2002. Multiculturalism and Local Government in Greater Vancouver, Working Paper Series No. 02-02. Vancouver: Centre of Excellence Research on Immigration and Integration in the Metropolis.

- Friskien, Frances. 1997. Jurisdictional and Political Constraints on Progressive Local Initiative. In *The Politics of the City: A Canadian Perspective*, ed. Timothy Thomas. Toronto: ITP Nelson.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. *The Public Metropolis: the Political Dynamics of Urban Expansion in the Toronto Region, 1924-2003*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars Press Inc.
- Garcea, Joe. 2006. Provincial Multiculturalism Policies in Canada, 1974-2004: A Content Analysis. *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 38, no. 3: 1-20.
- Good, Kristin. 2004. Multiculturalism in the City: A Comparative Analysis of Municipal Responsiveness to Immigration in the Greater Toronto Area (GTA) and the Greater Vancouver Regional District (Some Preliminary Findings). Paper presented to the Annual General Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, Winnipeg, Manitoba.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2005. Patterns of Politics in Canada's Immigrant-Receiving Cities and Suburbs: how immigrant settlement patterns shape the municipal role in multiculturalism policy. *Policy Studies* 26, no. 3 and 4: 261-289.
- Graham, Katherine A., Susan Phillips, and Allan M. Maslove. 1998. *Urban Governance in Canada: Representation, Resources and Restructuring*. Toronto: Harcourt Canada.
- Guiraudon, V. 1998. Citizenship Rights for Non-Citizens: France, Germany and the Netherlands. In *Challenge to the Nation-State: Immigration in Western Europe and the United States*, 272-318. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Grant, Hugh and Arthur Sweetman. 2004. Introduction to Economic and Urban Issues in Canadian Immigration Policy. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research/Revue canadienne de recherche urbaine* 13, no. 1: 1-45.
- Leo, Christopher. 2006. Deep Federalism: Respecting Community Difference in National Policy. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 39, no. 3: 481-506.
- Lightbody, James. 2006. *City Politics, Canada*. Peterborough: Broadview Press.
- Mahnig, Hans. 2004. The Politics of Minority-Majority Relations: How Immigrant Policies Developed in Paris, Berlin and Zurich. In *Citizenship in European Cities: Immigrants, Local Politics and Integration Policies*, 17-38.
- Messina, Anthony. 1987. Mediating Race Relations: British Community Relations Councils Revisited. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 10, no. 2: 186-202.

- Penninx, Rinus, Karen Kraal, Marco Martiniello, Steven Vertovec. 2004. In *Citizenship in European Cities: Immigrants, Local Politics and Integration Policies*, 1-16.
- Poirier, Christian. 2004. The Management of Ethnic Diversity and Comparative City Governance in Canada. Paper presented to the Annual General Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, Winnipeg, Manitoba.
- Ragin, Charles. 1987. *The Comparative Method: moving beyond qualitative and quantitative strategies*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Reilly, John. 2009. Municipal Roles in Immigrant Integration: the Edmonton Experience. *Our Diverse Cities: Prairies Region* 6, spring: 156-160.
- Rex, J. and Yunas Samad. 1996. Multiculturalism and Political Integration in Birmingham and Bradford. *Innovation* 9, no. 1: 11-31.
- Statistics Canada. 2006. *Community Profiles*. <http://www12.statcan.ca/census-recensement/2006/dp-pd/prof/92-591/index.cfm?Lang=E>
- Tate, Ellen and Louise Quesnel. 1995. Accessibility of Municipal Services for Ethnocultural Populations in Toronto and Montreal. *Canadian Public Administration* 38: 325-351.
- Tindal, Richard and Susan Nobes Tindal. 2007. *Local Government in Canada*, 7<sup>th</sup> edition. Toronto: Nelson Education.
- Tossutti, Livianna. 2009. The language of municipal government in global communities: corporate communications policies in six cities. *Plan Canada*, January/February: 60-63.
- Wallace, Marcia and Francis Frisken. 2000. City-Suburban Differences in Government Responses to Immigration in The Greater Toronto Area. Toronto: Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto.
- Winnemore, Laura and John Biles. 2006. Canada's Two-Way Street Integration Model: Not Without its Stains, Strains and Growing Pains. *Canadian Diversity* 5, no. 1: 23-30.

## Websites:

<http://vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/cclerk/20070628/documents/csb1.pdf>  
[http://www.toronto.ca/council/cae\\_index.htm](http://www.toronto.ca/council/cae_index.htm)  
<http://www.city.vancouver.bc.ca/ctyclerk/mission.htm>  
[http://www.toronto.ca/committees/rt\\_accessequity.htm](http://www.toronto.ca/committees/rt_accessequity.htm)  
<http://www.toronto.ca/protocol/motto.htm>  
[http://www.toronto.ca/strategic\\_plan/goals1.htm#social](http://www.toronto.ca/strategic_plan/goals1.htm#social)  
<http://www.city.vancouver.bc.ca/eo/>  
<http://www.criticallink.ca/docs/ERIEC%20Interim%20Planning%20Phase%20-%20exec%20summary.pdf>  
<http://migration.ucdavis.edu/rs/images/uploads/7.TRIEC-Omidvar.pdf>  
<http://www.edmonton.com/moving-to-edmonton/newcomer-services.aspx>

## Personal Interviews

1. Wade King, Consultant, Office of Diversity and Inclusion, City of Edmonton
2. Patricia MacDonell, Corporate Management and Policy Consultant, Strategic Communications, City Manager's Office, City of Toronto
3. Janet Mackenzie, Director of Public Access and Council Services Division, City of Vancouver
4. Michael Phair, Councillor, City of Edmonton
5. Gary Guthrie, former City Manager, City of Abbotsford
6. Frank Pizzutto, City Manager, City of Abbotsford
7. Various confidential interviews