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Throughout its history as a nation, Canada has had a culturally diverse population. For much of this time education has been one of the principal means through which the state and society have addressed the concerns associated with cultural diversity. From the early 1900s onward local and provincial educational authorities have developed and implemented a variety of policies and programs designed to address these concerns. In the 1940s, as the federal government started to develop its first policy and programs to address cultural diversity, it also found itself involved in the field of cultural diversity and education. This study examines how the federal government became interested in cultural diversity and education and how it continued to work in this field despite the fact that education is an area of provincial jurisdiction.

In 1940 federal authorities began to lay the groundwork for a cultural diversity policy designed to foster support for the Canadian war effort among members of non-British, non-French ethnic groups. Education was initially to have been one of the strategies through which federal authorities implemented their cultural diversity policy but cultural diversity and education became an area of federal policy separate from yet related to the cultural diversity policy. Throughout most of its history, the two main objectives of the cultural diversity and education policy were education of immigrants for assimilation and education to promote effective intergroup relations. By the late
1960s tentative steps were being taken in the direction of education for cultural retention.

Over the period from 1940 to 1971 a policy community of individuals and agencies with interests in cultural diversity and education evolved. Members of this community influenced the development of the federal policy by working on specific initiatives with the federal agency responsible for cultural diversity and education. Each of those initiatives became a site for negotiation on the direction of the policy. Thus the policy developed in an unplanned and ad hoc manner and grew to incorporate contradictory objectives. In addition, some of the work in cultural diversity and education also undermined the goals of the federal cultural diversity policy.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Introduction

The impetus for this study came from the recognition of two significant facts: first, that the federal government has played an important role in the development of the field of multicultural education, and second, that the origins of federal multiculturalism policy can be traced to programs and policies that were initiated in the 1940s. In a 1987 publication titled Multiculturalism in Education Resources, Andrew Machalski pointed out that "[a] large part of materials in the field of multiculturalism have been funded totally or in part by the Multiculturalism Sector." (Machalski 1987,1). John Grant (1992) has noted that "[n]o initiative of the federal government, whether as a Branch or Department, has been so 'up front' about using the provincial and territorial school systems as has multiculturalism." (Grant p.26). In addition, The first report on the operations of the Multiculturalism Act (1988) highlighted work in education as one of the major achievements of Multiculturalism Canada (Minister of State for Multiculturalism 1989). These declarations indicate that the federal government, through its agency responsible for multiculturalism, has had a direct and influential role in the area of multicultural education. However, scholarship in the area makes very little reference to this role (Joshee and Bullard 1992).

Some scholars (e.g. Dreisziger 1988, Pal 1989) have recently
begun to question the conventional wisdom which places the origins of the federal multiculturalism policy in the 1960s specifically linked to the Quiet Revolution and the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (1963). Both N.F. Dreisziger and Leslie Pal have argued convincingly that the multiculturalism policy is actually rooted in the Second World War and the efforts of the federal government to marshal ethnic support behind the Canadian war effort. They have shown that the Nationalities Branch of the Department of National War Services, established in 1942, was the first in a series of federal agencies responsible for what we now call multiculturalism. Their respective analyses have focussed on the role of bureaucrats and scholars in the development of policy and programs on cultural diversity. Although both Dreisziger and Pal have commented on the role of individual scholars and educators in the development of early policy on cultural diversity, neither has examined the role of the education sector in this process.

I chose to focus on cultural diversity and education for three reasons. First, the educational sector has been involved in the implementation of policies on cultural diversity from the earliest days of this country (Jaenen 1985). Second, focussing on this area allowed me to determine which of several interest groups were actually involved in the development of policy on cultural diversity and education. Third, given that education is a provincial responsibility, concentrating on this area provided some insights into the nature of federal-provincial relations in
the area of cultural diversity and education and how this relationship has influenced the policy process.

My primary interest in undertaking this research lay in determining if education had been a central concern of the federal government throughout the development of its policies on cultural diversity and how a focus on education may have played a role in the development of the federal policy on multiculturalism. Consequently, I sought answers to seven main questions. What policies and programs existed in the area of cultural diversity and education prior to the official adoption of the federal multiculturalism policy in 1971? Who was involved in developing and implementing these policies and programs? How were these groups and individuals involved? How did the federal government negotiate working in an area that is constitutionally a provincial responsibility? Was education an important part of the cultural diversity policy? Did the development of policy on cultural diversity and education influence the development of federal multiculturalism policy? If so, how?

Based on these questions I outlined and conducted my study. Two important preliminary aspects of the study were determining appropriate definitions for key terms that I would use to describe my findings and understanding the history of cultural diversity and cultural diversity and education in Canada prior to federal government involvement in the areas.
The Study

At the outset, I considered examining federal policies on cultural diversity and education from 1940 to 1988, the year that the Multiculturalism Act was adopted. My preliminary research, which involved examining annual reports of the Departments of Citizenship and Immigration and the Secretary of State and relevant publications of the Nationalities Branch and its immediate successor the Citizenship Branch, convinced me that this task would be unwieldy. These sources showed that work in cultural diversity and education did date back to the Second World War and that from 1947 through the 1960s it was a major focus of the Citizenship Branch. Furthermore, my literature review revealed that this work had received no serious scholarly attention. For these reasons I decided to limit my study to the period from 1940 to 1971, in other words to the period before the federal government officially adopted its Multiculturalism Policy.

I obtained the data for this study primarily through an analysis of documents found at the National Archives of Canada. I began by consulting the files of the three departments that, during the period under study, housed the agency responsible for cultural diversity, namely, National War Services, Citizenship and Immigration, and Secretary of State. The agency, which began life as the Nationalities Branch and after the War was renamed the Citizenship Branch, was at different times in its history involved in struggles with other federal agencies over control of
cultural diversity and education. During the time period I studied, the other two agencies with interests in this area were the Department of Labour and the Immigration Branch. I have referred to these two agencies when appropriate throughout the dissertation and I did examine their files in a cursory fashion. I found that their work in education was generally limited to areas outside the scope of my study. That is to say, there was no direct involvement with schools or school boards and contact with provincial departments of education was not consistent. I also determined that these files did not provide any information beyond what I could obtain through the files of the Nationalities Branch and the Citizenship Branch.

From information in the files of the Nationalities Branch and the Citizenship Branch I determined that there were a small number of key agencies and organizations involved in the policy development process. Among them were the Canadian Citizenship Council, the Canadian Association for Adult Education, the Community Programmes Branch of Ontario Education, and the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. I therefore consulted the files of the Canadian Citizenship Council and the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission which are also located at the National Archives. Because of the close relationship between the Canadian Citizenship Council and the Canadian Association for Adult Education, the Council's files contained substantial documentation about the Association. I found additional relevant information on the Association and the
Council in the files of the Canada Foundation whose director, Walter Herbert, was an active member of both organizations. These files are also located at the National Archives. Collectively the files of Citizenship and Immigration, the Secretary of State, the Canadian Citizenship Council, and the Canada Foundation also contained considerable information about the Community Programmes Branch. The material in the files of the federal departments documented in detail the various activities which the Community Programmes Branch and its successor the Citizenship Division undertook in conjunction with the Citizenship Branch. The Citizenship Council and Canada Foundation files provided additional background about the activities of the Ontario government and the involvement of the director of the Community Programmes Branch, Stephen Davidovich, in immigrant and adult education. Given that I was able to obtain this information at the National Archives, I determined it would not be necessary to consult the files of the Community Programmes Branch and the Canadian Association for Adult Education, both of which are located at the Provincial Archives of Ontario.

In the files that I examined I concentrated on those documents that pertained to initiatives which involved the Nationalities Branch or the Citizenship Branch working with provincial departments of education, school boards, or educators, either directly or through an intermediary. I also scrutinized all documentation on the development of the Citizenship Act (1947) and the Multiculturalism Policy (1971) paying particular
attention to those aspects of the discussion concerned with education. As well, I was interested in any statements Citizenship Branch officials made on cultural diversity policy and programs, especially those with specific reference to the Branch's work in education.

I found that the Nationalities Branch and the Citizenship Branch considered part of their work to be public education. This term was used to designate activities that included providing information about federal programs and policies to ethnic newspapers and producing and distributing information about the naturalization process. In addition, the Branches engaged in a variety of activities that were grouped together under the heading "citizenship education". At various times this category included providing resources for second language education for adult immigrants, development and distribution of materials to assist in instruction for naturalization, development and distribution of materials about human rights and intergroup relations, leadership training programs, seminars on intergroup relations, and travel and exchange programs for youth. Because of my interests in the formal education system and the federal-provincial aspect of cultural diversity and education, I limited my focus to those activities that concerned education for or about immigrants and non-British, non-French ethnic groups and that involved or influenced the work of departments of education, school boards, schools, or teachers within the formal education system. Much of the study focusses on English Canada because this
was where the federal government concentrated its efforts in cultural diversity and education. Specific initiatives did emerge to address cultural diversity and education in francophone contexts but often these were extensions of existing initiatives developed with agencies and organizations in the anglophone sector.

**Definition of Terms**

There are four key terms I have used throughout this dissertation: policy, education, cultural diversity, and integration. Each of these terms has many possible definitions and several synonyms. Moreover, each of these words carries with it a certain "baggage", that is to say a healthy set of value-laden connotations. I have, in part, chosen to use the words because rather than in spite of their connotations.

Brian W. Hogwood and Lewis A. Gunn (1984) have identified no less than ten different uses of the term "policy" (Hogwood and Gunn pp.13-19). Of their ten definitions the one which best expresses the way I use the term throughout my discussion is the notion of "policy as a label for a field of activity" (Hogwood and Gunn p.13). This definition is most relevant to my project because of the ad hoc and hidden nature of the development of the cultural diversity and education policy. As I will discuss later in this work, initially, education was to have been no more than a strategy to implement cultural diversity policy. A cultural diversity and education policy, with objectives distinct from the
cultural diversity policy, grew out of a series of initiatives. In order to articulate and understand the cultural diversity and education policy it is therefore necessary to study the activities that were carried out in that field.

I use the word "policy" rather than "program" precisely because the work in cultural diversity and education did have distinct objectives. Policy is generally seen as a "purposive course of action" (Hogwood and Gunn p.22) and "an authoritative determination, by a governing authority, of a society's intents and priorities" (Downey 1988, 10). In other words, policy constitutes an expression of what the state and the society value and, even when the policy develops in an ad hoc manner, it has a definite purpose and reflects what is valued. These are important points to keep in mind throughout this discussion.

My definition of education comes from Ernest Hodgson's 1988 monograph Federal Involvement in Public Education. He notes that education includes activities through which one or more of the following activities are accomplished:

1. Existing knowledge is transmitted from one person to another.
2. New knowledge is developed, or existing knowledge is reorganized to show new facts, relationships, or hypotheses.
3. Skills are taught.
4. Attitudes are developed.
5. Habits are established. (Hodgson p.27).

This definition seems particularly appropriate because Hodgson was also examining federal involvement in education and found that the initiatives of federal departments and agencies may support activities in any or all of the categories enumerated
above. Although I use this broad definition for education, because of the limitations of my study I have not done an exhaustive review of all cultural diversity and education initiatives. Specifically, I have excluded programs at the post-secondary level, public education initiatives, and research activities other than those that had some direct influence on the work of provincial departments of education, schools, school boards, or teachers.

Hodgson and others who have studied federal involvement in education (e.g. Hargraves 1981, Stevenson 1981) have noted that one of the strategies federal agencies have used to hide their work in education is to call it by another name. Most often federal initiatives have been called "training", "instruction", or "communication". In so doing, they have maintained the illusion that the federal government is not involved in education and have effectively blocked the participation of legitimate extra-governmental groups in the policy process (Hargraves p.23). Federal government agencies like the Citizenship Branch have been engaged in the development of educational policies. Using the term "education" helps draw attention to this fact.

In early versions of my research proposal I spoke of investigating federal multicultural education policies because the policy and programs I wished to uncover were concerned with some of the same issues as current multicultural education policies. After careful consideration I discarded the term "multicultural" in favour of "cultural diversity" primarily
because part of my interest lay in determining what work was being done in the area before the official Multiculturalism Policy came into being. I felt that using the term "multicultural" to designate programs and policies that preceded the Multiculturalism Policy might lead to some confusion. This being said, I use the term "cultural diversity" in much the same way I would use "multiculturalism" in other contexts. Cultural diversity policy includes all programs and initiatives designed to address the "problems" associated with immigrants, non-French, non-British ethnics, and people of colour, namely, assimilation, cultural retention, and intergroup relations.

One of the specific objectives of the cultural diversity policy from the 1950s onward has been immigrant integration. In Chapters 6 and 8 I examine in some depth the meaning of this objective and its implications for cultural diversity and education policy. At this point I would simply state that in the lexicon of the Citizenship Branch of the 1950s, "integration" meant gradual, voluntary assimilation. I realize that the term "integration" has, in recent years, been used more as an antonym rather than a synonym for "assimilation". As I will discuss later in this dissertation, although the meaning of the term changed, the programs designed to implement this objective did not. In other words, programs that in the 1940s and 1950s were designed to promote assimilation were still in place in the 1960s. The only difference was that officials were now claiming that these programs would promote incorporation of immigrants into Canadian
society without loss of their ethnocultural identity.

Throughout the time period that I am studying, immigrant integration was a major focus of cultural diversity and education policy. I believe that assimilation was the actual goal of the integration programs from 1940 to at least 1971. Therefore, when I use the term "integration" to refer to federal policy or programs I mean it to be synonymous with "assimilation".

Background to the Study

Prior to 1940, the federal government did not have a policy or programs devoted to cultural diversity. The interest that it had in this area was channelled through its work in immigration. Canadian policy on immigration and immigrants in the early part of our history was primarily the result of three major influences: Social Darwinism, Protestantism, and imperialism (Palmer 1982). The vision of Canada that predominated was that of a white, British, Protestant Christian country. At the turn of the century, economic considerations, the need to settle the West, and a lack of immigrants from Britain and the United States willing to settle the West forced Canadian officials to go outside of these preferred source countries to attract immigrants. This meant that many of the immigrants coming to the country from 1900 to 1939 did not conform to the picture of the perfect Canadian. As a result, "old stock" Canadians embarked on a project of "...turning them into us as closely, quickly and cheaply as possible." (Troper 1979, 10). The legacy of this
project and perspective remains with us today in policy and practice and came to us in part through the federal cultural diversity and education policy.

Attitudes and Ideology

During the period from 1900-1939, much of the national consciousness of English Canadians was built of the foundation of loyalty to the Empire. Canada at that time saw herself as the North American outpost of Britain. "The vision affixed Canada to an imperial destiny, and to an empire of which Canada was not simply a part but a defender and would-be-heir." (Troper p.10). This image of Canada was reinforced by voluntary organizations like the Empire Club and the Imperial Order of Daughters of the Empire; Protestant churches which saw part of their mission as creating a population that shared a heritage of political democracy and Protestant Christianity (Palmer 1982, 42); and by a school curriculum that focussed on "...patriotism, the power and responsibility of the British empire, and its contributions to civilization." (Burnet and Palmer 1989, 109). The dominant attitude towards immigrants was angloconformity (Palmer 1975, Troper 1979). Immigrants from Europe were expected to assimilate into the Anglo-Canadian culture. Potential immigrants were assessed on the basis of perceived assimilability and programs were established to ensure all European immigrants became "good Canadians" as soon as possible.

Palmer (1975, 1982) has argued that there was a softening of
attitudes towards European immigrants, particularly in the West, in the period immediately following the First World War. The economic prosperity of the time and the fact that many people in leadership positions had gone to school with the children of immigrants led to increased tolerance. Influential people like J.S. Woodsworth began to question the assumptions of angloconformity and advocate a new vision of Canada. "The patriotic organizations must not attempt to make of the immigrants Canadians after our own pattern, but rather to mediate between the old life and the new and to express emerging Canadian ideals." (Woodsworth in Palmer 1975, 125). This new vision was similar to the melting pot ideal that was to gain acceptance in the United States. A vision of a Canada where all "races" would blend together to form a new and vibrant country. Immigrants would still have to assimilate but now they would be assimilating to a blended Canada, not an Anglo-Canada.

Closely related to the idea of the melting pot was the early version of the mosaic. The business sector had an interest in immigration from the late 1800s. More settlers meant more customers for everyone, but certain businesses had a higher stake in the area than others. Such was the case with the railways which gained not only from the increased passengers but also because they were able to sell the lands they held in the West to the new settlers. In 1925, the federal government entered into the Railway Agreement which gave the CPR and the CNR a leading role in promoting immigration (Burnet and Palmer p.34). The
railways thus developed mechanisms for recruiting and settling immigrants. The settlement programmes included helping to establish and support local colonization boards. These boards, many of which were ethnically-based, put the companies in touch with prospective immigrants and helped to settle the immigrants when they arrived in Canada (Palmer 1982, 94-95). In addition to its efforts in the area of immigrant settlement, the CPR was also active in promoting tourism. In 1926, the company hired John Murray Gibbon to work in tourism promotion. In order to accomplish his task, Gibbon organized ethnic festivals across the West (Pizanias 1992). His idea proved to be successful and the CPR, and probably other companies, found that there was money to be made by supporting ethnic diversity. This was the genesis of the notion of the Canadian mosaic.

The term "mosaic" had actually been introduced into the Canadian vocabulary by Victoria Hayward who used it in her 1922 book *Romantic Canada* as a descriptor for church architecture on the Prairies (Porter 1987, 148). Gibbon, who used *The Canadian Mosaic* as the title of his book published in 1938, is credited with giving it currency (Pizanias, Porter). The mosaic of the 1930s was not seen as an end point but a stage in the development of a truly Canadian identity. As Watson Kirkconnell, a contemporary of Gibbon, expressed it:

*Human beings cannot be profitably run through a swift assimilation-machine, like blanks through a coining-press, without losing much of their spiritual and cultural value. The experience by which in the course of some generations these varied new communities may grow organically into a*
single but multiform Canadian tradition will be rendered less painful and less hazardous if we of the older Canadian communities can view their present [cultural] activities with sympathy and understanding. (Kirkconnell 1941b, 129-130).

In other words, the long term vision of Canada was that of the melting pot with the mosaic representing an interim stage. At that juncture, the idea of a blended Canada did not take hold under either label as the economy deteriorated and the Depression intensified hostility towards those who were perceived as foreigners. During this period immigration was almost entirely stopped, and many immigrants who found themselves on relief rolls during the 1930s were deported (Palmer 1982).

Attitudes among French Canadians during the 1900-1939 period were somewhat different than those of their English counterparts. French Canadians were generally opposed to the federal government's immigration policy not because they felt the European immigrants would not become assimilated, but because they feared they would. The vast majority of the "foreigners" who came to the country learned to speak English and adapted to Anglo-Canadian society. This led French Canadians to see the immigration policy as a tool the Anglo-Canadians were using to increase the size of their population and therefore their ability to dominate French Canadians (Behiels 1991, Corbett 1957). As a minority themselves, French Canadians were concerned with protecting their own cultural identity. They did not actively try to assimilate newcomers to their culture in Quebec because both nationalist and Church leaders were afraid of the potential
contaminating influence of the foreign ideologies (Behiels p.7). In other parts of the country, their numbers were small and they were fighting to hold on to limited cultural and language rights. They were opposed to the melting pot idea because it would mean a loss of identity for them (Palmer 1975, 113).

The result of these attitudes was considerable hostility towards immigrants all across the country. As Palmer has stated, "[a]nti-Slavic, anti-Semitic, and anti-Oriental attitudes were common currency among many English and French Canadians, both Protestant and Catholic, during much of the period prior to the Second World War." (Palmer 1982, 9). This hostility translated into policies and programmes of exclusion, segregation, and assimilation.

Immigration Policy

One of the most important individuals in the field of immigration in the early part of this century was Clifford Sifton. Sifton was Minister of the Interior from 1896 to 1905, among his responsibilities were the areas of immigration and settlement. He implemented an aggressive policy of attracting farmers from the United States and Europe and, in doing so, opened the way for immigrants from central and eastern Europe. Many, including the man who was to be his successor as Minister of the Interior, Frank Oliver, believed Sifton was "... destroying the national fabric by his encouragement of 'Galicians' and discouragement of British labourers." (Hall 1977,
76-77) but Sifton firmly believed that different "races" had different characteristics and that the "Galicians" were well suited to the life of prairie settlers. When Sifton resigned in 1905, Oliver immediately went to work tightening immigration regulations.

If Sifton introduced the notion of Social Darwinism to immigration policy, Oliver showed how it could be used to exclude "undesirables". Oliver introduced two immigration acts, in 1906 and 1910, respectively. Both acts increased the ability of immigration officials to select or reject immigrants on the basis of origin but it was the 1910 Immigration Act that actually laid the foundation for what Freda Hawkins has called "the White Canada policy" (Hawkins 1989, 16). This act contained a clause which allowed that the governor-in-council might:

Prohibit for a stated period, or permanently, the landing in Canada, or the landing at any specified port of entry in Canada, of immigrants belonging to any race deemed unsuited to the climate or requirements of Canada, or of immigrants of any specified class, occupation, or character. (in Hawkins p.17)

There was general consensus among politicians and citizens about the kind of country they wanted and the type of immigrants that were best suited to that image (Palmer 1982, 23). Consequently, an unofficial but commonly agreed upon "ethnic pecking order" was established with the British and White Americans at the top followed by northern and western Europeans, central and eastern Europeans, southern Europeans, and, at the bottom of the list, Asians and Blacks. It was within this frame of reference that the
above policy statement was interpreted.

Nationalism and nativism both increased as a result of conditions surrounding the First World War. The impact of these harsher attitudes was felt in amendments to the Immigration Act passed in 1919. The prohibition clause cited above was expanded and made more explicit. It now read:

Prohibit or limit in number for a stated period or permanently the landing in Canada, of immigrants belonging to any nationality or race of immigrants of any specified class or occupation, by reason of any economic industrial or other condition temporarily existing in Canada or because such immigrants are deemed unsuitable having regard to the climatic, industrial, social, educational, labour or other conditions or requirements of Canada or because such immigrants are deemed undesirable owing to their peculiar customs, habits, modes of life and methods of holding property and because of their probable inability to become readily assimilated or to assume the duties and responsibilities of Canadian citizenship within a reasonable time after their entry. (in Hawkins p.17).

Perceived assimilability was now explicitly written into law as a criterion of admission. In addition, specific legislation had been enacted over the years to limit or exclude immigrants of origins in China, Japan, and India. This immigration policy remained virtually unchanged until 1962.

Immigration policy, then, was tied to concerns of nation building. In the first few years of the century, this translated into a need to attract immigrants from non-preferred countries. As time went on, the nation building imperative came to include an understanding within the policy that certain groups of people were unsuitable as potential citizens. This understanding was
made more explicit by regulations like the Chinese Head Tax, the Gentlemen's Agreements with Japan, the Continuous Journey Rule, the Chinese Exclusion Act, and the amendments to the Immigration Act in 1919. Clearly this nation was meant to be built by people who were white, British Protestants or who could be turned into close approximations of that ideal.

Assimilation and the Churches

Although immigration regulations grew progressively more restrictive, this could only control the influx of unwanted newcomers. It did nothing to address the problem of the "foreigners" who were already in the country. Tighter naturalization laws were seen as a partial answer in that they helped to postpone the impact of the immigrant on Canadian society (Palmer 1982, 45). The real problem then was how to prepare the immigrants to take on the responsibilities of Canadian citizens and how to ensure that they would not subvert the society as they took their place in it. The answer was assimilation. Among the main agencies to which the duty of assimilating immigrants was given were Protestant churches.

Across English Canada, one of the goals of Protestant churches was to create a Christian nation. Their vision of this nation was that it would be "...based on British ideals of government and Protestantism." (Palmer 1982, 38). Thus, although they were already Christians, central and eastern Europeans were targets of the missionary efforts because of the "Canadianization" component
of their work. The fact that many of these groups had arrived without religious leaders left them vulnerable to the missionaries. Proselytizing efforts were also carried out among Jewish, Chinese, and Japanese immigrants but these efforts were not very successful (Burnet and Palmer). In part this may be explained by the fact that the churches themselves "...were torn between a desire to extend the hand of fellowship to groups such as Jews and Asians and the disquieting sense that there was something lacking in the non-Christian minorities." (Palmer 1982, 176).

The three denominations that were most active in this area - the Presbyterians, Methodists, and Baptists - found themselves in competition for souls. As a result of this competition, probably coupled with a genuine humanitarian impulse, Protestant missionary societies often started what today would be called immigrant settlement programs. They taught English, offered social services, and became leading spokespeople on issues affecting immigrants. They also became concerned with promoting tolerance for newcomers (Burnet and Palmer) but their efforts often reinforced negative stereotypes which encouraged prejudice rather than tolerance (Palmer 1982).

Protestant church groups continued their work into the 1920s but they became less active as other issues, such as the union of the Presbyterians and Methodists and losing members to political and economic reform movements, took precedence.

The work of women's groups in the area of immigration and
settlement was closely related to the work of the churches (Palmer 1982). Some of these groups, like the YWCA and the Women's Christian Temperance Union had definite religious bases and others, like the Imperial Order of Daughters of the Empire and the National Council of Women, had clearer connections to the Empire. Many were also involved in the struggle for women's rights. Their motivation to work with immigrants has been described as "...a combination of humanitarianism and fear." (Palmer 1982, 80). While they were concerned with improving social conditions for immigrant women and their families, they were also arguing that they needed to have the vote to offset the detrimental effect that immigrants were having on the society (Palmer 1982, 39). Women's groups continued to be involved in this area through the 1930s. John Murray Gibbon, in his book The Canadian Mosaic (1938) discussed the work of the IODE (Porter p.149) and Palmer (1982) reported that the Calgary Council of Women was one of the groups that lobbied the Alberta government in 1937 for the right of Chinese Canadians to receive relief.

Unlike the Protestant churches, in the early part of the century established Roman Catholic groups in Canada seemed to want to distance themselves from newcomers. As a result, rather than being assimilated to Anglo or French Canadian Catholic traditions, ethnic communities of this faith established ethnically-based churches (Burnet and Palmer, Behiels). This did not mean, however, that the Catholic Church was unconcerned about the issue, simply that it did not wish to be contaminated by
foreign influences.

The Protestant churches were involved in a holy mission. N.K. Clifford has described the essence of this mission in the following terms:

The inner dynamic of Protestantism in Canada during the first two thirds of the century following Confederation was provided by a vision of the nation as 'His Dominion.' This Canadian version of the Kingdom of God had significant nationalistic and millennial overtones, and sufficient symbolic power to provide the basis of a broad consensus and coalition. Not only the major Protestant denominations but also a host of Protestant-oriented organizations ... utilized this vision as a framework for defining those elements which posed a threat to the realization of their purposes. ... Amongst the threats to this vision was the massive immigration to Canada, between 1800 and World War II, of people who did not share it... (in Palmer, 1982: 41).

Canadian Protestantism and the connection to British ideals were intertwined, but the churches were also concerned with service to humanity. The combination of the two purposes led them to provide valuable social assistance to the newcomers they served and establish a tradition of work in the area of immigrant settlement that continues among some denominations today.

Assimilation and the Schools

In the late 1800s, Egerton Ryerson had proclaimed that public schooling was an "instrument of patriotic progress for the collective Canadian consciousness." (McLeod 1975, 20).

Consequently, as immigration from non-traditional source countries increased, schools became the primary vehicle of assimilation. They were seen as the "...most effective agency to
'Canadianize' the youth of the country" (McDonald 1982, 122) because their sphere of influence included the students and their families. As Frederic Haultain, Commissioner of Education in the Northwest Territories from 1901 to 1905, once stated: "The function and mission of schools was to mould and assimilate all families making the prairies their home." (in McDonald p.125). Thus assimilation and the inculcation of Canadian nationalism became the primary task of the school systems across English Canada.

Despite the emphasis on assimilation some schools in English Canada, particularly in the Prairies, did allow the teaching of ancestral languages. In Manitoba, for example, a provision for bilingual schools existed from 1896 to 1916. It was enacted as an accommodation to the French Canadians but was worded in such a way that other groups could also avail themselves of the opportunity. This foray into multilingual education should not be seen as an indication that the dominant group had given up on its project of angloconformity. As W.L. Morton has explained:

The French of course insisted on their right to instruction in the mother tongue; the Germans, both the Old Colony Mennonites and the newcomers did so too; the Poles and Ukrainians soon learned, from the politicians not least, to do the same. The result was to demonstrate that... the bi­lingual system of 1897 was unworkable. (Morton 1982, 114).

Thus, while the system may have had to make temporary accommodations to ethnic groups, the ultimate result was to convince members of the Anglo-Canadian majority of the necessity of the conformity project.
The feelings of nationalism engendered by the First World War led to an increased emphasis on Canadianization. The bilingual provision was removed from the Manitoba statutes in 1916 and provisions to teach ancestral languages were removed from legislation in Saskatchewan in 1919. By 1921, fifteen percent of the population of Alberta and eighteen percent of the population in Manitoba and Saskatchewan were newcomers from central and eastern Europe. "There were fears that illiterate immigrants would lower the cultural level of the whole country and undermine British governmental institutions" (Burnet and Palmer p.112). It was in this climate that J.T.M. Anderson, then Inspector of Schools in Yorkton, Saskatchewan, wrote his famous book The Education of the New-Canadian, subtitled, "A Treatise on Canada's Greatest Educational Problem". Anderson, who later became Minister of Education and Premier of Saskatchewan, emphasized the urgent need to assimilate newcomers to the Anglo-Canadian culture. Failure to do so was the greatest threat to national unity and any group that resisted assimilation was to be viewed with fear and suspicion. He supported the work already underway with immigrant children, which he saw as the "...paramount factor in racial fusion" (Anderson 1918, 89), but he also advocated an active campaign of adult education. In this campaign he needed to enlist the support of all Anglo-Canadians and so encouraged people, for the good of the nation, to overcome their prejudices about socializing with newcomers.

Just as the instinct of fear in the child may be modified and removed by education, so, in the case
of the illiterate and superstitious among the immigrants to Canada, education in the wider sense will tend to remove these retarding influences. By encouraging them and affording them opportunities for intermingling with the more enlightened of the newcomers, and also with Anglo-Saxon citizens, they will eventually see that life in Canada means something wider and richer than ever could be possible under that despotic control with which so many were familiar in youth. (Anderson pp.212-213)

And so Anderson helped to establish the principle that members of the dominant society had a vital role to play in the assimilation process. They needed to accept immigrants into their communities and social circles so that, in time, the immigrants would be uplifted and enlightened.

Anderson’s accent on the need to accept newcomers was in some ways a foreshadowing of developments in the 1930s. Educators became involved in conducting "...studies and surveys to substantiate the type of schooling that was the result of the sociopolitical decision to create an Anglo-Canadian society" (McLeod p.25). Their research led them to an increased understanding of the process of assimilation and so they began to emphasize that true assimilation would only be achieved through tolerance (Palmer 1982, 140).

From 1900 to 1939, in British Columbia and the Maritimes, many of the major concerns in the domain of immigrant education focussed on issues of segregation rather than assimilation and accommodation. Asians and Blacks had not only been deemed unassimilable but also potentially dangerous (Palmer 1982). Although attempts to segregate Chinese children in British Columbia were met with resistance by the Chinese community,
segregated classes were a sporadic feature of the province's school system from the beginning of the century until the Second World War (Burnet and Palmer, Walker 1989). Segregation of Black school children was more easily accomplished. It was enshrined in law in Nova Scotia and Ontario and in practice in New Brunswick and Alberta for most of the period between Confederation and the Second World War (Walker).

The educational scene in Quebec throughout this period was very different from that in English Canada. Like many other provinces, Quebec had a publicly funded dual confessional system - Catholic and Protestant but the situation in Quebec was very unlike other provinces. The Catholic system had both French and English streams while the Protestant system had only an English stream. The majority of immigrants coming to Quebec at this time were Jewish or Italian.

The Jews, who had been attending Protestant schools from the beginning, were officially declared Protestants for the purposes of education in 1903. However, "[i]n reality, Jewish parents and children received none of the same rights and privileges" (Behiels p.8). This led some members of the Jewish community to lobby for a separate Jewish school system. In 1930, a bill was passed to establish a Jewish School Commission in Montreal but protests from the Protestant, Catholics, and French Canadian nationalists resulted in a second bill being passed one year later to do away with the Jewish School Commission.

The Italians, meanwhile, had entered the Catholic system.
Given the Catholic Church's proclivity to stay apart from immigrants, it is not surprising that by 1915, there were two schools in Montreal that taught in French, English, and Italian. The Catholic system also went on to provide separate facilities for Poles, Ukrainians, Lithuanians, Syrians, and Chinese (Burnet and Palmer p.110). This practice changed in the 1930s when a combination of factors, including increased ethnic conflict and financial limitations on the Church, led the Catholic Board to end its support for separate schools (Behiels).

Schools were the major weapon in the assimilationist arsenal. In English Canada, they were used to assimilate those who were assimilable and segregate those who were not. In Quebec, they were initially used to keep groups segregated so that the foreigners would not contaminate the French Canadian community. This trend started to change in the 1930s. In the post-war era, French Canadians began their own assimilation campaign (Behiels) and English Canadians, despite some change in official rhetoric, continued theirs (McLeod).

Effects on Immigrants

As we have seen, in the early 20th century, when relatively large numbers of immigrants began to arrive from non-traditional source countries, controversy arose because many felt that the newcomers would not fit into Canadian society. In the debate that developed through speeches by prominent individuals, articles and editorials in newspapers, and public posturing by politicians,
members of the mainstream found themselves in one of two groups: those who were openly hostile to the newcomers and advocated ending immigration from those parts of the world and those who championed the cause of tolerance and argued that it was necessary was to help immigrants assimilate as quickly as possible. Throughout this debate, the focus was always on the immigrants as the problem. There was never any recognition of the fact that attitudes and institutions the immigrants were encountering might require modification.

Although all non-British, non-white American immigrants suffered as a result of the attitudes, the situation was undoubtably worst for immigrants who were considered unassimilable. For Blacks and Asians, angloconformity meant, at best, being kept segregated from the rest of Canadian society and at worst, being subject to harassment and violence (Palmer 1982, Walker). These attitudes also found their expression in official policies. As I have already noted, policies were introduced to limit or eliminate immigration by members of these groups. In addition, those who were in the country were denied the vote, and a variety of policies were established to enforce physical separation of the "races" (Walker).

All of this hostility was one of the factors that gave rise to ethnically-based organizations. Ethnic organizations began to develop in almost all communities shortly after their arrival in Canada. Many European groups first came together under the leadership of their churches to provide support for others in
their community (Burnet and Palmer pp.186-190). The range of activities in which these groups were involved is unclear, but we do know that some of them lobbied provincial departments of education in the early 1900s for the right to have their children educated in their ancestral language (Anderson p.32). In Quebec, the establishment of ethnic groups was facilitated by the general practice of segregation and particularly the Roman Catholic practice of encouraging "national" parishes.

Groups of Asian origins had started to organize in the late 1800s and early 1900s. Some have suggested that these organizations were primarily concerned with issues in their countries of origin (Burnet and Palmer p.188), but there is sufficient evidence to suggest that they were also very concerned with issues in Canada. The Chinese Benevolent Association, "which emerged originally as a protective organization in the face of prejudice and discrimination" (Norris 1971, 215), was founded in 1884. The Canadian Japanese Association came into being in 1897 for the purpose of assisting immigrants of Japanese origin and "endeavoured generally to combat discrimination" (Norris p.222). The Khalsa Diwan Society, established in the Indo-Canadian community in 1907, was involved in political lobbying aimed at the Canadian government almost from its inception (Johnston 1984, 7-8).

Hostility from the mainstream was one of the primary reasons ethnic organizations began to develop. Once groups were established, they were able to assist others from their countries
of origin to come to and settle in Canada. They were also able to organize cultural activities, protests, and lobbies. In other words, they set the stage for the activities of future ethnic organizations.

The Legacy

I have already commented on the fact that the attitudes of the first forty years of this century resulted in a variety of institutional and institutionalized activities that continue in a similar form today. Mainstream immigrant settlement agencies, both denominational and secular, continue to work with newcomers, providing many of the same kinds of services as their predecessors. Schools continue to work with immigrant children and "...the fact of the matter is that in classroom after classroom...immigrant children and children whose mother tongue is not English or French are being subjected at this very moment to continued programs of Canadianization based on the concept of and belief in assimilation" (McLeod p.29). Ethnic organizations continue to be involved in the same kinds of activities as they have since their inception. The programs and policies of the federal government in the area of cultural diversity and education also grew out of the history I have just described. The attitudes towards and activities in the area of cultural diversity in the first forty years of the twentieth century influenced the thinking of federal officials as they became interested in the area.
Perhaps the most influential and lasting legacy from this period is a way of conceiving of ethnicity and integration. Today we do not talk about assimilating immigrants; we integrate them. There are strong reasons to believe that our current concept of integration is not much different than the 1930s concept of assimilation through tolerance. Assimilation through tolerance meant understanding that ethnic groups, particularly in the first generation, needed to maintain a sense of connection to their cultural traditions. Past the first generation ties to one's ancestral culture were seen to be irrelevant and undesirable. Ethnicity thus became something that could and should be shed as quickly as possible. In the 1940s, people working in the area of immigrant settlement came to use the term "integration" to describe this process. The term became part of the federal vocabulary in the 1950s. As I have noted above, federal officials used it to mean gradual voluntary assimilation. Programs and projects were developed to meet the goal of integration. Although the official definition of integration changed on paper in the 1960s the programs remained much as they had been. Part of what I will explore in this dissertation is the relationship between the federal government's goal of integration and the cultural diversity and education policy.
Notes

1. Prominent members of the Canadian Association for Adult Education were among the founders of the Council. The Association maintained membership in the Council until the latter was disbanded in 1969. During and after the War the Council was involved in the Association's flagship program, Citizens' Forum, a radio series that will be discussed in Chapter 6. Finally, John Kidd, who was executive director of the Council from 1948 to 1960 was the brother of Roby Kidd who was associate director of the Association from 1947 to 1950 and director of the Association from 1950 to 1961.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

While existing studies yield little information on the federal government's role in cultural diversity and education, there are at least three bodies of literature that provide a backdrop to my research. The first of these examines federal government involvement in education, the second, conceptions of multiculturalism and multiculturalism in education and the third, the implementation of multiculturalism policy and programs.

Federal Government Involvement in Education

Although the British North America Act specified education to be an area of provincial jurisdiction, the federal government has always retained some responsibilities in the field. In a memo written in 1952 an official of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration outlined this role. From the outset, for example, education of Status Indians and children on military bases has been considered federal territory. By 1913, the federal government began to make other incursions into the area of education in the guise of "vocational training" initiatives. Federal participation in the area was justified on the grounds that the federal government had responsibility for ensuring both an adequate supply of skilled workers and equality of educational opportunity for all Canadians. In addition, federal authorities argued that vocational training was an expensive undertaking and
that the provinces did not have adequate resources to develop programs on their own. Based on these justifications three separate federal-provincial programs in vocational training were launched between 1913 and 1939.

In 1937, Prime Minister Mackenzie King struck the Rowell-Sirois Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations. The event heralded a new era for federal involvement in education. The Report of the Commission, issued in 1940, "argued against the hard and fast splitting off of federal versus provincial jurisdictions in favour of planned cooperation in areas of mutual interest" (Government of Canada in Stevenson p.3). In reference to education, the Commission noted that "the concept of education had expanded and changed to include new dimensions unanticipated in 1867" (Secretary of State in Hargraves p.23). Further justification for federal involvement in education came in 1951 from the Report of the Massey Commission on the National Development in the Art, Letters, and Sciences. As John Grant has pointed out, the Report of the Massey Commission "drew a strong connection between culture and education and advocated that 'federal grants must strengthen Canadian universities in order to strengthen their role in the life of the nation.'" (Grant p.16). Not surprisingly, then, by 1962, fifteen percent of the total amount of money spent in Canada on education came from the federal government. In 1967 some forty different federal departments and agencies were involved in education. By 1981 this figure had risen to seventy-one federal agencies (Stevenson
Recent scholarship has pointed to the diversity of federal programs and initiatives in education. Ernest Hodgson, for example, has noted that federal intervention can range from general and indirect to specific and direct. He has also said that "Ottawa offers service, influence, financial assistance, and degrees of control; it does this through programs affecting provinces and territories, school boards, industry, voluntary groups and organizations, and finally, individuals." (Hodgson p.46). Hugh Stevenson (1981) has commented that, despite this variety in programming, there are some common features that characterize federal involvement in education. He has isolated five commonalities. First, there is always an arguable legal basis associated with protecting national interest. Second, the involvement is always financially beneficial to the provinces. Third, the interventions have often been sanctioned because of a national crisis. Fourth, since the 1950s the government has frequently referred to its role in developing cultural and national identity as a way of justifying work in education. Finally, much of the involvement has come in the areas of higher education and adult education which have come to be seen as less "sacred" than the education of children.

As I stated earlier, both Hugh Stevenson and Susan Hargraves have commented on the fact that federal participation in education is often masked by creative use of terminology. Hargraves has contended that this hidden quality of federal
policy initiatives in education results in a policy process that is "neither accessible nor accountable to legitimate interest groups." (Hargraves p.23). The hidden nature of federal interventions has also allowed for the perpetuation of the myth of federal non-involvement in education. Thus the considerable federal influence on educational policy in Canada continues to be largely unexplored.

Multiculturalism and Multicultural Education

Elsewhere I have argued that multiculturalism is the most recent in a series of Canadian policies that have been designed to respond to cultural diversity (Joshee, in press). In the first part of its history, from 1940 to the early 1960s, the policy was closely linked to citizenship, which during the War meant patriotism. After the War, until the early 1950s, it was used as a synonym for naturalization, and through the 1950s it became associated with citizen participation. In the early 1960s the cultural diversity policy began to shift and become more closely aligned with a complex of policies meant to address national unity and national identity. Since the early 1980s human rights and social justice have been the focal point of the policy. Successive policies and programs have not replaced the existing ones. Instead they have been added to them. As a result, the current policy is part of three larger policy fields - citizenship, identity, and social justice. Having studied the writings of many prominent Canadian scholars, I have come to the
conclusion that most researchers approach the study of multiculturalism from the perspective of one of these three policy fields. The three resulting paradigms have yielded different definitions for multiculturalism and related concepts, as well as different approaches to the study of the policy.

The Citizenship Paradigm

The citizenship paradigm flourished in the first twenty years of the cultural diversity policy. The primary policy objective was immigrant assimilation. The term "ethnic" was synonymous with "immigrant" and "race" referred to different European groups, so the minority groups of the day were European immigrant groups. "Race" relations referred to relations between "old stock" and "new stock" Canadians or to relations between French and Anglo-Canadians. Cultural pluralism was basically a temporary phenomenon which would be replaced after "some generations" by a single Canadian tradition influenced by the many European cultures that had been brought to Canada.

There was not a great deal of academic research on ethnic diversity during this period but what was undertaken was closely tied to policy considerations (Palmer and Troper 1973). It is, therefore, not surprising to find that much of the scholarship was also shaped by this perspective. In his presentation on the research in the area in 1953, Jean-C. Falardeau noted that there were three main areas in which research was being conducted: individual ethnic groups, integration of newcomers, and
intergroup relations (Falardeau 1953). He also commented that "[s]ystematic work on these problems in universities has been done chiefly in departments of Sociology and Psychology and has centred on the behaviour of minority groups and the 'acculturation' of immigrants" (Falardeau p.99). The work that was done on intergroup relations focussed mainly on English-French relations.

One of the few scholars today whose work is influenced largely by the citizenship paradigm is Freda Hawkins. She has equated the concept of multiculturalism with the public policy which she has stated was never intended to make "...any dramatic change, indeed any change at all, in the political structure on behalf of the ethnic communities." (Hawkins 1988 p.17). She has contended that the main focus of the multiculturalism policy is immigrant integration and the administration of the policy should be reconnected to immigration. In the final analysis, she has argued that multiculturalism is a temporary phenomenon.

[Un]ity does not grow automatically out of diversity, so governments have to work at it, and this is what Canada has tried to do since World War II. I will argue that multiculturalism is an important stage in that journey, but it constitutes neither the beginning nor the end of it. (Hawkins 1988, 14).

So while she has spoken of multiculturalism as including "cultural freedom, social justice, and equality of opportunity" (Hawkins 1989, 214), from her perspective, the policy will eventually lead to the creation of a single blended Canadian identity.
The Identity Paradigm

The identity paradigm began to take hold in the 1960s with the movement for official recognition of multiethnic nature of the country. One of the first proponents of this position was Senator Paul Yuzyk. Yuzyk set forth his vision of Canada and multiculturalism in a paper he presented in 1965 titled "Canada: A Multi-Cultural Nation". His definition of the concept was as follows:

The third element ethnic groups now numbering approximately five million persons, are co-builders of the West and other parts of Canada, along with the British and French Canadians and are just as permanent a part of the Canadian scene. ... As co-founders they should be co-partners who would be guaranteed the right to perpetuate their mother tongues and cultures. (Yuzyk in Porter p. 117)

Unlike the citizenship paradigm, within the identity paradigm multiculturalism is a permanent feature of the country. The end goal is not to meld all groups into one but to maintain distinct ethnic languages and cultures.

Discussing multiculturalism from this perspective in 1982, Evelyn Kallen noted that the term was used in three different ways: first, to refer to the multi-ethnic character of the population, second, to refer to the federal policy, and third, to refer to "the ideology of cultural pluralism underlying the federal policy" (Kallen 1982, 51). This ideology of cultural pluralism, she explained, "...is predicated on a national goal of one nation/many peoples/many culture" (Kallen 1982, 52). She went
on to enumerate the five assumptions underlying this vision: 1) that all ethnic groups are able and willing to maintain distinctiveness; 2) that all groups are willing to adopt a laissez-faire attitude toward other groups; 3) that there are low levels of prejudice and discrimination; 4) that there is equal distribution of power among all groups; and 5) that there is limited interaction among groups in order to restrict acculturation and assimilation (Kallen 1982, 52). In effect, this is one of the prescriptive definitions of cultural pluralism arising from the identity perspective. The vision focusses on ethnocultural groups which would develop and maintain separate identities in a society where no one group would dominate.

The other prescriptive definition is what could be called contained or limited pluralism. In this view the basic assumption is that "...English and French Canadians have had a great influence on Canadian society and cultural life...[and] they will continue to do so" (McLeod 1984, 31). Other cultural identities will develop within this existing framework. What distinguishes this view from the immigration perspective on cultural pluralism is the belief that ethnic identities will be a continuing feature of Canadian life rather than a stage in the development of a melting pot identity.

Cultural pluralism in the lexicon of the identity paradigm has been used as a term to describe what Kallen called the "multi-ethnic composition of the population" (Kallen 1982, 51). This has led some researchers to attempt to describe the kind of
pluralism that exists in Canada. Findlay (1975) identified two basic types of pluralism - institutional and ethnic. He contended that Canadian society was both institutionally pluralistic and multiethnic. Abu Laban and Mottershead (1981) developed a typology based on ideologies about ethnic and racial groups, institutional supports for pluralism, and communal social structure among ethnic and racial groups. From this they identified four types of pluralism that can exist in egalitarian societies - corporate, integrated, liberal, and nominal. They characterised Canadian pluralism as incorporated, that is, combining "...legal or governmental recognition of ethnic groups...and a relatively low (at best moderate) degree of ethnic institutional enclosure" (Abu Laban and Mottershead p.53). Driedger (1989) was concerned with other aspects of pluralism. In developing his conceptual model of Canadian society, he used two continua: conformity-pluralism and voluntary-involuntary. In doing so, he highlighted the fact that identification with one's racial or ethnic group is not simply a matter of choice. To date, there is no definitive agreement on the descriptive definition of cultural pluralism. For those who work within the identity paradigm, the key questions in multiculturalism must concern the state of pluralism today, the nature of the society desired by Canadians, and the differences between the two.

Within this paradigm, minority groups are ethnic groups. Ethnicity is defined as the identities created by groups as they adjust their ancestral culture and traditions to accommodate to
life in Canada (e.g. Troper 1979, 11). Ethnic groups by
definition then are groups that have been in Canada long enough
to have created a Canadian ethnic identity. They are not
immigrant groups.

Intergroup relations involve the British and/or French
Canadians and the "third element" groups. One of the main points
of contention is nature of the relationship between the dominant
groups and the "other ethnics". Some, like Burnet (1975) and
McLeod (1984), have contended that multiculturalism was never
meant to give other ethnic groups equality with the "charter"
groups. This vision has grown out of the belief that
multiculturalism was intended to be interpreted as "...voluntary
marginal differentiation among people who are equal participants
in the society" (Burnet p.212). Others, like Lupul (1982),
subscribe to the belief that:

...multiculturalism was a passport to equality of
treatment and place without regard to history or
size. All who had settled the West were founding
peoples - the French and 'English' no more no less
so than the rest. (Lupul 1982, 97)

The key question in terms of intergroup relations then is: are
British and French Canadians considered ethnic?

In sum, the identity paradigm has two variants. One
considers the goal of multiculturalism to be equality among all
groups. It views cultural pluralism, in the prescriptive sense as
the development of distinctive cultural identities within a
society where none dominates. The other believes in the goal of
equality among ethnic groups, but does not see British and French
Canadians as ethnic groups. The pluralism that this view foresees is a limited pluralism that would develop within a French or Anglo-Canadian sociopolitical framework. They share the understanding that ethnicity is a permanent feature of Canadian life and that cultural pluralism is a worthwhile goal.

The Social Justice Paradigm

Shifts in demographics in the 1970s, brought on in large part by changes to the immigration policy, resulted in an increasingly "racially" diverse population. The new immigrants, as well as people of colour who had been in the country for years, were subjected to hostility in the form of harassment and violence. The perceived "race crisis" triggered a new policy debate (Walker 1989). This led then Minister of State for Multiculturalism, Jim Fleming, to announce a new priority in the implementation of multiculturalism - race relations. With this announcement the social justice focus within multiculturalism came to the foreground.

Within the social justice paradigm multiculturalism has been seen as a reflection of the government's support of the goal of anti-racism (e.g. Stasiulis 1991) or the government's way of avoiding the issue of racism (e.g. Li 1988). Some have gone so far as to say that it is the government's way of continuing to legitimize racism (e.g. Bagley 1986). The common denominator in these interpretations is that multiculturalism is defined as a government policy that is ineffective as a means of addressing
racism. The crux of the problem appears to be a bad fit between multiculturalism as an identity policy and as a social justice policy. As Kogila Adam Moodley has noted:

Multiculturalism, the policy designed to appease the European ethnics from outside the charter groups, did not address the problems of racial discrimination of people who could never hope to blend into the mainstream as long as they were considered aliens regardless of their culture or behaviour. But in its eagerness to reconcile the liberal creed of equality of opportunity with a contradictory reality - the Canadian dilemma revisited - the blueprint confuses the solution with the problem. In our eagerness to recognize the salience of race as a marker of deprivation, in contrast to an apolitical multiculturalism, we have tended to go overboard by reifying "race". Hence the goal of curing racism through the recognition of multiracialism has in fact become part of the problem, rather than part of the solution. (Adam Moodley 1987, 400).

The notion of cultural pluralism is viewed with suspicion, because, like multiculturalism itself, it is seen as way of downplaying the issue of racial inequality. Those working within this paradigm often use the term "racial diversity" or "racial heterogeneity" rather than pluralism and the term is used strictly in a descriptive sense. The goal of multiculturalism is seen not as racial pluralism but nonracialism (Adam Moodley).

Closely associated with the implementation of the race relations initiative at the federal level has been the term "visible minority" signifying that the pertinent minority groups in this perspective are people of colour. Many scholars working in the area speak of racial and ethnic minorities. In one sense, this indicates a recognition that not all discrimination is based on skin colour, often accompanied by acknowledgement that
discrimination based on race is of a different, probably harsher, character than that based on ethnicity (e.g. Li). The term "racial and ethnic minorities" is also used by some to highlight the fact that minority groups are not only racially different from the dominant group, but also ethnically different. In this view, ethnic difference and the salience of ethnicity to a group's experience and aspirations are seen as important factors in trying to understand the status of the group in Canadian society (e.g. Ujimoto 1989).

The concept of race relations is central to this paradigm. At issue is the relationship between the dominant white majority and the subordinate non-white minorities. To fully understand the nature of this relationship, one must consider structural and systemic causes of inequality in addition to the current relationship as it is played out between individuals. Failure to recognize the systemic roots of racism leads to a perception that minority groups are creating "the problem" rather than "...meeting a long-established dynamic from the past" (Walker 1989 p.13). It also leads to the conclusion that racism is the result of individual attitudes and behaviours, ignoring the fact that these attitudes and behaviours are structured and reinforced by the existing system. Consequently, policy solutions focus on changing individuals rather than structures and the inequality persists.
Implications for Education Policy

Research has shown that in education, as in other areas of practice, the approach to multiculturalism tends to be influenced to some extent by all three paradigms. The result is policy that contains conflicting goals. Tensions exist between assimilation/integration and ethnic pluralism; ethnic pluralism and racial and ethnic equality; and racial and ethnic equality and assimilation/integration. In the realm of education, it appears that assimilation is by far the dominant force.

As I have already noted, until the 1940s, schools were the main vehicle of assimilation (e.g. Jaenen 1981, Palmer 1982, Burnet and Palmer 1988). Shortly after the Second World War the mission of schools changed on paper from assimilation to fostering better understanding among ethnic groups but the practice of assimilation did not change (McLeod 1975). Some contend that there were significant policy changes in the 1960s (e.g. Murray 1977) but others have noted that, again, there was no real shift in terms of practice. Assimilation remained the dominant theme in educational practice with regard to children of ethnic origins other than British or French through the 1970s (e.g. McLeod 1975, Troper 1981). More recent appraisals of multicultural education have also come to the same conclusion (e.g. Lupul 1987, Vachon 1987, Cummins 1989). The obvious question is, why is this the case?

Cummins and Masemann (1985) pointed out that the stated aim of most multicultural education policies is the acceptance and
development of diversity. Many policies address five principle areas: representation in the curriculum, heritage languages, human relations/human rights, affirmative action, and education for immigrants (Cummins and Masemann pp.24-25). As Vachon has stated, the problem lies in an approach based on the principle of integration in a society that sees modern Western culture as a universal norm. He highlights the implications of this perspective for the implementation of multicultural education:

Il est fort significatif que la question des relations entre communautés culturelles et l'école est généralement présentée en termes d'abord 'd'intégration des minorités (tout en respectant leurs cultures)', plutôt qu'en termes d'acceptation de leurs identités et valeurs culturelles propres. (Vachon p.91)

Similarly, Lupul (1987) has noted that the multicultural education movement has neglected cultural identity "...almost as if there was a discomfort with human differences and a great temptation to invoke all that is common to human societies" (Lupul p.87). Others have commented that multicultural education policies and programmes are developed as if they were isolated from the wider context of social and economic inequality, the education system thus tends to reinforce inequality and existing power relations (e.g. Dehli 1987). In short, what we see are policy statements which have been influenced by the rhetoric of the identity and social justice paradigms but practices that are firmly rooted in the citizenship paradigm.

The literature on conceptions of multiculturalism and multicultural education provides different ways of viewing the
central concerns of the policy field. It also highlights some of the internal contradictions within and between cultural diversity and cultural diversity and education policies.

Studies of Multiculturalism Policy

As stated above, scholars who have studied the implementation of multicultural policy have tended to begin their discussions in 1971 (e.g. Burke 1984, McLeod 1984). Further, these studies have generally focussed on relationships between ethnocultural groups and the government or its agency responsible for cultural diversity (e.g. Ng 1990). Some similarities exist between these relationships and those between the government and education sector. Scholars studying government and ethnocultural groups have, for example, commented that an important factor in this relationship is that government is a major funding source for many ethnocultural groups. A funding relationship has also existed between the government and organizations and agencies within the education sector. The character of this relationship, however, is likely to be different than the relationship with an ethnocultural group for several reasons. First, government is also generally a major target for an ethnocultural group's lobbying efforts. Second, ethnocultural groups are largely volunteer groups and thus the relationship with government is based on volunteers interacting with bureaucrats, whereas contacts between the Branch and educational organizations and provincial departments have been made between bureaucrats.
Volunteers generally have limited time available to devote to their activities as members of ethnocultural groups while the provincial and local bureaucrats with whom federal officials have worked have been paid to devote some or all of their time to cultural diversity and education. Finally, members of ethnocultural groups are by definition members of "minority" groups while representatives of educational organizations and institutions are more likely to be members of the "majority" group. Given that more differences than similarities exist between these two types of relationships, the literature on relationships between government and ethnocultural groups is likely to be of limited use in gaining a better understanding of the relationship between the government and the education sector.

Studies that have examined the implications of the multiculturalism policy for public institutions have generally not addressed the question of the relationship between these institutions and the government (e.g. Burke 1984, Cryderman and O'Toole 1985). These studies imply a certain autonomy and isolation in the development of policies and programs within a particular sector rather than recognizing that the government, often through its multiculturalism branch, has encouraged and supported this type of development. Similarly, evaluations of institutional programs and policies have only given passing attention to the role of the Branch in assisting with their implementation (e.g. Carenage Consultants n.d., Fisher and Echols 1989). In this literature the government is acknowledged for
having established the multiculturalism policy which set the context for work within these sectors but little or no mention is made of the importance of government funding for initiatives or the support of federal officials in developing and implementing specific projects. If the dynamics surrounding the funding relationship are key for ethnocultural groups working with the federal government, it is likely that they would also be important for educational organizations and institutions.

Closely related to the studies of multicultural policy are studies of citizenship policy, particularly in the 1940s and 1950s. N.F. Dreisziger (1988) and Leslie Pal (1993, 1989) have focussed explicitly on the link between citizenship policy and cultural diversity policy. William Young (1978, 1981) has explored the relationship between the work of federal officials in developing and distributing propaganda on Canadian involvement in World War II and their work with non-British, non-French ethnic communities. Dreisziger has shown that the origins of federal involvement in cultural diversity were connected to the efforts of federal officials in citizenship. Pal has extended the argument and demonstrated that policies and programs developed in the 1940s to promote patriotism among members of non-British, non-French were the prototypes for later policies and programs in multiculturalism. The work of these three scholars holds particular significance for my study as they have established the origins of federal involvement in cultural diversity began in 1940. Furthermore, their work provides background and
supplementary material to my own research. However, none of the three have addressed the issue of federal involvement in cultural diversity and education.

Moving Forward

There is a wealth of information available to students of multiculturalism policy through existing historical, conceptual, and policy studies. But, while the literature provides a backdrop for the study of federal cultural diversity and education policy, none of the existing work addresses the topic directly. Furthermore, those studies of federal education policy and multiculturalism policy that do exist have not examined the policy process and the roles of different members of the policy community in the policy process. This study explores the policy process, providing new ways of examining the different sets of issues raised in the three bodies of literature I have examined above.
Notes

1. National Archives of Canada (hereafter NAC). Records of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration. RG 26/65/2-3-1. Memo for the Deputy Minister from J. Boucher re. The role played by the Department of Labour in the citizenship and language training of newcomers as well as in the general field of vocational education. November 20, 1952.


CHAPTER 3

ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction

The study of policy developed as a field in North America and Britain during and after World War II. Initially, there was general agreement among those in the field on a central paradigm and, therefore, definitions and methods of analysis. The basic assumption was that the individual was "a rational maximizer of satisfactions operating self-interestedly ... in a world of relative scarcity." (Tribe 1972, 68-69). As the field grew, researchers began to question some of the underlying assumptions of this model and to look at aspects of social, political, and institutional processes that had been ignored to that point. Today, agreement on the meaning of "policy" is limited to the understanding that, for researchers, it is an analytical category the definition of which is determined to a large extent by the perspective of the researcher. There are four main approaches to the study of policy. I will briefly outline these below and then speak to an integrative approach that I will apply in this work.

Rationality

In the beginning there was rationality... The first approach to understanding policy was based on the economic model of choice and the theory of rational decision-making. This approach was theorized in the 1950s and 1960s by Herbert Simon (1957, 1960) and Charles Lindblom (1959, 1968). Simon contended that policies
The notion of policy in both variants of this approach is the same. Policy is the choice that is made at the end of the process. This view has led to an interpretation of the term "policy" as a decision of a governing body, particularly a decision perceived to be crucial. Such a decision often, but not always, receives authorization in the form of a specific piece of legislation or a formal statement of policy. It is also likely that the decision is accompanied by a statement about how the governing body intends to carry out its policy. In some circles the term "policy" is used to mean not only the decision but also this accompanying program (Hogwood and Gunn p.16).

The focus of analysis in this perspective is the decision and the decision-maker. The purpose of analysis tends to be prescriptive rather than descriptive with the researcher concentrating on "...ways of improving decision-making by broadening the role of logic and empirical inquiry." (Tribe p.75). The critical process under review is the problem-solving
technique of the decision-maker with particular attention devoted to information and values as the primary ingredients in the process.

This approach to the study of policy, which Majone (1989) has called "decisionism", has a number of limitations which have been highlighted by several authors in the field. Lindblom, himself, was one of the first to recognize rationality suffered from what others have called "psychological limitations" (Hogwood and Gunn p.50). In other words, individuals simply do not have the analytical capacities to "...follow through to a conclusive analysis of the merits of alternative policies." (Lindblom 1968, 116). Related to this issue is the fact that the requirement for all relevant information is unrealistic (Hogwood and Gunn p.47). The approach also suffers because of its assumption of a single decision-maker or a small group of decision-makers acting uniformly. It does not allow for the possibility of conflict among decision-makers (Majone p.15) nor does it allow for the influence of external sources. Further, this approach makes little distinction between a policy and a decision. If policy is seen as one moment of choice then the analysis ignores related decisions made before and after that moment (Hogwood and Gunn p.19). Also, it tends to assume that all decisions are made in the interest of maximizing benefit and does not allow for other motivations such as envy or altruism (Tribe p.69). Finally, its concern with decision-making and its output ignores larger aspects of the process and the fact that the process has a
significance apart from the final product (Majone p.17-18, Tribe p.79). Given these concerns and criticisms it is not surprising that many scholars have moved away from rational decision-making as a theoretical perspective in policy study.

Managerial Perspective

The managerial perspective is similar to rational decision-making in that the focus is internal to the governing body in question. This perspective on policy making is part of a larger theory of the state which emphasizes organizational structures and strategic activities of the bureaucracy and elected officials. The bureaucracy, or administrative elites, and elected officials, or political elites, are seen as managing the affairs of the state rather than responding to political and economic markets. All state action, including policy making, is seen as a manifestation of competition among elites for control of their environment.

In this perspective, policy is perceived as the consequence of institutional structures. It exists as a method of inducing individuals to conform to beliefs and rules that will allow the elites to maintain control over the population (Alford and Friedland 1988, 162). It is developed through a process of competition and bargaining among elites.

Within this perspective there are different views on the nature of the policy process. One view, which has been labelled the public choice model, shares common roots with rational
decision-making in that it is based on an economic theory of choice. This view holds that individual decision-makers within the state act on the basis of self-interest. The interest of members of the political elite is determined by their need to be elected and to maintain power. The interest of members of the administrative elite is determined by their desire for increased status which is measured by more human and financial resources, new policy tasks, and being given chief responsibility for a policy area (Brooks 1990, 51). External groups are part of the process insofar as they are connected to the interest of the elites. Voters are important to members of the political elite. Interest groups that advocate for spending in particular areas, for example, ethnic organizations, are important to members of the administrative elite who also stand to gain from increases in that area, in this case, the multiculturalism sector. Policy, then, is "the outcome of strategic behaviour within a system of overlapping games that connect state to society." (Brooks p.51).

A second view of the policy process within the managerial perspective appears even more closely linked to rational decision-making. This view, associated with sociologist Daniel Bell, holds that voters and interest groups are unimportant to the policy process. He posits that three conditions have become the primary factors in shaping national policy:

(1) the way ... policy requirements have centralized resources "in the hands of a national administration", (2) the way that the need to anticipate and direct social change has led to an "emphasis on planning" in order to increase productivity from scientific innovation, and (3)
the further consequence of both of these factors in increasing the technical component of decision making, in order to manage the national economy. (in Alford and Friedland p.167).

In other words, power is becoming more centralized and policy-making is concentrated in the hands of a few. It is therefore important to concentrate on improving data gathering and decision-making techniques. Again, the task of the analyst becomes more prescriptive than descriptive.

The focus of analysis for both of these variants is on decisions and strategic activities of elites as they take place within the state structures. The type of activity the two choose to highlight is quite different. The public choice model places importance on the process of competition and bargaining among elites while Bell's model centres on decision-making. In both cases the focus is on the individual within the structure but it is the structure that determines the actions of the individual.

The limitations of the managerial perspective derive from its almost exclusive emphasis on the state structure. First, the focus on structure leaves little or no room for agency as individual actions are all determined by the individual's role within the structure. Second, the environment for policy making is limited to the frame of state structure. As Alford and Friedland have noted, "[t]he environment within which state organizations function is recognized, but not theorized at a societal level." (p.163). As a result, the existence of external groups is explained only in terms of internal organization. There is no way to account for external sources of change other than to
link them to already existing administrative elites. Finally, the managerial perspective holds that power rests in the "... ability to create effective organizations" (Alford and Friedland p.169). Any group that can become well-organized should be able to wield power in the policy process. This view ignores power differences based on characteristics like race, ethnicity, class, and gender. Despite these limitations, the managerial perspective is valuable to the development of an integrated approach to the study of policy because it provides a way of looking at activity within state agencies.

**Marxist Perspective**

The Marxist perspective on policy analysis, like the managerial perspective, is grounded in a theory of the state. This theory is based on four main points: the division of society into classes determined on the basis of relationship to the means of production, the pre-eminence of class as a basis of political and economic conflict, inequality of the classes, and a bias of the state in favour of the dominant class (Brooks p.55). There are two main variants within this view - functional and political. In the functional variant societal imperatives of production are seen to penetrate all institutions. In other words, "... the systemic power of capital constitutes the historically real environment of every organization in a capitalist society, as well as the context and even the content of individual behaviour." (Alford and Friedland p.274). In the
political variant the state is above and independent of society. The class struggle influences the state from the outside and representatives of different interests are seen to express varying forms of that struggle. The chief debates among Marxist theorists of the state and social policy have concerned the nature of the state, the role of individual agency, and the issues of race and gender.

In the functional variant of Marxism the state is necessarily seen as monolithic and state action is structurally determined. In the political variant, the state may be seen as a complex entity composed of different, and sometimes competing, parts. The political variant stresses that the main purposes of state policy are to support capital accumulation and to legitimate the power of the state. The two types of policy are not always compatible. Different state agencies are charged with responsibility for accumulation and legitimation policies. When the interests of different state agencies come into conflict struggles that mirror societal struggles occur within the state (Carnoy 1984, 250-257).

Given the emphasis within this perspective on the class-based nature of society and the state, the tendency has been to view action from either a collective or structuralist perspective. Some theorists are challenging this perspective and positing a significant role for individual agency within a Marxist analysis of the state. In this regard, Robert Alford and Roger Friedland have pointed to the work of sociologist Paul
Willis as having contributed to the development of a theory of individual action within a class perspective (Alford and Friedland pp. 303-305). Willis, in his study of working class boys and their response to schooling, asserted that the "creation of 'free individuals' capable of producing surplus value also creates human beings with a capacity to defy authority in a wide variety of militant and insurgent ways." (Alford and Friedland p.303). Individuals capable of resisting authority are capable of responding in ways other than those predetermined by their class status and thus may become significant actors in the policy process.

Recent debates among Marxist theorists have concerned the issues of gender and race. Scholars interested in gender and race have advanced the notion that oppression occurs on the basis of characteristics other than economic class. Feminist theorists, for example, have theorized connections between patriarchy and capitalism while writers on race have discussed the importance of understanding the influence of colonial heritage on modern capitalist societies (Williams 1989). Thus some discussions of the state and policy formation have included analyses of patriarchal and colonial structures as well as class relations.

Policy within the Marxist perspective is defined primarily as the outcome of state decisions rather than as the decisions themselves. What is important is what actually happens as opposed to what was stated. The underlying questions focus upon how policy affects distribution of power and capital. The belief is
that, in a capitalist society, policy is ultimately determined on the basis of the needs of the dominant class. The state uses policy to fulfill its two central functions of accumulation and legitimation. Accumulation policies help the dominant class to continue accumulating capital. Legitimation policies are used to keep members of the under classes sufficiently satisfied with the state to allow the state to maintain power. In this way the state legitimates both its role and the position of the dominant class.

Analysis in this perspective is concerned with the effect of policies rather than their content. The process of policy development is of little interest particularly in the functional variant of this approach. The historical and economic conditions become important because they play a key role in determining the actions of the institution. In the functional approach the focus is on how these conditions affect the state apparatus. In the political approach the focus is on how these factors manifest themselves in the distribution of power among different interests and how these interests then influence the state.

For the purposes of this study, there are two main limitations to this approach. First, even though there is some scope for individual agency, either an individual's actions themselves are seen as determined by her or his class position or the consequences of her or his actions are seen as ultimately contributing to the reproduction of class relations. Thus there is little possibility for change within this paradigm. Second, the focus of policy study is on the outcomes and effects of
policies rather than on how they develop. Such an approach would provide limited insight into why policies in the field of cultural diversity and education were developed at the federal level and why they were developed in a hidden and ad hoc manner. In terms of building an integrated approach to policy, this perspective does make three important contributions: it goes beyond seeing policy as simply the content of a decision, it views historical and economic factors as important influences on policy, and it stresses the importance of race, class, and gender as central components of policy analysis.

Pluralist Perspective

The pluralist perspective on policy analysis comes out of a liberal democratic tradition of theories of the state. This perspective holds that the state is essentially democratic. Individuals join groups based on their personal interests and values. These groups compete and bargain in a political marketplace and state action is the consequence of this process. "Political conflict [is] seen in terms of shifting constellations of actors that [vary] from issue to issue." (Brooks p.48). Power, then, is situational.

Policy from this perspective has been defined as a "... broad framework of ideas and values within which decisions are taken and action or inaction is pursued by governments in relation to some issue or problem. " (Brooks p.16). Further, it is seen to be an expression of society's intents as interpreted
by a governing authority (Downey 1988). Ideas and values are major determinants of policy which is larger than a simple decision. Policy is a statement of the scope of state action in a particular area. The notion contains within it the understanding that deliberate inaction may also be the consequence of a particular policy.

Given this definition, the focus of study is not specific decisions but the entire policy space, that is to say all of the "... governmental interventions and the increasingly complex interactions among them." (Hogwood and Gunn p.13). The emphasis on interest group participation in the policy process leads to an analysis involving significant attention to the interaction among groups and between external groups and the state. The other important factors in understanding policy are prevailing ideas and values. Therefore, analysis may also involve a consideration of the role of intellectuals and/or the media in developing and disseminating ideas.

The major limitations of this approach come from its focus on external groups and its conception of power. First, and most importantly, all groups are seen as equal. Those scholars who have attempted to theorize inequality within this framework have either borrowed from the managerial perspective and stated that power is determined by the degree of organization of the group (e.g. Lowi in Richardson and Jordan 1979, 160) or have borrowed from the Marxist perspective and claimed that the needs of the market economy underpin all decisions therefore business
interests are likely to wield more power (e.g. Lindblom in Brooks p.48-49). These perspectives fail to account for systemic constraints on power based on attributes such as ethnicity, race, and gender. A second limitation of the pluralist approach is that, despite its basis in individualism, the only room for agency comes in the form of choice in joining groups. Third, the external focus means that the role of state officials is reduced to responding to demands from the outside. Finally, the focus on values is problematic because the assumption is that the values upon which all policies are based are the values of a liberal democratic society. This view fails to take into account that the bureaucracy within which policies are ultimately formulated and administered has its own set of values and imperatives (Hummel 1987). What this perspective offers to an integrated approach is the understanding of the importance of ideas and the notion of policy space.

Process Approach

In his influential 1976 article, "Studying Public Policy", Richard Simeon outlined five different approaches to the study of policy. Each of the five approaches viewed policy as primarily a consequence of one of the following factors: the environment, distribution of power, prevailing ideas, institutional frameworks or the process of decision-making. He argued that "[t]he approaches are not mutually exclusive, indeed the interactions between [sic] them are important objects for study." (Simeon
p.566). He also noted that of the five, it is the process approach which focuses on interactions between members of the policy community that necessarily draws on the other approaches:

...on power, by looking at who the participants are, what interests they represent, what resources they possess; on ideas, by looking at both the procedural and substantive values of the participants; on institutions by examining the constraints and opportunities they present, and by assessing the ways certain assumptions, precedents, standard operating procedures, and the like become entrenched within certain departments and agencies. The process focus would also stress the strategies and tactics of participants as influenced by the other factors, and would look at the relationship between the policy-making in the policy field with that of other fields. (Simeon p.579)

In addition to drawing on Simeon's work my analytical framework is grounded in a theory of the state that William Galston (1991) has called "purposive liberalism". In this view the state is not a neutral arbiter mediating between individuals and groups. Instead, the state plays a central role in determining and enforcing constraints on individualism and diversity. The constraints are based in a conception of individual and societal good that would ideally be shared among all members of the society.

From this perspective, I believe that policy is most appropriately defined as a label for a field of activity (Hogwood and Gunn p.13). The state's ideological position develops and changes through a series of decisions, actions, and statements in the field in question. Interactions among actions, decisions, and statements influence the direction of the policy. In other words,
policy is defined by process. That is to say, it is "... perceived as comprising a series of patterns of related decisions to which many circumstances and personal, group, and organizational influences have contributed." (Hogwood and Gunn: 23-24). This contains within it the notion that policy is not static and that it is not separated from administration. Policy is not simply determined by the process of competition and bargaining at all levels, in some respects, it is that process.

Policy development is an activity in which agencies of the state engage for multiple purposes. On a societal level, the debate on policy is a fundamental aspect of defining common values. Policy is also a political enterprise insofar as those involved in the process in any policy field are continually engaged in strategic activities designed to influence the direction of policy to achieve their objectives as individuals or as members of a collectivity. Finally, given that the state exists primarily to develop and enforce constraints and those constraints are expressed through policies, policies in effect become the building blocks of state structure.

From this perspective, the state is seen as a multifaceted entity within which agencies compete and cooperate to maximize their resources. State agencies owe their existence to a set of policies that are considered their jurisdiction. Control of a policy field carries with it a certain level of resources. The resources include a material component which is measured by the agency's budget and staff complement and a symbolic component
which is measured by the power and influence the agency has within and outside the state structure. As the policy field grows, so do the material and symbolic resources of the agency charged with responsibility for the policy. Consequently, state agencies compete for jurisdiction over policy fields. The competition and cooperation between and among agencies of the state then also becomes an important element for study within this approach.

The initial focus of analysis is to identify principal members of the policy community and determine how, when, and to what degree each influenced the policy development. The significant activities are those which give members of the policy community an opportunity to be involved in policy negotiations. Once an agency has succeeded in establishing control of the policy field that agency becomes the focal point of the analysis. The actions of administrative officials of that agency become a critical aspect of the analysis and it becomes important to understand what motivated those actions. The motives may include one or more of the following: an individual official's self-interest or ideological commitments, the need of administrators to respond to the actions or demands of other members of the policy community, the desire for growth on the part of the agency, and perceived or actual threats to the agency's existence. The actions or activities that are central to the analysis are those which influence the development of the policy under study. Of particular interest are the ways in which members
of the policy community use their material and symbolic resources to influence the direction of the policy and the ways in which the agency justifies taking specific actions which serve to broaden the scope or change the focus of policy. Ultimately, this type of analysis allows the researcher to explore how ideological and organizational considerations influence each other in the development of policy.

The purpose of the analysis is primarily descriptive. This approach allows us to examine the development and continued existence of contradictory elements within a policy. It also allows us to understand why the actions of state agencies do not always follow logically from official statements of policy. In addition, it provides a way of studying the complexity of the policy process.

The limitations and strengths of the approach derive from its complexity and its focus on interactions. In attempting to bring together various approaches to the study of policy, this perspective requires the researcher to consider a host of factors and the processes that link them. While this would give the approach an explanatory power far greater than that of existing approaches, a study which tried to focus on all of the issues and concerns I have identified could easily become unwieldy. This is one reason why I believe it is important to focus on the agency that has established control of the policy field. The study then centres on the relationship between that agency and other members of the policy community. While this potentially excludes the
examination of important interactions between and among other members of the community, it allows for a more manageable study. I believe that it is justifiable in a case such as this where the object of study is the federal policy and where one agency clearly became the government's principal agency in the field.

In terms of the interactions, given that studies are generally carried out after the fact, the researcher would not actually be studying the interactions that took place but the outcomes of those interactions. Documentary evidence and information from individuals who participated in those interactions would provide only partial descriptions of what took place. The researcher would therefore have to make justifiable inferences from the available evidence. In the case of this study, I have made those inferences based on a relatively stringent standard of proof. Before making an assertion I looked for supporting evidence in the files of at least two agencies. Where I could not find such evidence I made my assumptions and inductions explicit in the text.

This approach allows for the development of a more comprehensive approach to understanding policy and policy process. It focusses attention on processes and objectives at the societal, political, and organizational levels. It recognizes that policy is not simply a response to a societal issues. The policy process is also a political and organizational enterprise. The key to understanding policy lies in understanding how the societal, political, and organizational levels, and the members
of the policy community who operate on them, relate to each other.

Within this approach there is a recognition of the importance of structural considerations and individual agency in the development of policy. The participation of individuals and organizations in the policy process is mitigated by the economic and symbolic resources they possess and is governed primarily by their desire to increase their level of resources.

I believe that this approach is particularly useful in the study of cultural diversity and education policy because of the ad hoc manner in which the policy developed. I will argue that the policy developed through a series of initiatives and strategies that were originally intended to implement the federal cultural diversity policy in an area of provincial jurisdiction and that it was important for the agency responsible for the policy to establish itself in the field of education to be able to make the claim that it was involved in a key area of cultural diversity which no other federal agency could claim. Thus the agency under consideration, the Citizenship Branch, had to be prepared to negotiate with the provinces in order to enter their "turf" and it had to find creative ways to expand its work in the field once it had been granted access. I believe that these negotiations and strategies which, in turn, contributed to the development of the policy can only be fully understood through an investigation of the process.

I also believe that the attention to symbolic as well as
material resources is an important aspect of this approach to the study of cultural diversity and education policy for two reasons. First, it is significant that the areas of cultural diversity and cultural diversity and education traditionally do not receive large material resource allocations. I believe that, as a result, symbolic resources become very important. In the case of the Citizenship Branch, for example, gaining the position of the government expert in the area of cultural diversity gave it a lifeline to which it could cling when it had little in the way of material resources and was in danger of being eradicated. Second, I believe that the power and influence of individuals and groups in the cultural diversity and education policy process were mitigated by their cultural and social attributes. Not surprisingly, individuals who had the greatest influence tended to be men of British or French origin who had post-secondary education and whose vocations were vested with authority such as university professors, army officers, or government officials. Similarly, the organizations with influence had memberships consisting primarily of men with the same type of profile. Thus this approach provides a way of examining the influence of attributes such as race, class, gender, and ethnicity.

My study, then, will centre on the agency responsible for the development and implementation of cultural diversity and education policy. It will examine the strategies this agency used in attempting to implement programs in cultural diversity and education and the relationships the agency developed with other
agencies and organizations as a result of these initiatives. I will attempt to determine the membership of the cultural diversity and education policy community and how each of the members of this community influenced the policy development process. Finally, I will attempt to define the policy that developed through this process.
CHAPTER 4

CITIZENSHIP AS PATRIOTISM

Introduction

George Woodcock has noted that "[t]he Great Wars of the twentieth century changed Canada both socially and politically, not by introducing new social developments but by accelerating those that already existed." (Woodcock 1988, 294). Many of the significant changes that took place during the Second World War were related to a growing sense of Canadian nationalism and identity that referenced the country itself before the British Empire. Immigration levels had dropped during and immediately after the First World War and, though they had increased towards the end of the 1920s, during the 1930s immigration was all but nonexistent. Consequently a larger proportion of the Canadian population was born in the country. The social and economic pressures of the Great Depression forced the government and the people of Canada to focus internally. Ensuring effective communication among Canadians became an important issue for government officials and the growing number of adult educators concerned with building a sense of common citizenship.

A small part of the emerging identity was an awareness of cultural diversity within the population. Scholars in the disciplines of sociology, history, literary studies, and education were beginning to study issues associated with ethnicity and cultural diversity. Despite this new-found interest in cultural diversity, when the War broke out, Canadians of
German, Ukrainian, and Italian origin were the targets of harassment and discriminatory treatment and Japanese Canadians were stripped of their property and interned. It was within this context that the Canadian government began its first tentative efforts in the area of cultural diversity and education.

Prior to World War Two the federal government had no official policy on cultural diversity. Its involvement in the area, which was defined through three separate policy spheres; immigration, naturalization, and national security, established a context within which extra-governmental groups determined the range of diversity that would exist in the country. The federal government's role was largely to regulate who could enter the country, when they could assume the role of full citizens, and when those privileges might be revoked. The job of helping immigrants settle into the country and understand the responsibilities of citizenship was left to the railways, women's organizations, churches, and schools. Thus when the Second World War began, federal government involvement in cultural diversity was limited to a narrow range of activities.

Unlike cultural diversity, education was explicitly discussed in the British North America Act as an area of government responsibility, more specifically, an area of provincial jurisdiction. Notwithstanding this fact, the federal government had begun to establish a role for itself in this field. The Technical Education Act (1919), for example, allowed the federal government to enter the domain of education by
providing funds to the provinces for vocational training (Selman and Dampier 1991). The existence of federal agencies like the Education Branch of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics opened another door to involvement in education. From 1935 onward the Education Branch collected and published statistics on education. The director of the Branch, John Robbins, established personal contacts with educational authorities throughout the country. Through these contacts, Robbins solicited and received information and statistics on education from provincial authorities and major educational organizations. He used this information to produce publications on Canadian education. As a result, he effectively turned the Education Branch into a national clearing house of educational information and thus helped to establish a federal presence in the area (McLeish 1978). As in the area of cultural diversity, federal involvement in education was extremely limited. The fact that there was a presence in both areas, however, set the stage for what was to happen during the War.

World War Two presented proponents of federal involvement both in education and cultural diversity the opportunity to develop and implement policy and programs. In addition, it brought to the fore areas of common concern under the heading "citizenship education".

As Selman (1991) has noted, citizenship education has had several definitions throughout the history of its development in Canada. During the War the term "citizenship education" was used
to designate a variety of informational and educational activities designed to promote patriotism and a sense of common identity. Within this range of activities fell a set of initiatives aimed at developing a sense of Canadianism among members of the so-called "foreign-born" population and a related set of initiatives meant to educate "old stock" Canadians about the threat that prejudicial attitudes posed to national unity. While this work in citizenship education was not the sole focus of programming in cultural diversity during the War, it did lay the foundations for policy development in citizenship and cultural diversity in the postwar era.

Groundwork For Policy Development

By 1938, the government of Canada was preparing for war. The development of policy in cultural diversity was influenced by the work of two interdepartmental committees established that year. The committee to prepare emergency legislation drafted the Defence of Canada Regulations. Some officials feared that the provisions in the Regulations governing treatment of enemy aliens and anyone suspected of harbouring anti-state sentiments were too harsh and would have a negative impact on the attitudes of the "foreign-born" population toward Canada and the Canadian war effort (Dreisziger 1988). Similar discussion took place among some of the members of the Committee on Enemy Aliens. Out of these discussions arose suggestions that the federal government take a more balanced approach to the issue of the "foreign-born"
population. On one side would be the punitive and restrictive measures similar to those imposed in World War One; on the other side would be an attempt to communicate with members of immigrant communities, preferably in their own languages, about the War and Canada's role.

When Canada officially declared war on Germany in September 1939, there was no department within government that had a mandate to work directly with ethnic communities to promote understanding or a sense of belonging. This situation changed in July 1940 when the Department of National War Services was created. The mandate of this new department was to coordinate domestic initiatives in support of the war effort. The Minister of National War Services was given responsibility for two areas that needed to converge in order for policy in cultural diversity and education to begin to develop: information services and activities of volunteer groups. Both the newly appointed Minister, J.G. Gardiner, and the Associate Deputy Minister, T.C. Davis, were sympathetic to the issues of the 'foreign-born'. Independently of each other, they began almost immediately, to formulate plans for a mechanism within their department to address ethnic issues (Dreisziger). Thus the department not only had the mandate but the political and bureaucratic will to pursue policy development in cultural diversity.

Davis believed that there was a need to establish communication links with ethnic communities. The Department's first initiatives with ethnic communities fell into the general
category of public education. In the fall of 1940, National War Services initiated a speaking tour by a man named Tracy Philipps. Philipps was a former British soldier and civil servant who spoke several languages. He had been brought to Canada in the early part of 1940 by the National Council of Education for Canada to speak to various groups about the War in Europe, particularly its effect on Eastern Europe. Once in Canada, he worked primarily with and through the Association of Canadian Clubs. The tour initiated by National War Services, which was still officially sponsored by the Association of Canadian Clubs, took him to a number of ethnic community groups (Dreisziger). It marked the first major effort on the part of the federal government to communicate with Canadian ethnic communities about the War.

The Department of National War Services housed the Bureau of Public Information, a unit whose mandate included public education and the creation of shared Canadian identity. The next step in the evolution of cultural diversity and education policy was to involve this unit in the work with immigrant groups. Davis felt that it was essential that the Bureau of Public Information use existing ethnic newspapers to communicate the government's message and so plans developed to establish a foreign language press component (Dreisziger). The Bureau began by monitoring the ethnic press and in August 1941, was given approval by the Cabinet War Committee to establish a foreign language section (Pal 1989). In addition, in 1940-41, the Bureau initiated three important projects in the area of cultural diversity. It worked
with the National Film Board to produce a film called "Peoples of Canada" and with the CBC to produce a series of radio broadcasts titled "Canadians All". It also published a pamphlet called Canadians All. With these initiatives, the government signalled its desire to try to redefine "Canadian" to include all European ethnic groups.

Early in their respective tenures, both J.G. Gardiner and T.C. Davis had expressed their interest in creating a special unit within National War Services to coordinate initiatives with ethnic communities (Dreisziger). Before this plan could come to fruition Gardiner was removed from the position of Minister and replaced by J.T. Thorson. Shortly after Thorson's appointment in June 1941, Davis sent him a memo outlining the need for a unit to work in the area of ethnic issues (Dreisziger). Thorson, too, was supportive of the idea but it would take almost a full year before the unit could be established.

While this activity was taking place in cultural diversity, a small network of adult educators and academics continued efforts that had begun before the War to influence the work of the Bureau of Public Information. The establishment of the Bureau had, itself, been a hotly debated issue. Canada had had no comparable organization during the First World War and there were those who felt that the Bureau served no useful function. They believed that it was the job of the news media to ensure that the public was kept informed and that the government had no business in the field. On the other side of this debate were those who
felt that the government had a definite role to play in providing the public information that would help create a sense of patriotism (Young 1978).

The government declared its position on the issue when it established the Bureau of Public Information in 1939. The Bureau's major task was to unite all Canadians in a common cause (Young 1981). To achieve its goal, the Bureau of Public Information began to produce publications, work with the National Film Board and CBC, and provide information to newspapers.

The educators who had been involved in early discussions on the government's role in public information felt that this top-down approach was not the most effective way to engage Canadians (Young 1978). They felt it would be more appropriate to find means of presenting issues and encouraging debate and thus developing a participatory approach to public information. Initially they were unsuccessful in their attempts to convince the Bureau of Public Information to adopt this kind of approach but they continued to lobby and to develop projects that would substantiate their ideas.

In the first two years of the War, policies in the areas of education and cultural diversity continued to develop independently of each other. With the creation of the Bureau of Public Information and the Department of National War Services the government placed responsibility for both areas within the same administrative units. While this laid the groundwork, the work of three other bodies was largely responsible for creating
policies and programs that brought cultural diversity and education together in the form of citizenship education. The Canadian Council of Education for Citizenship was a national voluntary organization that brought together educators with an interest in citizenship issues, the Advisory Committee for Cooperation in Canadian Citizenship was an advisory body to the Minister of National War Services, and the Nationalities Branch was an administrative unit within the National War Services that was finally created to work specifically on ethnic issues. Each of these bodies contributed individually to the development of citizenship education policy, but it was the interplay among the three that was responsible for setting the tone for postwar policies in cultural diversity and education.

The Canadian Council of Education for Citizenship

The Council began at an informal meeting in November 1940. C.H. Blakeney, then Minister of Education for the Province of New Brunswick, called the meeting which brought together "forty-two educational authorities who represented the various Provincial Departments of Education and many national organizations interested in the teaching of citizenship."\(^1\) Included in the group were the ministers of education for New Brunswick, Ontario, and Saskatchewan and senior officials from five of the other six provincial ministries (Alberta did not send a delegate). Also present were representatives from several national educational and voluntary organizations\(^2\) and six federal government
agencies: the Bureau of Public Information, CBC, National Film Board, National War Services, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and the General Advisory Committee on Demobilization and Rehabilitation. It was the consensus of the meeting that an organization should be established to promote among all Canadians a better understanding of democracy and issues related to the war. Thus the Canadian Council of Education for Citizenship was founded.

While the meeting and the subsequent formation of the organization have officially been recorded as initiatives from outside of the federal government, there is ample evidence to suggest that federal officials were intimately involved in calling the meeting and determining the outcomes. The meeting was held in the Centre Block of the Parliament Buildings (McLeish p.101) which suggests that federal officials were at least co-sponsors of the event. The attendance list included thirteen senior bureaucrats and one Member of Parliament (Brooke Claxton). One of the federal officials, W.B. Herbert of the Bureau of Public Information, was appointed one of the joint secretaries of the meeting. The Ottawa bureaucrats participated in all the discussions throughout the two day meeting and three of them were named to the first national council of the Council.

Furthermore, when Robert England, who was one of the participants in the November 1940 meeting, wrote his report on the future of the Branch in 1944, he described the Council as an organization that had been formed under the auspices of the Wartime
Information Board, the successor to the Bureau of Public Information.

While all the evidence does point to significant federal involvement in this initiative, the founders of the Council went to great lengths to give their organization the appearance of being independent of the federal government. There is no mention of federal involvement in arranging the meeting nor is there any mention of the location of the meeting in the minutes or other documents on the establishment of the Council. When plans were drawn up for membership in the Council, no federal departments were given status as members and the one official from a federal department who was invited to be a full member of the Council, John Robbins of Dominion Bureau of Statistics, was officially requested to sit as the representative of Canadian Legion War Services Committee on Education. This is not to say that the Council did not want to work closely with the federal government. In fact, the organization immediately established its willingness to cooperate with the federal government. The discussion of the make-up of the Council included a suggestion that the Director of Public Information be invited to collaborate closely with the committee and the meeting as a whole expressed its "warm appreciation to the federal government departments which have been extending co-operation to provincial authorities with respect to education problems". This set the pattern for how the Council would function throughout the War. On paper it had the appearance of being an independent volunteer-based
organization but in practice major policy and program decisions were heavily influenced if not actually made by federal officials.

The founders of the Council intended that it would be a vehicle for the work of the Bureau of Public Information. The plan as it was articulated in the organization's constitution was that the Council would help to establish provincial committees which would operate under the direction of provincial departments of education and work in the area of citizenship education. Once these committees were in place, the role of the Council would be to coordinate their activities with the work of the Bureau of Public Information. Much of the day-to-day work would be carried out by a salaried executive secretary who would be appointed by "the Executive Committee in conjunction with the Bureau of Public Information". In other words, through the Council the Bureau of Public Information would be able to work with provincial departments of education.

But the organization did not develop according to plan. Despite the high degree of bureaucratic support, the Minister of National War Services, J.G. Gardiner, did not approve a grant that would have provided the organization permanent staff (Young 1978, 28) and the notion of provincial committees did not receive the enthusiastic support that had been anticipated. Although five committees had been organized by the end of the first year of operation, they were operating under the direction of the national body rather than undertaking their own activities.
Even though the first year did not follow the predetermined path, it did help to establish the Council as an important instrument in the work of the Bureau of Public Information. When it became apparent that the Bureau was not going to be able to provide funds for the staff position, the Ontario Department of Education stepped in and donated the services of F.S. Rivers to act as Executive Secretary and A. Schalburg to act as his secretary. In addition, the Government of Ontario provided office space free of charge.

When J.T. Thorson replaced Gardiner as Minister of National War Services, department officials renewed their request for financial support for the Council. Thorson eventually approved the grant. This allowed the Council to be actively involved in several initiatives. In 1941 the organization had a key role in the Canada and Newfoundland Education Association conference on Education for Citizenship and used the occasion to launch a booklet titled "Democracy in Education" which was later distributed to Provincial Departments of Education and Normal Schools. At the request of the Bureau of Public Information, the Council prepared programmes of activities for schools to undertake during Reconsecration Week and Remembrance Day. Lectures on citizenship were prepared and delivered at the Department of National Defence's training camps. Plans were also developed for a radio series to be produced with the CBC, a film series to be organized with the National Film Board, and a series of pamphlets on citizenship for teachers to be prepared with the
Canadian Teachers' Federation. In addition, in its annual report for 1941, the Council announced vague plans to become involved in the area of citizenship training for naturalization.

The successes of 1941 were not to be repeated in 1942. In March 1942, Rivers announced at an executive meeting of the Council that the Ontario Government was no longer in a position to be able to provide salaried personnel for the Council. This sparked a discussion on the future of the organization. In the end it was decided that the Council should work towards establishing itself as a national secretariat for education. The meeting was told that:

the office of the Director of Public Information was in full support of our Council as a central organization acting in a liaison capacity between the Federal Government and the various Departments of Education. It was on this basis that the Dominion Government had agreed to undertake financial support for the organization.

Unfortunately for the Council the plans never became reality. Before the Director of Public Information could act on his promise the federal government initiated a review of government information services. The report that resulted from this review suggested that the information service abandon the educational approach in favour of a news-based approach and that Bureau of Public Information be reorganized as an agency without affiliations to any particular department. The recommendations were approved in July 1942 and the Wartime Information Board was established in September of that year. With the newly appointed chair of the Wartime Information Board, Charles Vinning, wishing
to distance himself from the activities of the Bureau of Public Information, it is not surprising that the senior officials of the Bureau were all replaced and links with the Council were severed (Young 1978). As a result the Council was almost completely inactive throughout 1942.

In February 1943, the executive of the Council met. The members of the executive discussed the dissolution of the Council and decided to table the motion to dissolve the Council. They also agreed the Council should try to ensure that a permanent secretariat for education would be established. By February 1943, there was some hope that former plans could be resurrected because of changes at the Wartime Information Board. Norman MacKenzie had replaced Charles Vinning as chair and John Grierson had been appointed general manager. Both MacKenzie, a former president of the University of New Brunswick, and Grierson, former head of the NFB, had been founding members of the Council. The hopes of the Council executive rose even higher in June 1943 when officials of the Wartime Information Board, including Grierson, attended an executive meeting at which they reaffirmed their commitment to the Council. The role and purpose of the Council was discussed and summarized in the minutes:

The Wartime Information Board cannot approach the educational system, from an official point of view, without an intermediary. And it must go, in an orderly way, into the wide field of unofficial education, e.g. the Boy Scouts, etc. Some organization must be used as the intermediary. The Council is the best existing one. This organization must be creative in its cooperation and must go out and encourage participation.
Its duty would be to help government departments in the educational aspects of information services. For example, in sending out pamphlets or posters, the Council would be concerned with determining the educational basis and should be the intermediary between the properly constituted educational authorities and the Wartime Information Board, determining whether these authorities approve of such material.

The Wartime Information Board wanted to work in the area of education but was cautious about appearing to tread on provincial territory. The Council was to be their vehicle for the work in education. For this the Wartime Information Board wanted to give the Council a grant of $25,000. Grierson wrote a letter outlining the reasons why the Wartime Information Board should give a grant of this size to the Council. That letter was given to the Council executive and in July 1943 was submitted to Grierson under the signature of C.N. Crutchfield, secretary of the Council. (Young 1978, 95). Again, despite the manoeuvring of the senior bureaucrats, the Council was not to be successful in obtaining this grant. The organization got caught in the middle of a political controversy.

One of the projects Grierson wished to support through the Council was the Citizens' Forum, an innovative project of the Canadian Association for Adult Education and CBC. The CBC in consultation with the Association would develop and produce a radio program on an area of public concern. Prior to the air date, the Association would distribute printed material on the issue to leaders of local discussion groups. The broadcast would take place and be followed by discussions by several groups.
across the country. Because the Association had become connected with the left in the minds of many Liberals, Grierson thought it would be advisable to funnel the grant for Citizens' Forum through the Council rather than giving it directly to the Association (Young, 1978:80-81). The grant was not approved because the Council was seen to be too closely allied to the leadership of the Association. In the end a token grant of $2,500 was approved but the Council was still left without the funds necessary to hire an executive secretary. It is possible that the Council might have folded at this point had it not been for an intervention by another federal department, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

John Robbins, then head of the Education Division of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, had been a member of the Council since 1940. In 1943 he was serving as the secretary when word came of the small amount that the Wartime Information Board had finally approved for the Council. The executive approached Robbins and asked if he would consider taking on the position of executive secretary on a part-time basis. He declined a salaried position but used the invitation to convince his superiors at the Dominion Bureau of Statistics to alter the mandate of his position slightly to allow him to work for the Council (McLeish, p.103). Robbins, who had been with Dominion Bureau of Statistics since 1930, had been largely responsible for turning the Education Division into a national clearing house of educational information. In the process he had become involved with several
national educational bodies including the Education Division of the Canadian Legion War Services and the Canadian Association for Adult Education. As Roby Kidd later noted, "Because of Dr. Robbins' connections within the Federal Government and with educational bodies, a great many new fields were soon opened up [for the Council]." Robbins remained in the position of secretary until the end of the War.

The level of activity within the Council increased once the question of the secretary had been resolved. By the end of 1943 the Council was supporting the Citizens' Forum, preparing to publish the pamphlets that had been written by the Canadian Teachers' Federation, and distributing material developed by the Wartime Information Board. For the next two years, the Council received an annual grant of $10,000 from the Wartime Information Board and continued to function as the Board's main conduit into the area of education.

In 1944, the Council took its first discernible steps in the area of cultural diversity. George Simpson had met with the executive on two occasions in 1941 and 1942 in his capacity as the Department of National War Services's Adviser on Foreign Language Groups. On both occasions the executive had expressed support for the work Simpson wished to undertake in the area of citizenship training and naturalization. Indeed in 1942 the Council had gone so far as to send a memo, which had been drafted by Simpson, to T.C. Davis supporting Simpson's suggestion that a committee be established to study the issue of naturalization.
But the turmoil in the Council and the coincidental turmoil within the National War Services resulted in a two year period where the Council did nothing more in the area of cultural diversity. In early 1944 the situation changed when the Council published and distributed to teachers a pamphlet titled "The Problem of Race" and established a special committee to make recommendations on citizenship training for immigrants. These initiatives marked a slight change in direction for the Council as issues of cultural diversity began to have a higher priority on the Council's agenda.

By 1944, as Canada prepared for postwar reconstruction, it became increasingly evident that the Wartime Information Board would not have a place in the new order. The only groups that supported the continuation of a government information agency were those which received funding from the Wartime Information Board (Young 1978, 122). At the same time there was growing support for the establishment of a successor to the Nationalities Branch. It appears that the advocates for a reorganized peacetime version of the Branch used the support of the Council to strengthen their case and that the Council became involved in this campaign in order to assure itself a role in the postwar era as the principal non-government agency in the area of citizenship education.

The Advisory Committee and the Nationalities Branch

As we have already seen, the idea to establish a specialized
unit to deal with ethnic issues came into the Department of National War Services along with its first minister and associate deputy minister, J.G. Gardiner and T.C. Davis, respectively. But it was not until J.T. Thorson became minister in 1941 that work began on creating the unit. Thorson was appointed minister in June 1941. Almost immediately Davis sent him a memorandum outlining the idea for a specialized unit. Thorson was in Winnipeg when he received the memorandum. He consulted with RCMP Commissioner Wood, Tracy Philipps and a small delegation of leaders from the Ukrainian community on the idea. A few months later he contacted George Simpson, a specialist in Eastern European Studies teaching in the Department of History at the University of Saskatchewan, and asked him to take on the position of Adviser on Foreign Language Groups. Simpson accepted the offer and set to work on creating an advisory committee and an administrative unit within National War Services (Dreisziger, pp.17-19).

Simpson worked closely with Davis. Together the two called a small meeting at the end of October 1941 where they, along with Watson Kirkconnell, Tracy Philipps, and Robert England, recommended the establishment of a Committee on Cultural Group Cooperation. The committee was to be chaired by Simpson and include Kirkconnell, Philipps, England, and others who were considered knowledgeable in the area as its members. Its function would be to maintain contacts with various ethnic communities and advise National War Services on policy and programmes. Davis
presented the idea to his colleague Norman Robertson of External Affairs. Robertson supported the concept but suggested the group be called the Advisory Committee on Cooperation in Citizenship to emphasize that the focus of its work would be helping to build a sense of loyalty to Canada (Dreisziger, p.18). Thorson presented the idea to Cabinet on January 27, 1942 and Cabinet endorsed the establishment of the committee which had actually been struck in December 1941.

The Advisory Committee's mandate did not include any explicit reference to education but there were indications that the Committee was to work in the areas of formal and nonformal education. The terms of reference for the Advisory Committee outlined five areas of responsibility:

- to maintain contact with Canadian citizens of non-British and non-French origin and to seek to interpret their views to the Government and to the Canadian public generally;

- to cooperate with the Director of the Bureau of Public Information in distributing news to the foreign-language press in Canada and in explaining public policy as it develops;

- to maintain close relationships with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, the National Film Board, and other similar services; and the Canadian Council for Education in Citizenship [sic];

- to encourage cultural activities which may promote mutual understanding and esteem between Canadian citizens of different origin;

- to interest itself in situations which appear to be producing misunderstanding, dissatisfaction or discord among groups of Canadians of European origin, non-French and non-British, or between these groups and other Canadian citizens and, if it is thought advisable, to make representations with respect to such situations to the appropriate
All of the statements legitimized work in public education and nonformal education with specified groups. The injunction to maintain a close relationship with the Canadian Council of Education for Citizenship seems to indicate a desire to involve the Advisory Committee in the arena of formal education. A further connection to the education sector was provided by the members of the Committee, many of whom were well-respected educators and academics. In addition to George Simpson, the Committee included five prominent Canadian educators: Henry F. Angus, Donald Cameron, Robert England, Watson Kirkconnell, and C.H. Blakeney, then Minister of Education for New Brunswick and Chair of the Canadian Council of Education for Citizenship.

With the Advisory Committee established, the next step was to institute an administrative unit. The personnel for the unit were in fact on staff by the time the Advisory Committee received Cabinet approval but an autonomous unit had not been established. Simpson, who would head the unit, Tracy Philipps, who would be the European Adviser, and V.J. Kaye, who would liaise with the ethnic press were all affiliated with the Bureau of Public Information. The Nationalities Branch was finally formed in March 1942 as an entity separate from, but still working closely with, the Bureau of Public Information. When the Wartime Information Board was created in September 1942, the Branch remained with National War Services. All ties between the two agencies were cut because of the animosity between Phillips and Charles Vinning,
chair of the Wartime Information Board (Young 1978, 192).

Over the next year and a half the Branch suffered many setbacks. In September 1942 Simpson, for health reasons, resigned his position as director. The following month Thorson was replaced as Minister by L.R. LaFleche who up to that point had been Deputy Minister of the department. Since LaFleche was not a Member of Parliament, the majority of his time during the first two months in his new post was dedicated to getting himself elected. In December 1942 Davis, who had been Acting Deputy Minister since LaFleche's appointment, resigned. The work of the Branch was left to Philipps and Kaye, both of whom were ill for extended periods in 1943. As a result of having been left with little administrative support, the Advisory Committee was also largely inactive throughout this period (Pal 1989, 413-414).

A full Committee meeting was held in November 1943, and a small delegation from the Advisory Committee met with the Minister in January 1944. They advised him to reorganize the Branch and he called on Robert England, who by this time had left the Advisory Committee, to make recommendations on the reorganization. England returned to Ottawa in April 1944 and submitted his report to the Minister two months later.

Education became a major focus of the report. In the course of preparing his report England attended a meeting of the Council of Education for Citizenship where he along with H.M. Tory, chair of the Council and G.E. Trueman of the B.C Security Commission, drafted a set of recommendations on citizenship training for
naturalization. England then presented the Council's recommendations in his report in such a way as to suggest that the idea to establish a formal system of citizenship training had originated with the Council. He reproduced the entire resolution and ended the section on citizenship training by stating that he concurred with the recommendation of the Council. In addition, England used his report to advocate for the continued existence of the Council. He suggested that, if the Council did not exist, the new director of the Citizenship Division would find it necessary to create such a body because it was "the most suitable method of keeping contacts with Provincial Governments on this question and of avoiding the imputation of attempting federal direction of educational procedures and curricula." Later in the document he added that it was important that the content of citizenship curriculum be studied by the Council "since it provides the necessary liaison with the Provincial Governments and much misunderstanding may thus be avoided."

England's report was presented to the Minister on June 12, 1944 and was implemented almost immediately. The report contained 18 recommendations for areas of activity but it was the work in citizenship education and naturalization which took preeminence from 1944 well into the 1950s.

With encouragement from Frank Foulds, the newly appointed director of the Citizenship Division, the Council began to play an increasingly prominent role in the area of citizenship education for newcomers. The Council held a conference on
citizenship training for naturalization in December 1944. Foulds attended the conference and participated in the discussions. Primarily he outlined the plans of the Citizenship Division and pointed to areas in which the Council might become involved. Throughout 1944 and 1945 the Council kept in close contact with Foulds. Undoubtedly with his support and input the Council developed and presented to the Secretary of State recommendations on citizenship training and a naturalization ceremony which it hoped would be incorporated into the new Citizenship Act.

Summary

Through the Second World War, the federal government established that it had a role to play in the area of cultural diversity and education. Notwithstanding the fact that education was an area of provincial jurisdiction, federal officials found several ways of gaining a foothold in the area. The Education Division of Dominion Bureau of Statistics filled a role that no existing organization could and provided a useful service to educational authorities. Key figures in the field of education were invited to advise federal agencies. Officials from several federal agencies helped to create and sustain the Canadian Council of Education for Citizenship. The Bureau of Public Information, Wartime Information Board and later the Citizenship Division used the Council as an intermediary between themselves and the provinces. Finally, federal agencies limited their participation in education to areas in which they had some
legitimate claim. The federal claim to jurisdiction in the area of cultural diversity and education was its responsibility for citizenship and naturalization.

During much of this period "citizenship" was broadly defined. It included anything that was related to creating an understanding of democratic principles, creating a feeling of patriotism, or developing an inclusive definition of "Canadianism". Many of the federal government's initiatives in citizenship education were in the "grey areas" of education - public education and adult education. Yet even in these areas federal officials sought to work with organizations like the Council of Education for Citizenship or the Canadian Association for Adult Education in order to implement programmes. In part this was done to ensure that educators would be involved in the development of initiatives like Citizens' Forum or the publication of educational materials. I believe that this practice also allowed the federal government to work in the field with less fear of incrimination from the provinces.

These partnerships, particularly with seemingly non-governmental organizations like the Council, afforded federal officials opportunities to influence policy development in some creative ways. As members of, or advisors to, an organization, federal officials routinely influenced policy development within the organization. This allowed them to develop policy and programs that would complement or extend the work of their own agencies. As funding agencies they were in a position to suggest
or actually write funding proposals that the organization would then send to their agency. In this way they could challenge existing limits on their spheres of activity or their budgets. By establishing relationships with the members of an organization, officials could help to draft recommendations for new directions in government policy. This established that there was an external constituency of some stature calling for the change.

As the War came to an end, suspicions surrounding the political motives and sympathies of those who advocated a broad definition of citizenship coupled with a political will to pass a Canadian Citizenship Act led to a narrowing of the concept of citizenship education. "Citizenship" was coming to be associated only with immigrants and naturalization. And so the stage was set for the next phase in policy development in cultural diversity and education.
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CHAPTER 5
CITIZENSHIP AS NATURALIZATION

Introduction

The great legacy of the War from the perspective of cultural diversity was the focus on the need for tolerance among different ethnocultural groups. Hitler had provided for the world an extreme example of the consequences of ethnic intolerance. This caused other nations, including Canada, to reflect on the need to protect the rights of minorities. As a result, in 1948, the newly created world body, the United Nations introduced the International Declaration of Human Rights, to which Canada became a somewhat reluctant signatory.

The place of ethnocultural groups in Canadian society was affected by changes at the international level. The focus with regard to the former Axis powers was rehabilitation and reintegration into the new world order. The former colonies of the Indian subcontinent gained their independence in 1947. These changes coupled with the new emphasis on human rights led the Canadian government to reconsider its treatment of minority groups and eventually reinstate the franchise for Canadians of origins in Asia. In addition, special measures were enacted to allow for limited immigration for people from Asia.

In the immediate post-war era the focus of cultural diversity policy shifted from those ethnic groups already in the country to newcomers who would be arriving as a result of changes to the immigration policy. The central concern of the citizenship
policy became naturalization. Consequently, cultural diversity policy became preoccupied with the question of immigrant assimilation. Education was identified as the main vehicle through which immigrant assimilation was to be achieved. The struggle during this period was to establish a base for the Citizenship Branch and to legitimize its claim to involvement in education. The major challenges to the Branch came from within the federal bureaucracy and the course of policy development in cultural diversity and education from the end of World War II to 1952 was defined by the Branch's responses to these challenges.

The Citizenship Act

As the War drew to a close, interest in issues of Canadian identity was increasing. The need to respond to this sentiment gave the federal government a strong political and symbolic rationale to introduce the Canadian Citizenship Act (1947). On a practical level, the Act also fulfilled three other needs: it brought together under one statute the various statements on naturalization, it created a means by which to address the assimilation of newcomers, and it provided a focus for the work of the Citizenship Branch and the Council of Education for Citizenship.

As we have seen in the previous chapter, work to prepare the way for the Citizenship Act began with the England Report. Robert England had met with the Council in the spring of 1944 and had worked with members of that organization to write recommendations
on citizenship and immigrants. These recommendations were later incorporated into the England Report and taken up by Frank Foulds after he was appointed director of the Citizenship Division of the Department of National War Services. Paul Martin, who was named Secretary of State in April 1945, must have been well aware of these developments because, even before the Branch was transferred to his department, he enlisted the aid of the agency in the development of the Citizenship Bill. Not surprisingly then, the Citizenship Bill incorporated the major recommendations of the England Report.

The Citizenship Bill was initially introduced in October 1945 during the first session of the 20th parliament. As that session was rather short, the bill died on the order paper. It was reintroduced within five days of the opening of the second session and was passed in June 1946. The first Canadian Citizenship Act was officially proclaimed on July 1, 1946 to come into effect January 1, 1947.

The debate on the bill was significant in setting the tone for developments in cultural diversity and education. During this debate Paul Martin stipulated the government's position on cultural diversity, offered a definition of citizenship and proposed a role for the federal government in cultural diversity and education. He suggested that cultural pluralism was an important aspect of Canadian identity. As he put it:

Fortune has placed this country in the position where its people do not speak the same language and do not adore God at the same altar. Our task is to mould these elements into one community
without destroying the richness of any of those cultural sources from which our people have sprung. (Martin in National Identity Task Force 1991, 13).

His definition of citizenship as "...the right to full partnership in the fortunes and future of this nation," (Martin in National Identity Task Force, p.12) was, in effect, a statement of the principle of equality and full participation that has since become a cornerstone of the Canadian multiculturalism policy. He also stated that the bill would require new citizens to learn about the responsibilities and privileges of Canadian citizenship and that the federal government's role was to ensure the availability of "...properly prepared material prepared perhaps by non-governmental organizations who [sic] have the sanctions of educational authorities." (Martin in National Identity Task Force, p.11). Thus, the debate on the Citizenship Bill was also very much a debate on cultural diversity and education policy.

The implications of being involved in the area of education were not lost on the other members of the House. Several speakers, including Martin himself, noted that education was a provincial responsibility and that the federal government should consider implementing its plans in the area of citizenship education in consort with the provinces (National Identity Task Force, pp.25-27). Commenting on this issue Martin set forth a three-pronged strategy which outlined the avenues of federal involvement in cultural diversity and education throughout this period. First, the government would work with and through non-
governmental organizations involved in citizenship education; second, it would confer with the provincial ministries of education on the establishment of programs; and third, it would assist in the publication and distribution of materials which it would ask educational authorities to use. The arguments must have satisfied the Members of Parliament because, when the Citizenship Act was adopted, it included a provision which authorized the Secretary of State to "...take measures to provide facilities to enable applicants for certificates of citizenship to receive instruction in the responsibilities and privileges of Canadian citizenship," (National Identity Task Force, p.9). The provision gave the Citizenship Branch and Council of Education for Citizenship a focus for their activities and a basis for maintaining their relationship. In addition, it justified continued federal involvement in cultural diversity and education. But the legislation alone did not ensure the continued existence and growth of the Branch and the Council.

The Branch's Struggle to Establish Position

Part of the myth of the establishment of the Branch states that James Gardiner and J.T. Thorson, the first two ministers of the Department of National War Services, went to Mackenzie King in 1944 with the proposal to establish the Branch. King is supposed to have agreed to the proposal on the condition that the Branch's mandate include working with the wave of immigrants that were expected to arrive after the War and giving "...leadership
in the integration of those immigrants into Canadian life."³

Whether or not this conversation took place, the fact that Martin engaged the services of the Branch even before it was transferred to the Department of Secretary of State indicates that the mission of the Branch was known. Even with King's supposed anointing of the Branch as lead agency in immigrant integration and the adoption of the Citizenship Act, there were still obstacles to overcome before the Branch could be confirmed in this role. The Branch had to create a legitimate niche for itself in an area in which several government departments were already working.

Initially, the Branch attempted to address the situation by focussing on establishing its role in the field of education. As I have already noted, from its inception in 1944, the Branch began working closely with the Council on the development of proposals in the area of citizenship education for adult immigrants. It took part in activities such as the Canadian Association for Adult Education's 1946 conference of non-government educators⁴. In 1947, the Branch held a meeting with provincial deputy ministers of education to determine the division of responsibilities in citizenship education⁵ and asked the Canadian Education Association to propose a curriculum for citizenship education for adult immigrants that could be implemented across the country⁶. Also in 1947, the Branch studied the situation regarding immigrant education in Canada and suggested a role for itself in developing materials and assisting
immigrants on a one-to-one basis as they made the initial adjustment to Canada. But the Branch was largely unsuccessful in its earliest attempts to establish its place because there was antagonism toward the Branch and its work from within the federal government.

Within the Department of the Secretary of State, the Branch appears to have had to contend with one or more senior bureaucrats blocking the development and implementation of the Branch's programs. From 1945 onward, Frank Foulds was working with the Council to submit a proposal to develop a series of booklets which were central to the Branch's plans in the field of citizenship education. By October 1945, the executive of the Council had met with Paul Martin. Martin, who later, during the debate on the Citizenship Bill, indicated that he believed volunteer organizations had an important role to play in citizenship education, must have given the Council executive reason to believe the organization would receive support from his Department because the executive decided at the association's annual meeting on October 19, 1945 to write a letter to the Department requesting funds. The Council did not, however, receive support from the Department of the Secretary of State that year. The following year, the Council, on the advice of Foulds, again approached the Department of the Secretary of State for support. This time, instead of conferring with the Secretary of State himself, the executive spoke with the Under Secretary of State. Following discussions with the Under Secretary of
State, the members of the executive felt confident that their organization would receive the support they requested. But the 1946 budget estimates for the Department did not include an amount for the Council. Once again in 1947, the Council negotiated with the Department. This time it was with the newly appointed Secretary of State, Colin Gibson. They reached an agreement, the Council carried out a project, but the promised funding did not materialize. Foulds was on record as having said he wished to establish the Council as a parallel non-government organization to the Branch. Both Secretaries of State had expressed support for the involvement of the Council in citizenship education. The interference with the funding arrangements thus seems to have originated within the Department at a level somewhere between the Branch and the Minister and may have been an attempt to undermine the Branch's efficacy in program delivery. This opposition may have come from the Under Secretary of State, E.H. Coleman, who was on record as being opposed to the Citizenship legislation because he believed it would weaken Canada's ties to Britain (Martin 1983, 437).

There was also opposition to the Branch from at least one other significant federal department. When the Branch came upon the scene there were already four federal government departments with some involvement in immigration matters. The Department of Mines and Resources housed the Immigration Branch which was responsible for administering policy on admission of immigrants. The Department of Health and Welfare established and administered
policy on health and social assistance to immigrants and refugees. The Department of Labour prepared immigrants for the labour force. The Department of External Affairs distributed materials to potential immigrants abroad and handled immigration inquiries through its embassies. Of the four, two, Mines and Resources and Labour, had some claim on the area the Branch was trying to make its own. Mines and Resources was involved with initial reception of immigrants and in the preparation and distribution of basic English texts and materials on adjusting to life in Canada. Labour provided English language classes for some groups of workers and refugees. While Mines and Resources was favourably disposed to the Branch taking the lead in the area of immigrant integration, Labour felt that it was better placed to assume this role.

As a result of the opposition it faced both within and outside of its own Department, the Branch was unable to accomplish much of what it had planned to do in citizenship education in 1946 and 1947. It appears that the Branch consequently diverted some of its energies to addressing the obstacles. This it did in two ways: it worked to make its chief non-government ally, the Council of Education for Citizenship, a more powerful and important organization, and it helped institute an interdepartmental committee on citizenship that allowed the Branch to circumvent its detractors.
The Reincarnation of the Council

With the end of the War the Council became concerned about its future. Having been established during the War to provide a link between the federal government's information service and provincial education authorities, the Council's major focus in 1945 was to lobby for the continuation of a federal information agency. In a brief submitted to the federal government the Council characterized itself as an agency involved in mass education and gave itself credit for "...building up a national network of communications to educational groups." It urged the federal government to maintain its part of the communications network, the Wartime Information Board, and to provide financial support to voluntary organizations involved in mass education. Although the Wartime Information Board did continue to function through the 1945-1946 fiscal year as the Canadian Information Service, the government's ultimate decision was to disband the agency. This left the Council in need of a government "partner". It was at this point that the Council turned its full attention to the Citizenship Branch and the Department of the Secretary of State.

Although the Council was not yet ready to make immigrant issues the focus of its work, it did undertake a series of actions in 1945 that continued to build its profile as an agency involved in this area. In the brief to the government, the Council listed its work with the Branch as one of fourteen areas in which it was working. As the year began, the Council was
actively working on issues of cultural diversity through a small Committee on Citizenship Training for New Canadians. This committee had originally been struck during the meeting with Robert England in 1944 for the purpose of drafting the recommendations on naturalization and had consisted of three people: England; H.M. Tory, chair of the Council; and G.E. Trueman of the B.C. Security Commission. Of the three, only Tory was actually a member of the Council.

After Frank Foulds was appointed director of the Citizenship Division, he became a member of this committee and helped organize a conference on citizenship training for naturalization. It was a small meeting bringing together sixteen individuals, six of whom were federal government officials. As a result of the discussion at the conference, the committee recommended that a representative of the Council meet with the Under Secretary of State to discuss suggestions for a naturalization ceremony and that the Council begin preparing five pamphlets that would be used as texts in citizenship training for naturalization. The latter suggestion was in direct response to Foulds's announcement at the conference that his agency had funds available to support such an endeavour. The recommendations were accepted by the Executive Committee. The role of the committee on citizenship training for naturalization was expanded at the Council's annual meeting in October 1945 the Council adopted a motion, moved by F.S. Rivers of Ontario Education and seconded by Foulds, to have a committee study the
best methods of teaching newcomers. The Council subsequently decided to send a letter to the Branch asking for funds for some aspects of the work they had done in 1945\textsuperscript{23}. Thus, throughout 1945 the Council, under the direction of government officials, was creating a role for itself in immigrant education.

The next two years were difficult ones for the Council. The government information service disappeared and with it the Council's only source of federal funds. The Council changed its name in 1946 to the Canadian Citizenship Council in preparation for its new role as the Branch's parallel non-government organization and made applications for funding to the Secretary of State in 1946 and 1947. The requests were rejected. In addition, during this same period, the chair of the Council, H. M. Tory, passed away and the vice-chair was posted overseas\textsuperscript{24}. The organization managed to continue to exist thanks to a grant from the Carnegie Foundation and the efforts of a small group of people chief among whom were John Robbins of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and Frank Foulds of the Citizenship Branch\textsuperscript{25}.

Foulds's primary contribution to the Council in 1946-1947 was to help it build and maintain a profile in the area of naturalization. I have already noted that he directed the work of the committee on citizenship training for naturalization. He clearly planned to recommend funds for the Council on the basis of the proposals put forward by this committee. When the funds did not materialize he apparently arranged for the Council to organize the official ceremonies to mark the coming into force of
the Citizenship Act. While this project did not carry with it any funds, it did publicly give the Council stature as the central non-governmental body working in citizenship. Foulds also made certain that the Council was kept apprised of the plans of the Branch and helped shape the plans of the Council so that they would be complementary to those of his Branch. At the executive committee meeting in September 1946, for example, he presented a report on the plans of the Branch and suggested that the Council take on preparation of two of the three publications the Branch was going to need in order to do its work.

John Robbins, who was still head of the Education Division of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, continued to serve as the executive secretary of the Council until 1948. He guided the Council to its post-war position as the national coordinating body on immigrant issues by subtly and overtly redirecting the Council's attention to this field. He reinforced the notion that the Council had a major influence on the development of the naturalization legislation by circulating a copy of the Citizenship Bill to Council members with a note saying that the Bill included the main suggestions of the Council. In 1946, it was he who suggested that the Council shorten its name to the Canadian Citizenship Council in order that the organization be better able to "...pursue [its] objects with less likelihood of concern about possible interference or encroachment on the part of those formally and officially responsible for education under the constitution of our country." Finally, it was Robbins who
met with the Secretary of State, Colin Gibson, in September 1947 after the second funding application was rejected. It was at this meeting that Gibson suggested that, if the Council reorganized with a focus on immigrant issues, established an office, hired permanent staff, and succeeded in getting the support of the Montreal Board of Trade, the Secretary of State would provide a grant of $5,000 for 1947 and $10,000 for 1948. Robbins immediately hired an assistant, John Kidd, and started organizing a conference on citizenship and immigrant issues which took place in Montreal in January 1948.

The 1948 conference was an important turning point for the Council. Organizations as different in focus as the Canadian National Committee on Refugees and the Montreal Board of Trade had suggested to the government that there was a need for a national body to coordinate work in the area of immigrant integration. The Branch saw the conference as the first step in establishing this national body. Having organized the event with the support of both the Branch and the Montreal Board of Trade, the Council presented itself as the most likely organization to take on this coordinating role. Representatives of over 90 bodies attended the event and recommended that the Council establish a national office for the purpose of planning and coordinating matters of training and services to new immigrants. With this recommendation the main government and non-government agencies working in the field of immigrant integration and education legitimized the Council's claim to a
central role in this field.

The reinvigorated Council was also now in a position to be a more powerful ally for the Branch. As such, it played a significant role in the creation of the body that finally enabled the Branch to flourish.

The Advisory Committee on Citizenship

The story of the Advisory Committee on Citizenship began in October 1947 when Senator Cairine Wilson, in her capacity as the chair of the National Committee on Refugees wrote to H.L. Keenleyside, Deputy Minister of Mines and Resources, saying that her organization felt there was a need for some agency within the federal government to take responsibility for coordinating the efforts of governmental and nongovernmental agencies working in immigrant settlement. She suggested that the Immigration Branch of Mines and Resources take on this task. While Keenleyside did not wish his department to play the lead role in a committee of this sort, the idea of a committee obviously appealed to him as he began to champion it within the bureaucracy.

Keenleyside's immediate response to Wilson's letter was to write to his counterparts in the Departments of Secretary of State, Health and Welfare, and Labour to inform them of her suggestion. He was generally in agreement with her proposal but felt that the duty of chairing the committee should go to either Health and Welfare or the Citizenship Branch. Of the three
departments to whom he wrote, only Labour responded. The Deputy Minister of Labour, A. MacNamara, took the position that while the tasks Wilson and Keenleyside outlined needed to be accomplished, there was already a vehicle through which this could be done. He believed that the interdepartmental Labour Committee, which was already concerned with the settlement of "displaced persons", should simply broaden its mandate and membership.

Keenleyside was unwilling to let the idea of a committee fade way or be taken over by Labour. In December 1947 he wrote to Health and Welfare and Secretary of State once again to ask for a response to his earlier letter. This time the Under Secretary of State, E.H. Coleman, wrote back to say that his department did not wish to pursue the matter until the reorganization of the Citizenship Council had been completed at the meeting to be held in Montreal in conjunction with the 1948 conference. Keenleyside, too, appears to have decided to wait until after that event to continue on his quest to establish a committee.

The significance of chairing such a committee could not have escaped any of the deputy ministers. The department charged with this responsibility would be considered the principal department in the area of immigrant integration and this designation would likely be accompanied by additional resources. In light of this, the lack of response from Health and Welfare could be interpreted as lack of interest in taking on such a role. The decision of Secretary of State to wait until after the Council reorganization
could be interpreted in several ways. The Under Secretary of State could have been waiting to see if the "new and improved" Council would be in a position to take on the role. It is also possible that he believed that the Council would emerge from the conference as the central nongovernmental body in the area. Given the relationship between the Council and the Branch, this would put the Secretary of State in a stronger position to make a claim on the chair of an interdepartmental committee on immigrant integration. A third possibility is that Coleman, like the deputy ministers of Health and Welfare, was not interested in instituting such a committee and was simply using the reorganization of the Council as an excuse to not respond to Keenleyside's proposal. In view of the events following the Council conference, it appears that the third interpretation is most likely.

It was not until March 1948 that Keenleyside once again took up the banner of the interdepartmental committee. This time his argument was based on the discussions which took place at the Montreal conference. He noted that as a result of the conference, the Council was preparing to assume a central role in immigrant settlement. He believed there was a need for the federal government to form an interdepartmental committee which would coordinate federal initiatives in the area and liaise with the Council and other national organizations working in the field. This time he specified that the Branch should chair the committee. Once more, only Labour responded to the letter.
MacNamara's response to Keenleyside's latest proposal was to say that perhaps the federal government should wait until the provinces had a chance to become actively involved in the area. It could well be that MacNamara's true interest lay in seeing that no new committee was formed so that the interdepartmental Labour Committee could position itself as the only interdepartmental committee working in this area. The silence from Health and Welfare may have been born of disinterest or indifference but the lack of response from Secretary of State was curious to say the least.

The new context within which Keenleyside presented his proposal gave Coleman a perfect opportunity to stake a claim for his department's leadership in this area. Coleman chose not to take it. Had he been of the opinion that the Council could act as a coordinating committee it seems likely that he would have written to Keenleyside to say this. Instead, his lack of response seems to indicate that he did not want to prolong the discussion on this issue and that he was truly not interested in the prospect of participating in such a committee. In other words, he did not want his department, and specifically the Citizenship Branch, to take a prominent role in immigrant integration. If this is true, then Coleman, who had been opposed to the Citizenship Act from the outset (Martin, p.437), may have continued to express his opposition by blocking the Branch in its attempts to establish itself in this field.

The next time the issue of the committee was raised it
originated not with Keenleyside but H.D.G. Crerar, the new chair of the Citizenship Council and a well-respected member of the Canadian military who had just returned from leading a mission to Japan to assist the Canadian government formulate its views on the Japanese Peace Settlement. In June 1948, Crerar sent a letter to J.A. MacKinnon, the Minister of Mines and Resources proposing the establishment of an interdepartmental committee on citizenship, which, in structure and function, was almost identical to the committee that had been proposed by Keenleyside in March. The proposal was discussed by the Cabinet Committee on Immigration at its meeting on June 16, 1948. Following the meeting, both the Minister of Labour, H. Mitchell, and the Secretary of State, Colin Gibson, wrote to MacKinnon. Mitchell echoed his deputy minister saying that there was no need for yet another interdepartmental committee in this area. Gibson, on the other hand, wrote to express support for the proposal and to suggest the departments in question meet to discuss the mechanics of organizing such a committee.

On September 15, 1948, the Secretary of State submitted a memorandum to Cabinet requesting approval for the establishment of an interdepartmental committee on citizenship. The proposal called for a committee, composed of one representative from each of the departments of Secretary of State, Labour, Health and Welfare, Mines and Resources, and from the Citizenship Council, and the Canadian Welfare Council:

...to advise the Government on matters pertaining to the establishment of new settlers, their
assimilation, and instruction in the responsibilities of citizenship, and to coordinate the activities of the various Departments and organizations engaged in this work.\textsuperscript{42}

The memorandum went forward with the support of the Ministers of Mines and Resources and Health and Welfare. And it was Frank Foulds rather than E.H. Coleman who communicated with the deputy ministers of these departments about the preparation of the document\textsuperscript{43}. Cabinet decided to add the Department of Veterans' Affairs to the committee and left the decision about how to include non-governmental bodies to the committee. It also specified that the committee would advise government through the Secretary of State\textsuperscript{44}.

The Advisory Committee on Citizenship, as the body was called, met frequently throughout the rest of 1948 and 1949 and made important policy, program, and resource recommendations which allowed the Branch to finally begin its work in education in earnest. Many of these recommendations originated with the Branch and had actually been advanced by the Branch in 1946 and 1947 but it was not until the suggestions had the weight of the Advisory Committee behind them that the Branch was able to put its plans into effect. It seems that the Branch recognized it would need this support and helped to engineer the membership of the Advisory Committee in such a way as to ensure the support would be there.

Although the proposal had specified the Advisory Committee should consist of one member of each of the concerned departments, the first meeting had three representatives from the
Secretary of State: the Minister, the Under Secretary of State, and Frank Foulds. Although the Secretary of State, Colin Gibson, would not attend future meetings, a second member of the Branch staff, Constance Hayward, did become a regular participant. Gibson, acting as chair for the inaugural session, suggested the committee invite the chairs of the Citizenship Council and Canadian Welfare Council to participate in future meetings. The committee agreed but, in deference to MacNamara's objections to making non-governmental bodies members of an interdepartmental committee, the Committee determined it would ask the chairs of these two organizations to sit as advisors. Foulds suggested that the Canadian Education Association, which at the time was "...an association of provincial deputy ministers of education, superintendents of education, and the principals of some Normal Schools," also be invited to sit on the Committee\(^5\). Some members of the Committee were uncertain whether the Canadian Education Association, with its strong ties to provincial governments, would wish to participate and so authorized Foulds to approach the chair of this organization unofficially before they agreed to issue an invitation. Foulds did this and by the fourth meeting of the Committee in February 1949, the Canadian Education Association was also an advisory member of the Advisory Committee\(^6\). Although the members from the non-governmental bodies were technically only "advisors", in fact, they participated fully in the discussions of the Advisory Committee and, whether or not they actually voted, they influenced the
major decisions of the Committee. Thus it was that the Branch helped to ensure that its supporters outnumbered its detractors on the Advisory Committee. In the process, it had also created a means by which two of the major educational organizations of the day were able to directly influence the decisions of the federal government with regard to policy and programs in cultural diversity and education.

The Advisory Committee met frequently throughout the remainder of 1948 and 1949. In this time it was responsible for a series of recommendations that set the tone for federal work in immigrant integration. Three of these recommendations, in particular, also shaped policy on cultural diversity and education. At its first meeting the Advisory Committee authorized Foulds to begin work with Ontario Education and the CBC on a series of radio broadcasts aimed at informing Canadians of the reality of the lives of immigrants. At the fourth meeting a decision was made to recommend that the Branch be given adequate resources to provide provincial departments of education with language and citizenship materials. During the fifth meeting the Advisory Committee recommended the establishment of five positions for regional citizenship counsellors. Each of these recommendations carried with it an allocation of additional resources to the Branch and sanctioned three primary methods of fulfilling the Branch's mandate: funding projects, developing and distributing resources, and direct involvement with educational organizations.
Funding the Work of Other Organizations

When the Advisory Committee endorsed the Branch's involvement in the radio broadcast project, two doors were opened for the Branch. Until the Advisory Committee recommended that the Branch work with Ontario Education and the CBC, the Branch had been unsuccessful in obtaining grant dollars for projects it wished to support. This recommendation helped clear the way for the Branch to get an annual grants budget in order "to provide additional facilities for citizenship instruction."50 The recommendation also helped to broaden the definition of citizenship education to include projects designed to increase understanding between immigrants and non-immigrants.

The first, and, initially the only, non-governmental organization to benefit from the Branch's new status as a funding agency was the Citizenship Council. The Council received a grant of about $5,500 in 1948-49 and $10,000 per year for each of the next three years51. The first of these grants went to support the Council's Immigrant Education program which was initiated in September 1948. The impetus for establishing the program came from the Montreal conference52. The delegates at the conference felt there was a need for someone to develop standardized methods and materials for teaching adult immigrants. As part of this work, John Kidd, who was appointed executive secretary of the Council shortly after the conference, travelled to the West to speak with people working in the area. The report he made to the executive committee when he returned from this trip in August...
1948 noted that there was, in fact, a lack of uniformity in content and methods among those teaching adult immigrants and thus a need for a body with a national mandate to begin work in this area. In addition, he indicated that, while the groups involved in this work also recognized this need, they were reluctant to work with the federal government. The Council was the logical organization to establish a suitable program. The following month Florence Gaynor, who had been working with the adult education section of the Saskatchewan Department of Education joined the staff of the Council and the Council, with the assistance of the Branch, established its Immigrant Language and Teaching Program.

The Council created a Committee on Immigrant Education to oversee the development of policy and projects within Gaynor's program and asked Frank Foulds to sit as a member of that committee. Gaynor began immediately to develop materials and workshops for teachers of immigrants and to provide a consulting service to provincial departments of education. Over the eight years the program was in existence, Gaynor worked with the departments of education of all ten provinces, a variety of federal government departments and agencies, educational institutions, individual teachers, and voluntary organizations. Although the funding for the program came primarily from the Branch and was therefore officially earmarked for adult education, Gaynor also developed materials for and worked with teachers of immigrant children.
In addition to the Immigrant Education program, from 1949 to 1952 the Branch's funds supported the Council's involvement in Citizens' Forum, which, as I noted in the previous chapter, was designed to address citizenship issues with all Canadians. The Council's involvement in the project was limited to receiving money from the Branch which it would then turn over to the Canadian Association for Adult Education to pay for the production of the pamphlets which were used as discussion guides.

In sum, the Branch used its grants for extending its mandate in cultural diversity and education well beyond citizenship instruction for naturalization. The Immigrant Education project gave the Branch a way of becoming involved in teacher training and in the education of children. The support to the Ontario Education/CBC project and Citizens' Forum gave it a foothold in the education of mainstream Canadians on the issues of immigration and intergroup understanding.

Development and Distribution of Materials

From the outset, Frank Foulds had seen a need for the development of educational materials and had envisaged a role for the Branch in this area. Initially he had focussed on materials for citizenship instruction but, by 1947, he had broadened his notion of preparation for citizenship to include language instruction. A paper prepared by the Branch in 1947 noted:

Converting the Immigrant into a Canadian, is a two-fold project involving -
i) Formal Education, i.e. reading, writing and speaking of English or French, in addition to the elementary study of Canadian history, resources and government.

ii) Education for Citizenship, i.e. acclimatising him/her to and acquainting him/her with the habits, customs and institutions of Canada.

Within this extended notion of citizenship education, the Branch had seen its role as preparing and distributing graded literature on Canada which could be used as practice readers in adult English classes across the country. In other words, it had begun to envisage a limited role for itself in the area of language instruction. This move was a direct result of the meeting with the Deputy Ministers of Education in 1947. The provincial authorities were not very interested in instruction for naturalization but were very worried about the financial burden they would be forced to assume in language instruction. The Under Secretary of State steadfastly refused to fund the provinces directly but did agree to distribute English as a Second Language textbooks free of charge to the provinces.

By the time the Advisory Committee met in September 1948, the Branch had received from the Canadian Education Association its proposed syllabus for citizenship education for naturalization, which reiterated the need for graded language materials on Canada, and was still waiting for some indication about how it should proceed in this area. A discussion of policy on training for immigrants appeared on the Advisory Committee's first agenda. The Committee used the opportunity to ask Mines and
Resources and Labour to prepare memoranda on their respective department's involvement in the area. Once it had received this information, the Committee decided to recommend to Treasury Board that the Branch be given an allocation sufficient to provide to the provinces teaching aids for citizenship training for immigrants.

In the end, the Branch provided not only the citizenship publications that it produced but also copies of the basic English text, Learning the English Language. The decision to purchase and supply these textbooks was part of a compromise reached between the Branch and the departments of education. As the Secretary of State explained to the Senate committee on immigration:

Some provinces suggested that as the Dominion government had brought these people [immigrants] to this country it should be responsible for the additional expense in training them. We felt that we could not make cash grants to the provinces for this purpose, and after discussions with representatives of the departments of education we undertook to make educational material available to the provinces.62

These materials were also a means of entry into other aspects of education. Although they were designed for adult immigrants, the materials were being used in elementary and secondary schools as well. Officials of the Branch were apparently making the citizenship booklets available to elementary and secondary teachers, always stressing that "...these booklets, although they may fill a great gap, should only be used as supplementary material."63
The materials, then, represented an admission on the part of the federal government that it had some responsibility in the area of education for immigrants and provided a second means through which the Branch expanded its mandate past the borders of preparation for naturalization.

**Regional Liaison Officers**

When the Branch first suggested the creation of regional positions in 1947, the positions were to be called "citizenship counsellors" and the individuals filling these roles were to be primarily responsible for helping newcomers "...make the necessary psychological adjustment to Canadian living and Canadian Government before any formal education is started." When the issue came to the Advisory Committee the role of the counsellors was envisaged as "...a channel of information and advice upon matters relating to the assimilation of immigrants, and...liaison in this field between Federal Government Departments and local organizations and societies." Originally, then, these regional officers were not destined to be involved in education but circumstances surrounding the recommendation of the positions changed this.

The Advisory Committee first discussed the regional positions at the third meeting but the decision to recommend the establishment of five such positions did not come until the fifth meeting. Significantly there was no representative from the Department of Labour at the fifth meeting. Labour must have put
forward some objections to the proposal because in August 1949, the Under Secretary of State, C. Stein, wrote to an official of the Treasury Board to explain in detail how the proposed positions differed from Labour's National Employment Service officers. The Employment Services officers were deemed to have responsibility for ensuring that newcomers were placed in proper employment while the proposed citizenship officers would be responsible for carrying out the work of the Branch at the regional and local levels. This work was seen to include anything pertaining to the newcomer's "...formal education and training for citizenship; his[her] social and cultural re-adjustment in new surroundings, and ... his[her] acceptance in the community as an individual worthy and entitled to enjoy the full rights of Canadian citizenship." Stein argued that the regional officers would simply extend the existing facilities of the Branch by providing provincial departments of education and voluntary organizations on-going contact with an officer of the Branch. On September 9, 1949, Treasury Board approved the creation of two positions for regional liaison officers and the Under Secretary of State subsequently decided to transfer one of the liaison positions from Ottawa to Toronto.

Once the regional officers were settled into their positions they did have significant contact with local and regional education authorities. They provided citizenship materials to schools, spoke to groups of teachers and to parent-teacher organizations, conferred with school board and department of
education officials on the establishment of citizenship and language classes, and participated in local education organizations. The regional officers, thus, became the third vehicle through which the educational work of the Branch was expanded beyond citizenship instruction to immigrants.

Summary

The period from 1945 to 1952 was, for the Citizenship Branch, a time to establish itself and become legitimately involved in the field of education. Once the Citizenship Act was adopted in 1946, the Branch had the authority to work in the area of citizenship education for adult immigrants. There was some hesitancy on the part of elected officials to enter this field as it was seen as a possible encroachment on an area of provincial jurisdiction. Nevertheless, the Act passed and the Branch had its official mandate.

The Branch planned a program of activities to begin to carry out its new mandate but resistance from within the Department of the Secretary of State and from the Department of Labour kept it from achieving its objectives. As a result, the Branch focussed on helping its primary non-governmental ally, the Citizenship Council, to establish itself firmly in the centre of the immigrant education movement. The Council was then in a position to work with the Branch's supporters within the federal government to institute the Advisory Committee, a body which finally allowed the Branch to accomplish some of the tasks it had
set out for itself.

The Branch's work in education truly began with the inauguration of the Advisory Committee. The committee itself became a vehicle through which two major educational organizations, one of which represented provincial departments of education, were able to participate in making decisions on federal policy in cultural diversity and education. The decisions made by the Committee had the effect of extending the mandate of the Branch beyond that which it had been given on paper. By 1952, the policy of the Branch in the area of education, which was officially limited to involvement in preparation of adult immigrants for naturalization, in reality encompassed working with teachers of adults and children; developing and distributing materials in citizenship, language, and intergroup understanding for adults and children; and working directly with local and provincial educational authorities to establish citizenship and language education programs.
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CHAPTER 6
CITIZENSHIP AND INTEGRATION

Introduction

The 1950s were a time of relative prosperity and growth for Canada and a time when the federal government saw expanded role for itself in the life of the nation. The increased federal presence was particularly evident in the areas of health care and culture. Interest in health care was part of a larger interest in ensuring the establishment of a welfare state in which all citizens would be entitled to basic levels of personal security and care. The concern about culture grew out of the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences (1949). The Commission's report, tabled in 1951, suggested that a distinctive Canadian culture would not survive and grow without significant support from the federal government.

In addition, during this period, the Conservative party, under John Diefenbaker, came to power after twenty-two years of Liberal governments. In terms of cultural diversity this event was significant for three reasons. First, Diefenbaker was the first Prime Minister of origins other than English or French. Second, one of the early promises of the government was to review the immigration policy with a view to increasing the levels of immigration to the country. The government was not able to introduce such changes but in its second term it did pass an amendment to the Immigration Act that eliminated discrimination on the basis of race in the selection of immigrants. Third, in
1960, the Diefenbaker government introduced the Bill of Rights, the first major national legislation on human rights and fundamental freedoms.

The period from 1952 to 1963 was one of great change and growth for the Citizenship Branch. The momentum for growth began to build in 1950 when citizenship graduated from being associated with a small and rather insignificant branch within the Department of the Secretary of State to being one half of the mandate of the new Department of Citizenship and Immigration. The Branch was confirmed in its role as the lead federal agency working in the area of immigrant integration. The Branch no longer had to fight for status within the federal bureaucracy and so could turn its full attention outward. Its new responsibilities in integration allowed it to continue and expand its involvement in immigrant and intergroup relations education. In the process, the Branch created for itself a more central position in the field of cultural diversity and education in Canada.

The Policy of Integration

The term "integration" was already in use by 1947 when J. Roby Kidd noted that Canada had rejected the "melting pot" approach in favour of "cultural pluralism". The goal for Canadian society, he said, was "unity in diversity". People working in the field of citizenship preferred to describe their work with immigrants as "integration" rather than "assimilation" because
they felt that "assimilation" signified a process in which people were forced to give up who they were to become like the majority in the host country. "Integration", on the other hand, meant urging newcomers to adapt to the "Canadian way of life" without renouncing their cultural heritage (Canadian Citizenship Council 1949). People working with immigrants were firmly committed to the ideals of liberal democratic citizenship and so recoiled at the thought of forcing anyone to enter into a process that would ultimately lead to recreating immigrants in a vision of what someone else thought was "Canadian". Thus, integration became their term and goal of choice.

By 1952, federal bureaucrats were making official pronouncements about the government policy of integration. While the government also used the phrase "unity in diversity", what the government meant by integration was somewhat different than what the non-governmental organizations were advocating. In a 1952 response to a UNESCO questionnaire on the cultural assimilation of immigrants the Branch explained its policy in the following manner:

The basis of the methods adopted by the Branch is a preference for integration rather than assimilation. Assimilation is taken to mean complete absorption of individuals of one culture by a larger or more dominant culture within one society. It is a slow process, taking place over generations and the Canadian attitude is that it should take place voluntarily. In a society which upholds the worth and freedom of the individual, assimilation can neither be forced nor opposed. 

... This is a view of our society in which the cultural and ethnic identities of all groups are recognized and respected, while at the same time, all individuals are bound together in a common
Thus, the government's version of integration was voluntary assimilation which would take place over a long period of time. This same explanation of integration was repeated in government documents and correspondence produced by the Citizenship Branch throughout the 1950s.

Although the notion of respect and recognition for ethnic identities seems to contradict the goal of ultimate assimilation, officials of the Branch were able to reconcile the two parts of their policy statement. They believed that immigrants, when they first arrived in Canada, would attach themselves to their own ethnic communities. Initially this would happen because, in the midst of the strangeness of being in a foreign environment, immigrants would naturally look for the familiarity they could find with members of their own group. They would also gravitate toward their own ethnic community if they were rejected by other Canadians. In other words, the ethnic community was a refuge and a place where immigrants could feel a sense of belonging. Ethnic communities were to be respected for the comfort they provided to new immigrants and recognized as a vehicle through which immigrants could be encouraged to begin their adjustment to their new life. There was a danger, however, that newcomers and even established Canadians of ethnic origins other than British or French would want to remain separate. In order to avoid this, the Branch stressed that the role of the ethnic community was no more and no less than to help with the integration process of
immigrants and enjoined mainstream organizations to involve ethnic groups in the wider community.

This definition of integration gave the Branch clear direction for its involvement with education of immigrants and established Canadians. The mission of the Branch was to ensure immigrants chose to assimilate and ethnic groups ceased to have relevance for newcomers past the initial stages of adjustment. In order to achieve these goals newcomers had to be educated to understand and accept the Canadian way of life. At the same time, established Canadians had to be prepared to accept newcomers so that the latter would be welcomed and therefore feel a sense of belonging to the broader Canadian community. The Branch, then, would have to intensify its work in immigrant education and its role in intergroup relations education would have to become more well-defined. To effect these changes, the Branch started on a course that changed its programming and its relationship to voluntary organizations and educational authorities working in the field of citizenship education.

The Branch and the Voluntary Sector

The Deputy Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Laval Fortier, had a particular vision for the future of the field of citizenship. His goal was to divide the responsibilities in the field so that the government had one defined area of operation and voluntary organizations had another. Government, he was convinced, should have sole responsibility for immigrant
integration and non-governmental bodies should provide direction in areas of general citizenship, which included intergroup relations and leadership training. He saw a role for government, particularly the Branch, in general citizenship, but he saw no role for the voluntary sector in immigrant integration, especially not in immigrant education. In 1953, the Branch brought the Advisory Committee on Citizenship out of stasis to rally support behind two strategies that would help Fortier and the Branch to achieve their goal of dividing the field. The first strategy was for the Branch to sponsor a Seminar on Citizenship which would allow it to recast its role in the field of citizenship and the second was to change the grants policy of the Branch.

The story of the 1953 Seminar on Citizenship appears to have begun in 1952 when a number of voluntary organizations reportedly approached the Branch and said that it would be useful for them to meet with others working in the field to discuss issues of common concern. When he presented the idea of the seminar to the Advisory Committee on Citizenship, Fortier stated that from these comments, the Branch had determined the best way to address the issue would be to hold a national seminar on citizenship involving about 75 key individuals in an examination of the Branch's role in the field. In fact, it is more likely that the event was planned as an opportunity for the Branch to signal its new broadened mandate to its constituency and to begin to effect Fortier's plan of carving up the field of citizenship.
The invitations were issued by the Branch to select individuals from voluntary organizations and departments of education. Each participant was invited as an individual rather than a representative of her or his agency thereby eliminating the possibility of an agency deciding to send someone other than the person whom the Branch had chosen. Branch staff planned the event and determined the speakers, facilitators, and topics for the four discussion groups - adjustment of newcomers, leadership, research, and programs and materials. The Branch assigned each participant to one of the four discussion groups. Thus the Branch maintained tight control of the agenda, the participants, and the discussion. Not surprisingly, then, the conclusions of the participants mirrored the perspectives put forward by the Branch. When the seminar chair summarized the discussions, he noted that there were three important aspects of citizenship and citizenship education: teaching immigrants about "...the history and nature of the Canadian family so that they would know what they wanted to change or support[,],...the conditioning of old Canadians for the reception and acceptance of new Canadians, [and]... education for democracy and for the preservation of the Canadian way of life." (Canadian Citizenship Branch 1953, 156). The recommendations put forward by the seminar as a whole made it clear that there was a role for the Branch in all three areas. As a result, the Branch was able to claim that it had received support from its constituency for its new broader mandate and was able to continue to implement its plan of redirecting the work of
non-governmental organizations. The chief way in which this redirecting would be accomplished was through the use of grants.

From 1945 until 1952, the Branch had established a primary relationship with one non-governmental organization, the Canadian Citizenship Council. In part, this relationship had been maintained because, for a number of years, the Council was the only voluntary organization to receive funds from the Branch. In 1950, after the Branch was transferred to Citizenship and Immigration, Frank Foulds wrote to the Deputy Minister to suggest the time had come to reconsider how they were using their $10,000 grants budget. He pointed out that, although the entire amount was given to the Council, the Council gave $4,000 to the Canadian Association for Adult Education to support Citizens' Forum. He argued that it would be more efficient for the Branch to give the money directly to the Association for Adult Education. This point seems to have marked the beginning of the Branch's quest to change its grants policy.

In 1952, the Branch's grants allotment was increased to $30,000 and the Branch awarded grants to the Canadian Association for Adult Education, La Société canadienne d'enseignement postscolaire, and Camp Laquemac in addition to the Citizenship Council. The official purpose of the grants was still "to provide additional facilities for citizenship instruction", so the addition of these particular organizations and projects indicated that the notion of citizenship instruction had officially been broadened to include education for democracy,
leadership training, and intergroup relations.

At this point, however, there was no change to the Branch's granting procedure. The process consisted of Branch officials talking to representatives from an organization to determine an amount that would roughly cover the portion of the organization's work that related to the concerns of the Branch. The organization would carry out its work and submit an accounting to the Branch for expenses incurred. The Branch would then authorize payments to cover the expenses. It is important to note two key aspects about this process: first, the grants were made to organizations rather than to specific projects and, second, there were no restrictions on how the money could be used so payments were made to cover operational expenses as well as costs associated with particular projects.

By 1953 Branch officials were clearly dissatisfied with this process and therefore asked the Advisory Committee on Citizenship to consider the issue. It is unclear whether the Advisory Committee actually met to discuss the question but Branch officials did prepare and send to the members of the Committee a lengthy note outlining their concerns and making recommendations for changes to the Branch's grants policy. In the document they argued that, as more voluntary organizations approached the Branch for funding, the Branch needed to seriously reconsider the existing grants process. They recommended that funds be given to support specific projects rather than to support organizations and that organizations be required to
submit precise plans in advance of undertaking a project. In this way the Branch could better control where and how funds were spent. The document went on to question the wisdom of more than one federal agency giving funding for the same project and suggested that all federal funds towards a citizenship project be funnelled through the Branch. In addition, the Branch used the document to recommend that its annual allotment from Treasury Board be expanded to include an amount for research. It contended that the Research Division of the Branch, which was established to carry out research into the areas of immigrant integration, intergroup understanding, and promotion of citizenship using mass media, could no longer keep up with the demands for new information in the field. It wished to use a combination of contracts and grants to support the work of researchers outside of the Branch who were also concerned with these issues. Finally, the document contained a recommendation to institute subcommittees of the Advisory Committee to consider grant requests from both voluntary organizations and researchers. The ideas must have received some measure of support for in 1954, the Branch began to require voluntary organizations to submit detailed requests up to 18 months in advance of carrying out a project and it began to award research grants to individuals.

The change in the grants policy allowed the Branch to reorient the work of voluntary organizations away from immigrant integration towards areas of general citizenship. In terms of education, this meant moving one organization in particular, the
Citizenship Council, out of the area of immigrant education and beginning to support the work of other organizations in education to improve leadership and intergroup relations.

The Branch, the Citizenship Council, and the Association for Adult Education

As I have previously noted, the Council's relationship with the Branch was not entirely based on grants. From 1944 to 1951, the Council had had a special connection with Frank Foulds. In 1952 Foulds became ill and passed away. He was replaced as Director of the Branch by Eugene Bussière, formerly the Director of Adult Education for UNESCO. Foulds had sat as an advisor to the executive of the Council and had been an active member of some of its working committees, including the Committee on Immigrant Education. Bussière did not take on this same role in relation to the Council. In addition to Bussière, the Council found itself having to work with the Deputy Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Laval Fortier, and his assistant, Jean Boucher. Where Foulds had been invited to participate with the Council in determining the shape of its programs, Fortier, Boucher, and Bussière were seen as outsiders who tried to use their power as representatives of a funding agency to force the Council to change its direction. Through 1952 and early 1953 Fortier and Boucher told the Council what issues they should and should not write about in their newsletter, they informed the Council it had no right to criticize government policy, and they
approached the Council with a strong suggestion that it move away from the immigrant integration field and begin to concentrate on French-English relations, all of this "with a veiled threat about the $10,000."  

The situation between the two agencies was further aggravated when, at a meeting called by the Council in November 1952 to discuss its work, several voluntary organizations expressed confusion over the respective roles of the Council and the Branch. The meeting ended with the organizations affirming that the Branch was playing an important role in the citizenship area and questioning the need for the continued existence of the Council. This led the Council to reexamine its role and work. It is likely that it also intensified the feelings within the Branch that it should not be so closely linked to the Council.

Another mark of the deteriorating relationship between the two agencies was evidenced in the actions of both in relation to the 1953 Seminar. Before it approached the Advisory Committee on Citizenship, the Branch had consulted with the Council and the Canadian Association for Adult Education on the idea but, when the invitations were issued, the Council believed that the Branch had changed the purpose of the event completely from what it had initially proposed. Where the Council had understood from the consultations that the seminar would be a discussion of the work the Branch might undertake in general citizenship, the outline led them to believe that the focus had shifted to the work and
problems of voluntary organizations in all aspects of citizenship. The Council objected on principle to a government agency "stepping into the voluntary field" and it was concerned at the degree of control the Branch was exercising over the event. For its part, the Branch chose to invite only one delegate from the Council, the executive director, John Kidd, and assigned him to participate in the one discussion group in which he felt he had nothing to contribute. Branch officials also appear to have made a deliberate decision not to invite Florence Gaynor or Henry Seward who headed the Council's Immigrant Education Program and Immigrant Integration Program, respectively, and who were acknowledged as leading experts in their particular areas.

With this background, it is not surprising that the Council had a negative reaction to the new direction and the new grants policy. By the time the president of the Council was able to arrange a meeting with the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration to discuss the issue, the Council had an additional reason to be distrustful of the new policy. For the first time since the inception of the Immigrant Education Program, the Branch refused to fund the Council for Florence Gaynor's salary and, as a result, reduced the Council's overall grant. The Minister upheld his officials' decision on the Council's grant and defended the new grants policy. Thus began a period of declining financial support for the Council which resulted in the Council terminating its Immigrant Education and Immigrant Integration Programs in 1955 and redirecting its energies to
areas of general citizenship, human rights, and intergroup relations. While the Branch's relationship with the Council was disintegrating its relationship with the Canadian Association for Adult Education was beginning to blossom. The initial step in creating a stronger link with the Canadian Association for Adult Education was taken when the Branch began to give the Association an annual grant. The relationship grew as a result of both the new director and the new direction of the Branch. Prior to his work at UNESCO, Eugene Bussière had been a prominent member of la Société canadienne d'enseignement postscolaire, the French language counterpart to the Canadian Association for Adult Education. He therefore had a long history with the Association for Adult Education and its executive director, Roby Kidd. Evidence of the importance of this connection came for example in October 1952 when, a few months after he was appointed director of the Branch, Bussière spent a full three days with Kidd discussing the work of the Branch. Perhaps more important than Bussière's previous connection with the Association for Adult Education was the fact that the Association believed that "the task of adult education [was] the imaginative training for citizenship" and that "[a]ny informed approach to Canadian citizenship must recognize the need for developing and strengthening Canadian harmony..." Consequently by 1952 the Association was already involved in the areas of leadership training and intergroup relations. In short, the Canadian
Association for Adult Education's concept of citizenship and citizenship education fit very well with the Branch's new vision of the appropriate role for voluntary organizations.

By 1956, the Branch had moved all of its support to voluntary organizations away from immigrant education towards leadership training and intergroup relations education. The Citizenship Council received only $3,700, the bulk of which was for the preparation of a handbook to inform established Canadians about immigrant integration. The grants to the Association for Adult Education and la Société d'enseignement postscolaire supported the development and distribution of educational materials for adults. In addition, the Branch provided financial assistance to five separate two-week seminars on intergroup relations and to the YMCA for a leadership training project for youth (Department of Citizenship and Immigration 1957).

But moving the voluntary sector out of immigrant education was only part of Fortier's plan. The other part was to claim the area as government responsibility. This the Branch accomplished by entering into two separate federal-provincial agreements; becoming directly involved in teacher training; building on its relationships with departments of education, particularly the Ontario Department of Education; and encouraging regional liaison officers to be actively involved in education projects at the local and regional levels.
Federal-Provincial Agreements

From the time of the 1947 conference on education, the provincial authorities had been lobbying the federal government directly and through the Canadian Education Association for funding to provinces for some of the work they were undertaking in immigrant education. The provinces argued that the federal government was responsible for immigration and should, therefore, also assume responsibility for the additional costs provinces incurred in education as result of having to develop and deliver programs for immigrants. The federal authorities countered with a constitutional argument. They saw the issue as primarily one of education and were reluctant to enter into the field because it was deemed by the British North America Act to be provincial domain. Consequently, at the 1947 conference, the federal representatives agreed on a compromise position - the Branch would not give funds to the provinces but would supply textbooks and other materials to assist in citizenship and language education for adult immigrants. From 1947 to 1952, individual provinces raised the issue with the federal government and the Canadian Education Association passed a number of resolutions urging the Branch to reconsider its position but, until 1952, these went unheeded.

In 1951, the Canadian School Trustees Association added its support to the Canadian Education Association request and, the following year, the Toronto Board of Education raised the issue of federal responsibility for funding classes for adult
immigrants\textsuperscript{23}. While both of these factors may have played a part in making the Branch reconsider its position, the true catalyst for change came in the form of a challenge to the Branch's territory from its old rival, the Department of Labour.

On June 3, 1952, one of the Branch staff reported to the Deputy Minister that he had received a call from the director of training for the Department of Labour indicating that "some approach had been made to Labour looking toward their entering into the field of English classes for immigrants."\textsuperscript{24} Fortier immediately wrote to the Deputy Minister of Labour, A. MacNamara, saying that he understood that Labour was considering entering the field of English language training for immigrants. He went on to remind MacNamara that the task of providing instruction in "...language and other basic principles of citizenship to newcomers" had been assigned to the Branch\textsuperscript{25}. MacNamara responded by informing Fortier that Labour had been involved in the field since 1946 but that there was no movement afoot to increase its involvement\textsuperscript{26}.

At that point, Jean Boucher decided to investigate the actual degree of Labour's involvement in immigrant education. He asked the regional officers of the Branch to make some discreet inquiries and discovered that, with the exception of a program in 1946 for Polish refugees and a peripheral involvement in programs for Eastern European refugees in 1950-51, the Department of Labour had done nothing in the area of immigrant education\textsuperscript{27}. Despite this limited prior involvement in the field, by November
1952 the Minister of Labour had sent a letter to Citizenship and Immigration saying that his department was putting forward a proposal to extend the vocational training agreements to include language instruction for adult immigrants. This letter prompted Boucher to suggest to Fortier:

> If there exists a comprehensive system of Federal financial assistance to vocational courses throughout Canada, then I think that we shall have to give more weight to the requests that have been coming to us for financial assistance to Citizenship classes. However, as the latter are by no means connected with occupation, I should be very reluctant to endorse the proposal made by the Department of Labour that they be linked with vocational courses.

In other words, if Labour could fund provinces directly, so could Citizenship and Immigration. Moreover, Citizenship and Immigration needed to take the initiative before Labour took over the field.

In January 1953, the Branch put forward a memorandum to Cabinet on financial assistance for citizenship training. The document stressed the necessity of ensuring immigrants learned English or French as a way of avoiding the development of ethnic blocs. It also noted that there had been repeated representations from at least two major organizations in the education sector urging federal participation in financing language classes for adult immigrants. Further, it discussed the fact that the lack of federal involvement to that point had resulted in a lack of uniformity across the country and insufficient facilities to respond to the actual needs. Thus, under the existing conditions, the Branch was not fulfilling its mandate to provide
adequate facilities for citizenship instruction and if they did not enter into some kind of funding arrangement, immigrants would choose not to assimilate. Cabinet accepted the argument and agreed with the Branch's preferred option for funding - an arrangement whereby the federal government would contribute an amount equal to one-half of the provincial contribution to citizenship and language instruction for adult immigrants. It took the better part of one year to negotiate the specifics of the agreements but by December 1953 all of the provinces except Quebec had entered into the Citizenship Instruction Agreements.

The genesis of the second set of agreements, which related to the provision of language textbooks, was very different than the first. In 1947, when the Branch agreed to supply provinces with language texts, there was only one series of texts that was in use. By the late 1950s other texts had been developed and teachers were beginning to ask for a choice. Officials of Ontario Education raised the issue with the Branch in 1959 and in October of that year, representatives of the Branch and Ontario Education met to discuss textbooks. On the basis of the meeting the Branch began to reconsider its textbook policy. Deciding that it would be impractical for the Branch to stock and provide several different texts, officials explored the possibility of either extending the existing Citizenship Instruction Agreements to cover the provision of texts or negotiating new agreements on texts. Despite the commitment to reexamine the policy, no
changes were made at that point.

The issue was not raised again in any substantial fashion until 1961 when, at a Branch sponsored conference on immigrant instruction, "[m]uch attention was directed to the question of existing texts." Early the following year Branch officials met with Stephen Davidovich of the Ontario Citizenship Division to once again discuss the textbook question. This time, a memo was sent to the Deputy Minister of Citizenship and Immigration recommending the Branch enter into new arrangements with the provinces so that provincial authorities could select and purchase their own texts. By May 1963 a draft language textbook agreement had been put forward to Treasury Board and within a year all but three provinces had accepted the new arrangements.

With the two agreements in place, on paper the Branch had a very important role in the field of immigrant education. It provided a combined total of approximately $275,000 to the provinces through the Citizenship Instruction and Language Textbook agreements. In practice, however, once the agreements were signed, the Branch had very little direct involvement in immigrant instruction. The funding took on the nature of transfer payments and it was up to the provinces to determine their programs within the agreed upon guidelines. Thus the funding to provinces was of a very different character from the funding given to voluntary organizations and the Branch was not in a position to influence the direction of immigrant instruction. It
is likely that the reluctance shown by Citizenship and Immigration officials to begin discussions on both sets of agreements was in some way related to this consequence. But the Branch did find other ways of involving itself more directly in determining the future of immigrant education.

**Teacher Training**

From 1948 to 1954 the Branch's involvement in teacher training came largely through its involvement in the Citizenship Council's Immigrant Education Program. Florence Gaynor, over the course of her term as the Council's paid consultant in immigrant education, worked with educational authorities across the country to develop and deliver occasional short training sessions for teachers of immigrants. In 1954, the Manitoba Department of Education included a course on English as a Second Language taught by Gaynor as one of the offerings during its annual summer school for teachers. The course was so successful that two courses were offered the following summer, again with Gaynor as the instructor. By this time, however, the Branch was no longer funding Gaynor's salary and had begun its move to force the Council out of the immigrant education area.

The issue of specialized training for teachers of immigrants was discussed at the Branch's staff conference in 1954. It was decided that it would be unwise for the Branch to organize such a program because teacher training was rightfully the responsibility of the provinces. Nevertheless, that same year,
the Branch began paying a monthly retainer to W.F. Mackey to act as a linguistic consultant to the Branch. Mackey's services were made available to departments of education wishing to sponsor one- or two-day workshops for teachers⁴⁰. In addition, in 1955, the Branch experimented with providing some support for a regional summer course sponsored by the Saskatchewan Department of Education and in 1956, it offered to pay some of the expenses participants incurred as a result of attending summer courses sponsored by provincial authorities⁴¹.

By 1958 it was quite clear that there were not enough professional development opportunities for teachers of immigrants so the Branch decided to help Ontario Education establish a summer course on teaching English as a second language. The Branch took on the expense of flying in an instructor from England and providing travel grants to teachers from other provinces who wished to attend the program⁴². It continued this support until at least 1969. In 1961, educators at the conference on immigrant instruction recommended that the Branch expand its support of teacher training to regional courses outside of Ontario⁴³ but, with the exception of a course that was instituted in Quebec in 1962 for French language instructors, no other courses were established⁴⁴.

As with the federal-provincial agreements, this arrangement allowed the Branch to work through the provincial governments. Where this arrangement differed was that the Branch maintained some control over where and how the programs were organized and
who was involved. In other words, this type of intervention afforded the Branch an avenue of direct and on-going involvement in an important aspect of immigrant education.

The Branch and Ontario Education

From at least 1940 there was a close connection between Ontario Education and the citizenship education movement. As I have noted in previous chapters, the Minister of Education for the province of Ontario was one of the individuals who had been involved in establishing the Citizenship Council and Ontario Education had provided staff and office space to the Council during its first year of existence. In the immediate post-war era, Ontario was one of the first provinces to give serious attention to the development citizenship and language education programs for adult immigrants. Ontario was the first province with which the Branch undertook to co-sponsor a citizenship project (the series of radio broadcasts in 1948-49). The relationship between the Branch and Ontario Education was further strengthened by personal relationship between Ontario's key official in citizenship, Stephen Davidovich, and several members of the Branch staff. As one Branch official noted in 1954, the close association between the Branch and Ontario Education "...began when the Canadian Citizenship Branch contributed Steve to the Community Programmes Branch [of Ontario Education]."45 Through the 1950s the Branch continued to build on this relationship and used it as another avenue through which to be
involved in cultural diversity and education.

In some ways the nature of the relationship between the Branch and Ontario Education in the 1950s was reminiscent of the earlier relationship between the Branch and the Citizenship Council. Branch staff from Ottawa met regularly with staff of the Community Programmes Branch and conferred on joint projects. In 1953, when the Branch wanted to help institute a summer leadership program addressing intergroup relations in Ontario, it approached the Community Programmes Branch. The Branch promised it would fund the event if Community Programmes would organize and conduct it. Community Programmes agreed and consequently Ontario Education became the only provincial government department to receive a grant to sponsor such an event. In the area of teacher training, Community Programmes approached the Branch in 1958 to support Ontario Education's proposal for a new summer course. Where the Branch had previously been approached by other provinces and had only been willing to support some of the expenses incurred by participants, when Ontario requested support, the Branch agreed to pay the expenses for a specialist from London, England as well as travel costs for teachers from other provinces. Finally, as I have already noted, it was largely at the insistence of officials from Ontario Education that the Branch began the reexamination of its policy on language textbooks. The relationship between the Citizenship Branch and Community Programmes allowed the Branch to be directly involved in developing and implementing programmes in immigrant education.
and intergroup relations education. At the same time, this association permitted both agencies to influence each other's policy and programs.

The strength of this relationship was such that in 1956 the Branch almost became officially involved in the education of immigrant children as a result of proposals put forward by Community Programmes. In February 1956 the directors of the Branch and Community Programmes discussed the issue of assistance for the education of immigrant children. Ontario felt the citizenship instruction agreements should be amended to include children and that the Branch should make language textbooks available for immigrant children. Eugene Bussière put the request for textbooks forward to Laval Fortier and Fortier sent the request on to the Minister. Both Fortier and the Minister agreed that it would be appropriate to send the textbooks to Ontario but they were reluctant to appear eager in this matter. As a result they asked Bussière not to respond until Community Programmes renewed its request. Community Programmes apparently did not renew its request and so the policy on distribution of textbooks was never altered.

The relationship between the Branch and Community Programmes deteriorated somewhat in 1959 and 1960 when the Ontario Government decided to establish a Citizenship Division which would be part of a reconstituted department known as the Department of the Ontario Provincial Secretary and Citizenship. Although the department was not officially
renamed until 1960, the Citizenship Division was inaugurated in 1959. The first formal announcements about the new division noted its work would focus on assisting applicants for citizenship. Citizenship and Immigration objected to the fact that the Citizenship Division was saying it would assist individuals complete their citizenship application forms as this was part of the work of officers of the Citizenship Registration Branch. When officials of Citizenship and Immigration informed officials of the Department of the Provincial Secretary that the latter would be duplicating the work of Citizenship and Immigration, the officials agreed to reorient their efforts. The Provincial Secretary was not, however, willing to change the direction of his division. It was not until a new Provincial Secretary was appointed in November 1960 that the issue was resolved. Early in 1961, Stephen Davidovich and five others from the Community Programmes Branch were transferred to the Citizenship Division and a better relationship began to develop between the two agencies but it was never as close as it had once been between Community Programmes and the Citizenship Branch.

Regional Liaison Officers

As I discussed in the previous chapter, in order to receive approval for its regional positions the Branch had linked the work of Regional Officers to education. By 1952 the responsibilities of Regional Officers had been specified to include encouraging voluntary organizations and university
extension departments to develop and implement citizenship education programmes, urging universities to undertake research related to citizenship, and cooperating with provincial authorities to establish classes for immigrants⁵⁹. Through the early 1950s, they were also asked to be guest lecturers in teacher education and in-service programmes (Department of Citizenship and Immigration 1953). By the mid 1950s Regional Officers had established close working relationships with local and regional voluntary organizations and educational authorities.

By 1954, intergroup relations seminars were being organized in Alberta by the Canadian Council of Christians and Jews with assistance from the University of Alberta and in British Columbia by the University of British Columbia. Regional Officers in Edmonton and Vancouver were on the planning committees and teaching teams for these seminars in their respective regions⁶⁰. The Regional Officers maintained this type of involvement in these projects at least until 1961⁶¹. In addition to providing this assistance to regional seminars, throughout the 1950s and early 1960s Regional Officers worked with Home and School and Parent-Teacher organizations to develop and implement programs to improve intergroup understanding⁶². In the area of immigrant education, Regional Officers continued to work with local school districts and individual schools to encourage the establishment of classes for adult immigrants⁶³. Senior Branch officials supported this involvement through which Regional Officers were implicated in the direct delivery of educational programs to the
These same officials were, however, less enthusiastic about the relationships that developed between the Regional Officers and provincial government authorities. Although it was necessary for Regional Officers to have a certain amount of contact with their provincial counterparts, officials in Ottawa became concerned when this contact led Regional Officers to involve themselves in discussions of provincial policy. In 1959, for example, William Black, the Regional Liaison Officer in Vancouver, was asked to present a brief to the B.C. Royal Commission on Education. He began his brief by saying that he was not speaking as a representative of the federal government rather as a person who had had extensive involvement in citizenship education. When Black sent a copy of his brief to Ottawa, the response from his superiors was that it was inappropriate for him to make a presentation on a topic that had to do with provincial policy and that he should take steps to ensure that the brief was neither listed nor quoted by the commission. Even when Black wrote back to point out that the chair of the commission had specifically asked him to present the brief and had been particularly appreciative of his comments, officials in Ottawa did not recant. From the perspective of senior officials of the Branch, then, the appropriate role for Regional Officers was to be involved at the level of program implementation but not policy making.
Summary

The work of the Branch in education throughout this time period was framed by its newly articulated policy of integration. To the Branch, integration meant long-term voluntary assimilation and the role of the government in that process was to ensure that immigrants were persuaded to make the choice to assimilate. This, in turn, meant ensuring that immigrants were properly educated and that established Canadians were prepared to welcome newcomers into their country. Citizenship education thus took on the dual focus of immigrant education and intergroup relations education.

If general policy direction in education was influenced by the vision of integration, then the specific policy decisions were influenced by the Deputy Minister's vision of appropriate roles for voluntary organizations and government agencies. Laval Fortier believed that voluntary organizations should be involved in general citizenship and have no role in immigrant integration and that government agencies should take the lead in immigrant integration and a supportive role in general citizenship. As a result, the Branch used its new grants policy to force the voluntary sector, namely the Citizenship Council, out of immigrant education. It is possible that officials had intended to establish an immigrant education program similar to the Council program within the Branch but these plans were interrupted by the decision to enter into federal-provincial agreements with the provinces on citizenship instruction. These agreements limited the degree of direct involvement the Branch
could have in immigrant instruction. Nevertheless, the Branch hired an immigrant education consultant on retainer and began to work with the provinces, particularly the province of Ontario, in the development of policy and programs in cultural diversity and education. At the same time, Regional Officers of the Branch were encouraged to become involved with voluntary organizations and educational institutions in the direct delivery of programs.

In the period from 1952 to 1963, then, the Branch more clearly defined its place in cultural diversity and education. It no longer needed voluntary associations to act as an intermediary between itself and the provinces. Its role in relation to national voluntary organizations thus became more that of a funding agency than that of a collaborator. Through its national office the Branch had a role to play in policy and program development for the federal government and to some degree for the provinces. Its Regional Officers and its partnership with the Province of Ontario allowed it to have a direct involvement in the planning and delivery of specific educational projects. Thus, by 1963, the federal government was firmly and directly implicated in an area that it continued to insist publicly was a provincial responsibility.
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CHAPTER 7
CITIZENSHIP AND IDENTITY

Introduction

The period from 1963 to 1971 was one of great change and uncertainty for the Citizenship Branch. Two separate events - the report of the Glassco Commission on Government Organization (1961) and the election of the Liberal government of Lester Pearson in 1963 - resulted in a massive restructuring of the federal bureaucracy. The Glassco Commission, which reported in 1962, recommended sweeping changes in both the organization and budgetting process within the federal civil service. The government, having accepted the majority of the Glassco recommendations, established the Bureau of Government Organization to oversee the implementation of the recommendations. Following the 1963 election, several departments, including Citizenship and Immigration, received new deputy ministers as a result of the new government's desire to ensure loyalty in the senior ranks of the bureaucracy. The new Deputy Minister of Citizenship and Immigration began his term with a reevaluation of the work of the department's four branches - Immigration, Citizenship, Citizenship Registration, and Indian Affairs. But before the review had been completed, the Department of Citizenship and Immigration had been dismantled and the Branch had once again found itself part of the Department of the Secretary of State. As a result of this shift the Branch found
itself trying to justify its work in the context of the mandate of its new department - the promotion and development of Canadian culture.

The environment around the Branch was also charged with threats and possibilities. The immigration policy was under review and programs for immigrants, including integration and language training programs, were being reconsidered. Branch officials were concerned that their Branch would be forced out of both of these program areas. The rising tide of nationalism in Quebec resulted in the creation of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (1963) and the issues of Francophone – Anglophone relations as well as the place of "other ethnic groups" became the central focus of the debate on Canadian unity. In addition, the flag debate and preparations for the Centennial focussed attention on the issue of Canadian identity. Collectively, these events precipitated a fundamental shift in the focus of federal cultural diversity policy away from integration towards identity. For the Branch this opened the way for a new area of interest - education for cultural retention - but the Branch was not yet ready to end its involvement in immigrant education or intergroup relations education.

**Government Reorganization**

As part of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, the Branch held a unique if somewhat precarious position. The Branch was one of four administrative units within the
Department. Each of the other three - the Immigration Branch, Citizenship Registration, and Indian Affairs - was charged with the responsibility of administering a specific statute - the Immigration Act, the Citizenship Act, and the Indian Act, respectively. The existence of the Branch, however, was not required by legislation. Instead, the programmes of the Branch had evolved in relation to the objectives of the other three branches. Consequently, by 1963, the mandate of the Branch was "to facilitate the work of the other three branches and to contribute to the achievement of their aims."\(^1\)

In studying the government as a whole, the Glassco Commission had noted that, under the system that was in place until the early 1960s, annual budget increases to government agencies were automatic. This encouraged the kind of growth that had occurred within the Branch among other agencies. Glassco's solution was to move to a system of program-based budgetting and to review programs annually to determine their relevance. As one commentator on Canadian government has noted, Glassco set the stage for "a sort of managerial revolution in the bureaucracy." (Mallory in Savoie 1990, 127). When C.M. Isbister became the Deputy Minister of Citizenship and Immigration in 1963 he became part of this revolution.

Isbister noted the interdependence between the Branch and the other three units and initiated a departmental review designed to give each unit its own distinct sphere of responsibility. In particular, he wanted to establish a clear
mandate for the Branch, which, in Isbister's eyes, had "gone too far in the direction of becoming a sort of generalized adult education and community service organization" (Pal 1993, 95). Thus, the intent of the internal reorganization was to move the Branch out of the areas of immigrant and Indian integration and to reexamine its role in education.

It appears that the restructuring exercise was met with a certain degree of ambivalence within the Branch. On one hand, as the Assistant Under Secretary of State for Citizenship later noted, the Branch Director Jean Lagassé was initially supportive of if not enthusiastic about the restructuring. When the Canadian Services Directorate of the Immigration Branch was created in 1964 to be responsible for the initial reception and welfare and economic integration of immigrants, Lagassé responded by seconding an officer to the Directorate for a period of three months to effect a transfer of integration related activities and programs from the Branch to the Directorate and to help the new unit create its own program of activity. On the other hand, the minutes of the Branch Headquarters Staff Meeting of February 4, 1965 reported that the Branch intended to provide background material for the White Paper on Immigration in the areas of social and cultural factors in integration and public participation in immigration policy and integration. The minutes also noted that officials hoped that through this action the Branch would be able to establish its responsibility in these areas.
The desire to distance itself from immigrant integration was likely connected to the Branch's own new vision of its future. By 1964 the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission had been struck and the work of the Centennial Commission was well underway. The Branch wanted to carve out a place for itself in the area of national unity and national identity. The introduction to its first paper on possible new directions explained that the Branch's mandate in 1947 had been immigrant integration but it had gradually shifted to include "general citizenship" or working with non-immigrants. As a result, the paper argued, the Branch's focus had already moved from integration to "ensuring that all elements of the Canadian fabric contributed to the common heritage of the nation." On the basis of this the Branch proposed three possible options for its future: confirming its role in "general citizenship", returning to the original immigrant integration mandate, or disbanding the Branch and assigning its staff to the other three branches of the department. The Branch expressed a decided preference for the first option. Shortly after the paper was circulated, at a meeting of Senior Liaison Officers, Branch staff determined that this new direction which they were calling "general citizenship" was in fact synonymous with Canadian unity. The officers also agreed that the Branch could best accomplish its objectives by engaging in its own projects as well as supporting those of volunteer organizations.

The desire to retain responsibility for immigrant
integration and language education may have been motivated by a belief that if the Branch were to survive and grow it would need a solid programming base and a track record on which it could continue to build. Thus, while the Branch was claiming that it no longer wished to be associated primarily with integration, it was also arguing that its work with immigrants and First Nations peoples should continue:


not because the Department [was] charged with the administration of the Immigration, Citizenship and Indian Acts, but essentially because the Branch and the department had been entrusted with the responsibility of guaranteeing that all elements in society contribute their fullest potential to the Canadian heritage."

In other words, though it may not have wished to define its mandate as integration, the Branch was not prepared to relinquish its responsibility in any existing area of programming. Clearly, Branch officials were looking to the review exercise as a way of expanding their operations and gaining sanction for their active involvement in community development initiatives.

Before any decisions could be made about the mission of the Branch a significant reorganization took place within the federal bureaucracy which resulted in the dissolution of Citizenship and Immigration. The Immigration Branch became part of the new Department of Manpower and Immigration, Indian Affairs became its own department, and the Citizenship Branch and Citizenship Registration were transferred to the Secretary of State. Initially after the transfer was effected the future of the Branch was even less certain than it had been in the previous
three years within Citizenship and Immigration. The Secretary of State had been given a mandate in the area of culture and officials saw the work of the Branch, at best, as incongruous with this mandate and, at worst, as unimportant. Thus there was a real possibility the Branch might be dissolved (Pal 1993, 98-99).

In the face of this threat, Branch officials continued their quest to redefine their mandate. Having decided that the central focus of the Branch was Canadian unity, officials now found themselves in the position of having to recast this goal in terms that were more compatible with the overall mandate of the Department of the Secretary of State. This they did by associating their existing objectives and programmes with what they called "small 'c' culture". In an internal document prepared in August 1966 Jean Lagassé discussed different definitions of culture and asserted that small 'c' culture, which he defined as "the adaptation of man to his universe", included all of the activities in which the Branch was currently engaged as well as others in which it wished to be involved.

Senior officials of the Secretary of State apparently accepted the arguments put forward by the Branch as they allowed the Branch to submit a proposal to Treasury Board based on this "new direction". Treasury Board, however, refused the Branch's request for the new positions it required to implement the contemplated expansion and indicated that both the new name and the new objectives the Branch was proposing for itself were too vague. Branch officials once again returned to their task of
establishing their niche within Secretary of State. Again they prepared a document on the role of the Branch. This time they suggested that the role of the Branch was "to foster and sustain national consciousness, to strengthen national unity and to enrich the quality of life in Canada." It is unclear whether the memorandum was ever sent to Cabinet but it was circulated to some senior officials including the Under Secretary of State and the Principal Secretary to the Prime Minister. The former advised that the Branch should place a greater emphasis on the significance of cultural programmes and that the Branch's main goal should be national identity. The latter recommended that the future of the Branch be connected more closely to the federal government's constitutional responsibility for citizenship. While the Branch was considering these comments, political events intervened and the future of the Branch began to look much brighter.

In April 1968 Pierre Trudeau was elected leader of the federal Liberal party and Richard Stanbury became the president of the party. As Leslie Pal has documented, this change in political direction brought with it an increased interest in citizen participation as well as new leadership for the Branch (Pal 1993, 105-110). Bernard Ostry was named the new Assistant Under Secretary of State for Citizenship, Michael McCabe the new director of the Branch, and, Robert Stanbury was appointed Minister of State for Citizenship and Information Canada. Robert Stanbury initiated a review of citizenship policy which led to
cabinet approval for a new mandate for the Branch based on five objectives: promotion of national unity, encouragement of cultural diversity, preservation of human rights, support to citizen participation, and development of meaningful symbols of Canadian sovereignty (Pal 1993, 105). And so the years of uncertainty were finally behind the Branch.

Education was a minor part of the discussion throughout the process of redefining the Branch mandate. The 1965 document on new directions for the Branch made no explicit mention of language education, although work in adult education was included under the more general heading of "voluntary action", and the development of educational materials was cited as part of programming in human rights\textsuperscript{12}. The 1966 document, which described the mandate of the Branch as "small 'c' culture", listed language instruction as one of many areas included in the mandate\textsuperscript{13}. A 1967 document submitted to Treasury Board proposing a name change for the Branch spoke of language education as part of immigrant integration and made passing reference to education programs as part of human rights\textsuperscript{14}. It appears as though education had ceased to be a main concern of the Branch and was increasingly becoming simply one of several strategies through which the objectives of the Branch could be accomplished.

This did not mean that education had become unimportant. In fact, as the Branch's involvement with the immigration policy review and the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism showed, the Branch continued to jealously guard its
responsibilities in education and to look for ways to expand its programming in this area.

Immigration Policy Review

While the Branch was undergoing its series of reviews the immigration policy had also become the subject of study. The Diefenbaker government had promised to introduce a new immigration act but had succeeded only in initiating one change to the existing act - a clause that expressly forbade discrimination against potential immigrants on the basis of race (Hawkins 1989, 38-39). A full blown review of policy and programs did not begin until the Liberals took power. At this point, in addition to supporting C.M. Isbister's review of the Department, the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration struck a committee to prepare a White Paper on Immigration.

The White Paper was produced and circulated in 1965. The Branch had provided some of the background material to the committee in the area of social and cultural integration. It was not surprising then that the White Paper recommended that the Branch have some responsibility for the area of integration. It suggested that the area be divided between the Citizenship Branch, Immigration Branch, and Manpower Branch. The Citizenship Branch was to have authority in the area of social and cultural integration, the Immigration Branch was assigned responsibility for initial settlement, and the Manpower Branch was given the lead role in economic integration. The branches disagreed
somewhat on what their respective areas of interest encompassed. One of the most hotly disputed areas was language training. Negotiations to settle the dispute took place in 1966 between the Department of Manpower and Immigration and the Secretary of State.

Manpower and Immigration approached the negotiations at a departmental level and interpreted its mandate in the broadest possible fashion. It saw its role as assisting immigrants to become established in Canada and argued that this would best be accomplished by giving the department responsibility for seven program areas: reception, orientation counselling, emergency welfare, job placement, adjustment counselling, and language training. It recommended that the Citizenship Branch discontinue its work with voluntary organizations involved in immigrant settlement and that the federal-provincial language training agreements be subsumed under the Technical and Vocational Agreements which were already administered by Manpower and Immigration and which were being renegotiated at that time. The only role that Manpower and Immigration specified for the Citizenship Branch was to support research into issues of social and cultural integration16.

The Citizenship Branch, meanwhile, defended its position largely on the basis of the contrast between its mandate as a branch and the explicit mandate of the Immigration Branch. It argued that the Department of Manpower and Immigration was concerned with economic integration and Secretary of State was
concerned with social, political, and cultural integration. In the Branch's estimation, economic integration involved only initial reception, job placement, and emergency financial and medical assistance. This led the Citizenship Branch to claim that a major distinction between the two branches was that the Immigration Branch provided services to individual immigrants where the Citizenship Branch worked with immigrant groups. The second important difference between the work of the two branches according to the Citizenship Branch was that the responsibility of the Immigration Branch began and ended with those immigrants destined for the labour force where the Citizenship Branch was concerned with all immigrants. Based on these arguments the Branch proposed that it not only maintain responsibility for the areas related to immigrant integration in which it was currently involved, but that it be given resources to expand its programs and services.

In his note to the Under Secretary of State on the issue of the division of responsibility, the Assistant Under Secretary made only passing mention of the request for expansion and instead chose to concentrate on the issue of language education. He noted that Manpower and Immigration was already discussing with Ontario a proposal under which 100% of the cost of language training for adult immigrants would be paid for under the Technical and Vocational Agreements. He also pointed out that Manpower and Immigration seemed unaware that the existing Citizenship Instruction and Language Textbook agreements could
not be terminated without prior consultations between the appropriate federal and provincial departments. He further remarked that, if Manpower and Immigration were to take on the language training responsibilities, then the Under Secretary of State should strive to ensure that all immigrants, even those not destined for the workforce, continue to be included in the agreements.

In the end, the Branch maintained responsibility for the Citizenship Instruction and Language Textbook Agreements and the Immigration Branch developed and implemented new language training programs.

Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism

After it was elected in 1963, one of the first acts of the Pearson government was to appoint the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism in response to the growing tide of nationalism in Quebec. The Branch saw a great similarity between its work and the mandate of the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission in the area of Canadian unity. It is likely that the Branch believed that, if it could position itself to fall heir to the legacy of the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission, it would have a secure future and a broader mandate. The Branch set out immediately to establish a close association with the Commission. What Branch officials could not foresee was the direction in which this relationship would take the Branch, namely, towards an increased focus on ethnic groups. This
direction, in turn, led the Branch to an interest in heritage language education.

The effort to establish a relationship with the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission began in September 1963 when the Director of the Branch wrote to the Commission to inform officials of the work of the Branch and to suggest that the two units work closely. In October of that same year, at the invitation of the Branch, staff of the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission attended the annual Branch staff conference. Following the conference, the Branch assigned the Acting Chief of the Liaison Division to act as a liaison officer with the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission and the Branch began to help the Commission plan its regional forums by supplying Commission officials with information from the Branch's monthly reports. By the spring of 1964, the Branch's Regional Liaison Officers were helping to organize the Commission's regional meetings and the Branch was providing clippings and analysis of articles in the ethnic press related to the Commission and its work. In short, the Branch had become a sort of secondary administrative support unit to the Commission.

The Branch was dissatisfied with the nature of the relationship between the two agencies and, by the fall of 1964, the Branch officer responsible for liaison with the Commission was expressing doubts that the Branch would have any significant involvement in the work of the Commission. To rectify this situation, the Branch once again invited Bilingualism and
Biculturalism staff to the Branch's annual conference. At this conference, the Branch determined that the concerns of the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission would be the top priority for the Branch for the upcoming year and formulated specific recommendations on how the Commission and the Branch could work together more effectively. By November 1964, the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission had agreed to cooperate more closely with the Branch. Several specific changes in the relationship took place which included arrangements under which semi-confidential memoranda from the Commission were circulated to Branch field staff, Branch and Commission staff were jointly planning an "experts' conference", discussions were underway regarding programming that would help communicate findings of the Commission to the public, the Branch was supporting projects that would help prepare the way for the Commission's recommendations, and the Commission was supplying the Branch with lists of organizations submitting briefs and requesting input on other organizations which should be approached.

By 1965, a joint committee of the Branch and the Commission was well-established and meeting on a regular basis. Commission staff were frequent participants at Branch staff meetings in a resource or training capacity and Branch staff were called on by the Commission for their assistance in matters to do with ethnic groups. The Commission had begun to direct to the Branch any voluntary organizations requesting assistance in projects designed to promote national unity and the Branch was actively
engaged in assisting groups with projects ranging from intercultural youth camps and travel programs to the support and development of ethnic organizations. Thus the Branch had succeeded in creating a close working relationship with the Commission staff but there was as yet no official indication of the possible role the Branch might play in implementing the future recommendations of the Commission.

This point in the relationship corresponded with the period when the Branch was preparing for its transfer to the Secretary of State. It needed to establish the importance of its work and one way to accomplish this task was to make explicit the association between that work and the future recommendations of the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission. In an apparent attempt to do this, the Deputy Minister wrote to one of the Co-Chairs of the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission to request a meeting. The Co-Chairs of the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission agreed to meet with the Branch in October 1965. In preparation for the meeting the Branch officials provided notes for the Deputy Minister. Among the topics they suggested he talk about was the involvement of the Branch in language instruction. They noted that several briefs to the Commission had suggested that the federal government take an active role in providing facilities for bilingual training and they were interested in determining if the Commission would support an extension of the Branch programs in language training to meet this new need. Although the issue of language training
was discussed at the meeting, it is evident from both the Branch and Commission notes on the meeting that if the Commission saw any role for the Branch it was in the area of ethnic identity rather than bilingualism.

The Branch minutes of the meeting noted that:

In his opening remarks, the Deputy Minister stressed the fact that the work of the Citizenship Branch would be modified, perhaps profoundly, by the findings of the Royal Commission. The purpose of the meeting, therefore, was to explore possible areas in which the interests of the Commission and the Citizenship Branch might blend...

Commission representatives were, however, more interested in discussing the past than the future. They acknowledged the Branch's willingness to adapt to a changing environment, noted that the Commission was not yet in a position to predict the recommendations it might make, and then steered the conversation toward the Branch's operating principles. They were particularly interested in whether the Branch had "propagated a multicultural concept of Canada". Much of the remainder of the meeting was spent discussing the Branch's past and existing policy and programs for immigrants and ethnic groups.

Following the meeting, the Commission continued to work with the Branch. In yet another act of acknowledgement of the Branch's preeminence in the area of ethnic affairs, the Commission asked to second a member of the Branch staff to work with the its research unit. Further, the Commission asked the Branch to meet with three of its study groups - multiethnic questions, voluntary associations, and bilingual instruction and other
educational matters - to discuss "its own experience as a federal agency working in these fields." The Commission, thus, demonstrated that it recognized the Branch for its roles in education and voluntary action as well as in the field of ethnic relations.

Branch officials seemed unaware that, irrespective of the working relationship that had developed, not all the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission members and staff had a favourable impression of the Branch nor did they wish to advocate a role for the Branch in bilingualism. At the Commission meeting which immediately followed the meeting between the Commission and the Branch, Neil Morrison, Co-Secretary of the Commission, noted that the Branch appeared to be positioning itself to "fall heir to the work of the Commission as well as that of the Centennial" and that he saw this as "departmental empire-building on a fairly grand scale." André Laurendeau had expressed some of his concerns during the meeting with the Branch when he asked about the Branch's position on multiculturalism. He indicated that he saw a conflict between the Branch's role in promoting multiculturalism and the biculturalism mandate of the Commission. The Branch's role in multiculturalism remained a bone of contention for Laurendeau as he indicated in a 1967 discussion on voluntary associations when he spoke to the dangers of the "development of ideologies in voluntary associations, or in government departments dealing with voluntary associations" and cited the example of the Branch. In addition, as was noted
during a discussion of bilingualism in 1967, at least one Commission member felt very strongly that the Branch should "get out of the French-English aspect of its work" because she believed that "they were confusing the issues". It is not surprising then that when the first volume of the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Report was issued in 1967, the Secretary of State was not on the list of departments asked to review and respond to it.

By the time the recommendations from the Commission were translated into the Official Languages Act in 1969, the fortunes of the Branch had changed. With the Trudeau government firmly in place and the Branch's role in national unity and cultural diversity accorded a place of importance, Treasury Board gave the Branch approval to expand its programs to incorporate more work in intergroup relations involving official language communities, promotion of bilingualism among ethnic and First Nations communities, and expanded youth programs. Although at this point it appeared that the Branch had been frozen out of the area of education, the Commission's work in cultural diversity and education would eventually provide a basis for the Branch to plan an expansion of its own work in the area.

Cultural Diversity, Education and the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission

Education had been part of the mandate of the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission from the beginning. Though most of
the Commission's attention in this area had been focussed on bilingual education rather than cultural diversity and education, the title of the study group, Bilingual Education and Other Educational Matters, suggested that the committee's mandate extended beyond bilingualism. Even so, the volume of the Commission Report which looked at education did not concern itself with matters other than official languages. Therefore, it was not until Book IV of the Report, the volume on the contributions of "other ethnic groups", was published that the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission issued any recommendations about cultural diversity and education. The findings and recommendations in Book IV, including those concerning education, were based on information from the same sources as the rest of the report, namely, submissions, media reports, and commissioned research.

As one of the research papers on cultural diversity and education noted, most of the issues raised by groups submitting briefs on cultural diversity were concerned with how the public education system might promote cultural retention and development. Many of these spoke to the groups' desire to have language education programs in the schools and universities. Others mentioned the need for history books with an accurate portrayal of the contributions of the "other ethnic groups" and the need for scholarships to encourage the study of the culture and contributions of different groups. They also suggested the establishment of a central body responsible for providing
national direction in matters of culture and education⁴⁶. Thus, in order to reflect the concerns of ethnic groups, education had to be one of the central issues in Book IV.

Media reports pertaining to education published during the period the Commission was compiling its report paid little attention to cultural diversity. They did, however, draw attention to the considerable role federal agencies were already playing in the field of education, noting that Ottawa was contributing fifteen percent of the total cost of education in Canada by 1965. They also reported that both the provinces and the public at large were calling for some kind national coordination in the area of education. The provinces were reluctant to have a national education body controlled by the federal government and therefore eventually established the Council of Ministers of Education for Canada. The public, however, saw a definite role for the federal government in this arena as was indicated by polls in 1965 that showed that most Canadians believed education should be primarily a federal responsibility⁴⁷. Thus the Commission was aware that there was precedent and support for recommendations encouraging further federal involvement in education.

Given the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission's mandate and its focus on the connection between language and culture, it is not surprising that the commissioned research on cultural diversity and education focussed on linguistic retention. Two preliminary reports were presented to the Study
Group on Multiethnic Questions in 1966 and were eventually combined into one paper. The first of these preliminary reports examined the history of language instruction in languages other than English and French both within and outside of the public school system thereby presenting historical arguments for instruction in languages other than English and French. The second report offered options for the teaching of non-official languages, arguing strongly that the best option would be support for languages other than English and French within the publicly funded system. This second paper also made the case that the success of such programs depended upon acceptance by all Canadians of the value of this strategy and on the ability of educators to make the connection between languages, folklore, and those aspects of the culture which transmitted deeper cultural values, which the author identified as literature, art and philosophy. Thus, it was that the stage was set for five of the sixteen recommendations of Book IV to focus on education.

The Branch Response to Book IV

To fully understand the response of the Branch to the recommendations on education, it is necessary to first examine the Branch's response to Book IV as a whole. In preparing their response to Book IV, Branch officials revealed their bias towards a new cultural diversity policy based on two principles: immigrant integration and cultural retention. They also underlined their belief that, within government, they were the
true experts on cultural diversity. Accordingly they set forth a policy and program of action within which their aspirations in the field of education could be realized.

Book IV of the Commission Report was published in April 1970. Despite the Branch's new-found security of position, officials were uncertain whether the Branch would be given the responsibility of coordinating the response to Book IV. Shortly after Book IV was made public, Branch officials wrote to the Ministers outlining a clear rationale for giving the Branch responsibility for coordinating the response. They argued that, given the Branch's role in promoting social integration of immigrants and cultural activities of ethnic groups, it was the natural agency to take on the task of preparing the response. They also stated that they were studying the report to determine which areas had not received adequate attention. The Branch was obviously positioning itself as more of an expert in the field of cultural diversity than the Commission and giving itself a way to introduce into the response areas of programming in which it was already involved or wished to be involved and on which the Commission might not have commented.

Branch staff also appear to have been concerned that the government might decide not to respond to Book IV with an official policy statement. As the introductory paragraph of a document prepared in June 1970 stressed:

The IVth Volume of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism has recently been published. We believe now is the time for the government to formulate its policy with regard to
the implementation of the recommendations contained in the report, together with previous policy precedents and documentation from other sources. 

The document also reiterated arguments in favour of the Branch acting as lead agency in coordinating the response and provided an outline of a process through which the policy on ethnic communities could be developed. The ideas evidently met with some approval as the Branch began working on the response almost immediately after this document was written.

The Branch felt the best way to respond to Book IV was to formulate an ethnic policy that would become an integrated part of the citizenship policy. As a result, Branch staff prepared a discussion paper on a conceptual framework for an ethnic policy in which they based the objectives of the proposed policy on the objectives of the government's citizenship policy. Consequently the five objectives they initially advocated for the ethnic policy were:

1. To encourage in Canadians of ethnic origins other than British and French a greater sense of identity as Canadians and a greater solidarity with their fellow citizens and in particular to encourage the acquisition of citizenship by those who are eligible.

2. To encourage cultural diversification within a bilingual framework.

3. To protect and extend the human rights and fundamental freedoms of Canadians of ethnic origins other than British and French.

4. To increase and improve the participation of Canadians of ethnic origins other than British and French in our national life.

5. To develop symbols of Canadian sovereignty that
are meaningful to Canadians of ethnic origins other than British and French."

Based on these five objectives they proposed four "action areas" which would guide programming:

A. Assistance to those of other than British and French origin in their progress toward full participation in our society.

B. Encouragement of Canadians generally to accept members of ethnic minorities as full participants in Canadian life.

C. Encouragement and preservation of the cultural heritages of the various ethnic groups.

D. Contribution of other Citizenship Branch activities to the programme of ethnic participation."

It is important to note that the paper never once mentioned Book IV or any of its specific recommendations.

The discussion paper was circulated to selected individuals and groups and consultation meetings were held in Montreal, Toronto, and Vancouver. Branch officials reported that ethnic groups attending the meetings "not only agreed with the policy as outlined in the framework paper but also praised it very much and complimented its author." Thus, they established that they had a base of support within the community for their proposed direction.

At the same time that the Branch was conducting the community consultations it was also talking with colleagues within the federal bureaucracy whose agencies had been implicated in the Book IV recommendations. Branch officials met with representatives from each of the agencies following which each
agency was asked to submit to the Branch specific proposals in response to the Book IV recommendations. The Branch then collected the proposals, added their own, and appended them to their proposed policy statement.

The resulting document continued to remain true to both of its main sources of inspiration. The policy statement retained the flavour of the citizenship policy. The wording of the five policy objectives from the discussion paper had been altered somewhat and the statements were now called the principles of the policy. The four "action areas" had also been reworked to create what were now referred to as the policy objectives. The program of action designed to implement the policy included several discrete projects which responded to the recommendations of Book IV rather than to the proposed policy objectives.

By the time the policy was actually introduced into the House of Commons it had undergone still further refinement. There was no longer any reference to the citizenship policy or to a policy of ethnic participation. The Prime Minister's introduction to the policy referred only to the work and recommendations of the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission. The policy was labelled "multiculturalism within a bilingual framework" and the four objectives had been reduced in scope. The objective which, in the memorandum to Cabinet, had spoken of ensuring "linguistic and cultural survival and development of ethnic groups" had become a qualified pledge on the part of the government to "assist all Canadian cultural groups that have demonstrated a
desire and effort to continue to develop a capacity to grow and contribute to Canada", resources permitting (Trudeau in Palmer 1975, 136). The objective which sought "intensified involvement and acceptance of ethnic groups in the mainstream of Canadian life" became a promise to "assist members of all cultural groups to overcome cultural barriers to full participation in Canadian society" (Trudeau in Palmer 1975, 136). Finally, instead of an objective addressing the "integration of recent immigrants and first generation citizens", the official policy contained a statement which established the government's willingness to continue supporting English and French language training for immigrants (Trudeau in Palmer 1975, 136). In his speech presenting this new policy to Parliament, the Prime Minister also confirmed that the government had, in principle, accepted all of the Book IV recommendations directed at federal agencies and indicated a willingness to work cooperatively with provincial governments to implement all the recommendations (Trudeau in Palmer 1975, 136-37). Thus while the Branch had not succeeded in persuading the government to adopt a comprehensive policy statement, it had been able to clear the way for its continued involvement in a variety of areas including education.

Language Instruction for Immigrant Children

Of the sixteen recommendations in Book IV, five focussed explicitly on education. Of these, two referred to post-secondary institutions and three to public schools. The one of the three
directed at public schools was also the only Book IV recommendation that explicitly concerned immigrant integration. Recommendation 4 urged the federal government to assist provinces to provide the necessary instruction for children entering public schools without adequate knowledge of either official language. For the Branch, this was only the latest in a series of events that indicated this was the appropriate next stage in the evolution of its education program. The recommendation itself revitalized the debate on federal involvement in the education of immigrant children.

As noted in the previous chapter, the issue of federal support for the language education of immigrant children was a matter of discussion and debate from the mid-1950s onward. In 1966, while the Branch was still a part of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, the Branch and the province of Ontario began renegotiating the Citizenship Instruction and Language Textbook Agreements and Ontario once again indicated its desire to have immigrant children included in the terms of the agreements. The Assistant Deputy Minister for Citizenship in advising the Deputy Minister on the status of the negotiations noted that, even though "the advent of the federal government in the field of primary or secondary education, regardless of the subject to be taught, would undoubtedly raise issues which would require careful study and extensive discussion", it was his considered opinion that "the Government would be justified in accepting the proposal to extend the existing agreements on
teaching costs and textbooks for immigrant classes to include language classes for immigrant children."56 Before the matter could be resolved, the Department of Citizenship and Immigration had been dissolved and the negotiations on the agreements had stalled57. Negotiations had, however, started on the Technical and Vocational Agreements which were now administered by Manpower and Immigration. Consequently, the Ontario Department of the Provincial Secretary and Citizenship and the Department of Education put forward a proposal to Manpower and Immigration to provide funding for language training for immigrant children. The proposal argued that immigrant children who did not learn English dropped out of school as early as they could and therefore posed a serious long-term economic threat to the country58. Manpower and Immigration rejected the proposal stating that the education of children was a provincial rather than federal responsibility59.

The issue surfaced next in the House of Commons. The Toronto Board of Education had approached the Minister of Manpower and Immigration with a request to fund classes for immigrant children and a Member of Parliament from Toronto asked the Minister how he intended to respond to the request. The Minister reminded the House that the education of children was a provincial responsibility and stated that his department would refuse the request. Ten days later, the same Member of Parliament reintroduced the question, this time noting that the federal government had seen fit to assume responsibility for the
education of adult immigrants, aboriginal children, and children of military personnel, all of which made the constitutional argument seem rather suspect. Despite the new context for the question the government's response did not change.

While the Branch did not become overtly involved in the debate at this point it continued to work closely with the Ontario Citizenship Division. Members of the Branch and the Division met frequently to discuss issues of common concern and the Branch continued to fund the Ontario government's summer institute for teachers of English as a second language. In addition, the Branch claimed in at least one of its internal documents that it was already involved in the education of immigrant children. Late in 1967 the Branch once again opened negotiations on its federal-provincial agreements. Although Branch officials stated that they wished to make the agreements as comprehensive as possible and to provide "as large a contribution as can reasonably be expected toward the language and citizenship instruction of immigrants as it applies to social integration," they did not explicitly mention the education of immigrant children. However, the fact that the Branch was still considering its involvement in this area was highlighted in the 1967 document on language classes for immigrants which was prepared as part of the Branch's internal review. The paper noted that constitutional issues around education were rarely a consideration if the federal government was willing to provide funds without controls and raised the question of whether the
Branch should consider requests to fund language instruction for children. By 1969 the renegotiation of the Citizenship Instruction and Language Textbook agreements had stalled once again as the possibility of transferring responsibility for the programs to Manpower and Immigration reemerged. As a result, the discussion of specific aspects of the agreements, including possible federal involvement in the education of immigrant children, faded into the background.

The Book IV recommendation provided an opportunity to reopen the debate. The Branch's initial response to Recommendation 4 was to suggest that the Branch negotiate a new federal-provincial agreement on language instruction for immigrant children which would be similar to the existing agreements on instruction for adult immigrants. Branch officials then asked the Toronto Board of Education to provide them information on existing programs for immigrant children and proceeded to develop a specific response based on this information. At the outset, the Branch recommended that a funding formula be calculated according to the number of teacher-years devoted to language instruction and estimated that this would cost the federal government between 4.8 and 7.2 million dollars annually. By the time the proposal was included in the memorandum to Cabinet, the Branch was suggesting that the federal contribution be calculated on a per pupil basis and that the total cost of the program would be 10 million dollars over five years.

Two points of interest arise from the Branch's response to
this recommendation. First, the proposal that the instruction of children be the subject of a new agreement rather than an extension of an existing agreement was a departure from the Branch's previously held position. This may simply have reflected a belief that the government was more likely to support a new project rather than an extension of an old project or it may have been a deliberate attempt to ensure the Branch continued to have some role in education in the event that responsibility for the existing agreements were transferred to Manpower and Immigration.

The second point concerns the nature of this response in comparison with the responses to other recommendations. The Branch responded to other recommendations with suggestions for further research or grants programs for voluntary organizations. Recommendation 4 was not the only recommendation calling for federal-provincial cooperation nor was it the only recommendation concerning education yet it was the only recommendation for which a federal-provincial agreement was proposed and for which the Branch developed such a detailed response. This is not surprising considering that this was the only recommendation that concerned immigrant integration, the area that had been and continued to be, the Branch's strength. It is, however, worth noting the contrast between this response and the response to the recommendations on non-official languages.

Non-Official Languages

Three of the sixteen recommendations of the Commission
focused on teaching non-official languages. Two concerned the public schools and one was directed at university level education. The two concentrating on the public schools are of most interest to the current discussion. Recommendation 3 urged that "the teaching of languages other than English and French, and cultural subjects related to them, be incorporated as options in the public elementary school programme, where there is sufficient demand for such classes" and Recommendation 5 urged the same at the high school level (Government of Canada 1970, 228-29). From the response, it is apparent that the Branch was not as enthusiastic about these two recommendations as it had been about Recommendation 4.

Well in advance of the publication of Book IV, Branch officials had been in contact with researchers preparing the volume and were aware that some of the recommendations would concern teaching of non-official languages. They were preparing themselves for the possibility of being asked to provide support for Saturday schools. They anticipated becoming involved in an arrangement whereby the federal government, provincial governments, and ethnic communities would each be responsible for one-third of the costs for Saturday school programmes. It is somewhat surprising then that, in their initial comments on Book IV, officials acknowledged that they might have a role to play with regard to promoting non-official languages at the post-secondary level but asserted that acceptance of the recommendations at the elementary and high school levels was very
much a provincial matter. Having made this observation, there is no evidence to suggest that the Branch attempted to contact the provinces to discuss the issue.

Instead, the Branch proposed two projects to respond to Recommendations 3 and 5: a feasibility study on support for non-official language instruction and a funding programme for ethnic summer camps. The stated purpose of the feasibility study was to examine "how ethnic languages might best be taught" even though this issue had been studied in one of the research papers prepared for the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission. The idea behind the summer camps was that the Branch would provide some money towards the salary of instructors at camps which would have "language study and cultural maintenance as one of their objectives". By the admission of Branch officials, the summer camps responded only indirectly to the recommendations and were not, in and of themselves, sufficient to promote linguistic retention. Thus it appeared that the Branch was seeking to do the minimum possible in response to the recommendations on teaching non-official languages.

Linguistic retention was, however, a major issue for most ethnic communities. At consultation meetings on cultural diversity, ethnic groups had expressed "some suspicion of the government (federal) since no concrete proposals [had] been made to preserve and develop ethnic languages and cultures other than English and French." It is likely that this was the reason that the paper outlining the position of the government towards
ethnic groups stated that the federal government was willing to provide funds, in conjunction with the provinces, for teaching of non-official languages. Yet even after it had made this statement publicly, the Branch was still attempting to argue that the federal government could do nothing directly in this area because education was a provincial responsibility.

Despite the pressure from ethnic groups, there was very little change to the proposals designed to respond to these recommendations. In addition to the two that had been suggested originally, the Branch suggested that funds be given to the newly established Language Research Council to study non-official languages.

The difference between the response to these two recommendations and the response to Recommendation 4 probably stemmed from the ambivalence that existed within the Branch regarding promotion of ethnic identity. The debate had roots that went as far back as the early 1950s. At the 1953 Branch-sponsored National Seminar on Citizenship, for example, three distinct views on ethnic groups surfaced. One view held that maintenance of ethnic ties impeded integration. The second claimed that ethnic groups helped individuals to develop a sense of belonging to Canada. The third saw ethnic groups primarily as a vehicle of communication with newcomers (Canadian Citizenship Branch 1953).

By 1958, the Branch was working towards a policy on ethnic groups. In an early draft of the rationale for the policy, the Branch spoke to the value of ethnic groups in immigrant
integration but also noted that "ethnic leaders carried away by their talk, will often tend to emphasize diversity rather than community of purpose." With the advent of the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission, work with ethnic groups began to take a more prominent position in the Branch's programming but, until 1965, the Branch continued to view this work as primarily an immigrant integration activity. By 1965 the Branch was beginning to recognize the potential political power of ethnic groups and was using its expertise in the area of ethnic relations as the basis of its relationship with the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission. Thus in 1965 the Branch established its multiethnic programme through which it sought to "guarantee the full participation of all ethnic communities in all phases of the life of the nation and to prevent the permanent isolation of any particular ethnic group or segment thereof."

Despite the apparent support for ethnic diversity, as late as 1967 there was still concern within the Branch about the possible negative consequences of emphasizing difference. Officials of the Immigrant Integration Division of the Branch believed that the foundation of their work was expressed in a quote from John Porter:

The retention of strong European ethnic affiliation is deeply imbedded in the Canadian value system. This strong emphasis on ethnic pluralism, which seems to have increased during the twentieth century, has stood in the way of creating a coherent social structure supported by a commonly held set of values and beliefs, a consensus, that is, about what Canada is and what it means to be a Canadian. A national consensus is, surely, an important element in any national
character. All societies are differentiated, but when differences rather than similarities are emphasized, social structure lacks coherence."

The Division believed that its task was not to support diversity but to emphasize similarities. The Acting Director of Operations for the Branch agreed with the Porter quote and commented that it led him to wonder "to what extent do [the Branch's] contacts with ethnic groups promote their integration into the general Canadian pattern and to what extent do they promote ethno-centrism." He added that he believed it would be naive to think that they were not promoting ethnocentrism and thus inhibiting the development of a coherent Canadian social structure. The officer to whom the Acting Director's note had been addressed responded by saying that he believed that the concerns applied equally to all groups with which the Branch worked and that ethnic groups should not be singled out in this manner. Quite clearly, there were those within the Branch who saw promotion of ethnic cultures and identities as harmful and those who regarded work in this area as equally valid to work with mainstream organizations.

By the time the Branch became involved in responding to Book IV a number of new staff members had been hired. Several of these individuals were self-professed supporters of cultural diversity but the legacy of the ambivalence remained with them. They had stated in the fall of 1970 that the response to Book IV was motivated by twin desires to promote integration and cultural retention. The policy framework the Branch proposed was ethnic participation, which by the Branch's own definition,
meant "the involvement of underprivileged citizens in the mainstream of life in a society." This seemed to imply that to have an ethnicity other than British or French automatically meant a person was "underprivileged". Further, as the focus was on involving people in the "mainstream of life" rather than encouraging diversity, "ethnic participation" was synonymous with "integration". But the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission had concentrated on cultural retention rather than integration thus the majority of the projects proposed in response to the recommendations focussed on cultural retention. Consequently, the proposed programming did not support the policy objectives.

In addition to this inherent contradiction within the policy, officials of the Branch faced the task of having to convince politicians, colleagues, and the general public of the value of diversity. As they prepared the memorandum to Cabinet, they grappled with the problem that "all Cabinet Ministers [were] not as convinced of cultural diversity as we would think". They also believed that the provinces would react negatively to recommendations promoting cultural retention, particularly support for non-official language instruction. Further, their consultations with "non-ethnic groups" led them to the conclusion that most "non-ethnics" believed that the government's role should be to promote understanding between groups rather than to support cultural retention. Given the conflicting objectives and the external opposition to cultural retention, it is not surprising that the Branch was reluctant to appear overly eager
to support programs for cultural and linguistic retention.

Summary

To say that the period from 1963 to 1971 was one of great change for the Branch hardly begins to capture the nature and extent of the transformation the Branch underwent. The years spent redefining the mandate and the concurrent shift from Citizenship and Immigration to Secretary of State compelled the Branch to change its objectives but not its programs. The focus of the Branch's attention became its own survival and program and policy changes were suggested in accordance with this focus. That is to say, shifts in the policy were as much, if not more of, a response to the Branch's desire to secure its own future as they were a response to external demands. The one constant throughout this period was the involvement in immigrant integration despite attempts on the part of officials from other government agencies to reorient the Branch and remove it from the area.

The major change was the expansion of the Branch's mandate to include cultural retention and development. This change had begun in the 1950s with attempts by the Branch to establish a policy on ethnic groups. It was spurred on by the fact that the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission established the basis of its relationship with the Branch was the Branch's expertise in the area of ethnic groups. It did not take place in earnest until Book IV of the Bilingualism and Biculturalism report was issued. But the movement into this new area was difficult as there was
considerable discomfort about actively supporting the maintenance of separate ethnic identities. Even when the internal debate about this issue faded into the background the two parts of the mandate appeared to coexist uneasily.

For the area of education, the activity surrounding the Branch surprisingly did not result in major disruptions from 1963 to 1971. Intergroup relations education continued rather quietly as part of programming in Human Rights. Despite the attempts of the new Department of Manpower and Immigration to force the Branch out of immigrant education, the Branch managed to maintain its presence in this area and the education of immigrants remained the primary focus of the cultural diversity and education policy. Officials even made attempts to expand their work in this area to encompass immigrant children.

A new area of programming was added to cultural diversity and education as tentative steps were taken in the area of education for cultural retention. Clearly this latest addition to the cultural diversity and education was received with mixed, if not negative, emotions by officials of the Branch who attempted to do the minimum possible in response to the demands of ethnic groups and the recommendations of the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission in this area. Given the inclination of Branch officials, it is somewhat ironic that as the federal multiculturalism policy took shape that the government steadfastly refused to become involved in the education of immigrant children and instead focussed its attention on
developing a program of support for heritage language schools.
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Introduction

Earlier in this dissertation, I stated that my primary interest in undertaking this study was to determine whether education had been a central concern of the federal government throughout the development of its cultural diversity policy. I believe the evidence establishes unequivocally that education was a fundamental aspect of the cultural diversity policy from the beginning. Furthermore, I believe that as a result of the way policy in this area developed the federal government, in effect, established a cultural diversity and education policy related to but separate from the cultural diversity policy.

Arguably, the federal government never intended to establish a cultural diversity and education policy. Education was to have been nothing more than a strategy to implement the cultural diversity policy. But a separate education policy did develop with objectives that were distinct from and sometimes incompatible with the cultural diversity policy. In addition, the policy development process in the area of education undermined some of the principles of the cultural diversity policy. This occurred because of the interplay of three factors: the unplanned nature of policy development in this area, the organizations and individuals who were involved in the process, and the nature of the relationships between federal officials and others involved in the process.
Cultural Diversity Policy

As we have seen in this dissertation, from 1940 to 1971, the cultural diversity policy developed as part of the government's citizenship policy. During the War, the goal of citizenship policy was promoting patriotism. Immediately after the War the focus shifted to defining the legal status of citizen and establishing requirements for naturalization. By the mid-1950s the federal government's interest in citizenship had expanded to include encouraging all Canadians to become actively involved in the public life of the community. From the early 1960s to 1971 the policy addressed the issue of national unity. The focus of cultural diversity policy from 1940 to 1971 was to interpret citizenship policy for the so-called "newcomers". This meant developing programs that would promote patriotism, naturalization, participation, and unity among members of immigrant and non-French, non-British ethnic communities. One government agency was given primary responsibility for overseeing the development and implementation of cultural diversity policy. This agency, first known as the Nationalities Branch and later the Citizenship Branch, gave further definition to the policy through a series of programs, projects, and statements of policy. The policy grew and changed in response to changing sociopolitical conditions and the changing fortunes of the Citizenship Branch.

The cultural diversity policy began to take shape during the Second World War when the primary concern of the government was
to ensure the support of non-British, non-French Canadians for the war effort. Officials began their work in cultural diversity by establishing contacts with newspapers serving ethnic communities and providing the papers with information about government policy and initiatives, especially those in support of the war effort. They also contacted scholars and educators with an interest and expertise in the field of ethnic relations or cultural diversity and invited them to advise the government on policy and programs for ethnic communities. Later, government officials worked within ethnic communities to establish umbrella organizations that would bring together the leaders of the community's existing organizations and serve as another vehicle through which the government could communicate with the non-British, non-French segments of the population (Dreisziger 1988).

In addition, in December 1941, officials established the Advisory Committee on Cooperation in Canadian Citizenship, an advisory body consisting of scholars and educators who would direct the development of cultural diversity policy and programs for the remainder of the War. The Advisory Committee was initially charged with the responsibility for communicating the concerns of government to ethnic communities and the concerns of ethnic communities to government and the general public. Shortly after it began its work, the Advisory Committee argued that it needed a mandate to work with "established" Canadians as well because the British and French segments of the population did not accept members of other ethnic communities as equal citizens of the
country. As long as this held true, those of ethnic origins other than British and French would continue to feel alienated and never develop the sense of patriotism that the government wished to instill. As a result, by 1942, the cultural diversity policy had two explicit objectives: first, to promote among members of ethnic groups other than British or French a sense of loyalty and patriotism to Canada, and, second, to encourage members of the French and British ethnic groups to accept people of other ethnic origins as Canadians.

As the War drew to a close, there was some concern about the need for continuing federal involvement in the area of cultural diversity. The Minister of National War Services, whose department had had responsibility for cultural diversity throughout the War, commissioned a former member of the Advisory Committee, Robert England, to prepare a report with recommendations for the future of Nationalities Branch. The England Report proposed eighteen areas in which the successor to the Nationalities Branch could work. Of the eighteen, the one that provided the basis for the post-war mandate of the Branch was the preparation of immigrants for naturalization. The decision about the Branch's mandate was influenced largely by two factors: the expected influx of immigrants and the government's plans to introduce new legislation on Canadian citizenship.

The Branch, which, in 1944, was renamed the Citizenship Division, was transferred to the Department of the Secretary of State in 1945 where it was rechristened the Citizenship Branch.
The Branch immediately became involved in developing programs which would support the new Citizenship Act. When the Citizenship Act came into force in 1947, the Branch's role was defined as ensuring that prospective citizens were able to receive instruction to prepare them for Canadian citizenship. In spite of this narrowly defined official mandate the Branch managed to become involved in the broader field of immigrant settlement and to continue its involvement in encouraging "established" Canadians to accept "newcomers". By 1950-51 the Branch was describing its mandate in the following manner:

The functions of the Canadian Citizenship Branch are to promote unity among the various ethnic elements in Canada; to awaken in all Canadians a consciousness of the true worth of their citizenship; and to assist newcomers to this country adjust themselves more rapidly to the Canadian way of life. (Citizenship and Immigration 1951, 9).

Throughout the immediate post-war period the Branch maintained its connections with ethnic newspapers and continued to assist with the establishment of umbrella organizations within ethnic communities (Citizenship and Immigration 1950). In other words, the main focus of the Branch's work had changed but new programs and policy directions had been added to existing ones rather than replacing them.

Through the 1950s the Citizenship Branch, which became part of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration in 1950, continued to grow and expand its areas of interest. Citizenship and Immigration brought together those branches of government that developed and implemented policies for groups considered to
be outside of the ethnic mainstream, specifically, immigrants, First Nations peoples, and non-French and non-British ethnocultural groups. As the Branch's work with immigrant and ethnic groups continued and expanded, it was given primary responsibility for the federal government's policies in immigrant settlement and human rights.

By 1956 the Branch's status in immigrant settlement was confirmed when the government asked the Branch to represent Canada at the UNESCO conference on immigrant integration. In preparation for their participation in the conference, Branch staff drafted a document outlining the government policy on immigrant integration. The document emphasized that, to the government, immigrant integration meant encouraging voluntary assimilation while respecting the cultural diversity of immigrants. This did not mean that the government would support the development of ethnic identities within Canada but that it recognized that immigrants to Canada were of a variety of ethnocultural backgrounds and that, as long as there was immigration, there would be cultural diversity in the country. The government encouraged the creation of ethnocultural groups as a means to assist newcomers to assimilate.

In 1957, with the tenth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights on the horizon, the Branch was given responsibility for this policy area. The Branch was probably the most likely candidate because of its long-standing interest in relations between "established" Canadians and "newcomers". Its
role was to raise awareness among the general public about human rights concerns. To this end, in 1957, officers of the Branch were involved in several conferences on human rights and fair employment practices and in 1958 the Branch was asked to work with the Human Rights Anniversary Committee for Canada to encourage dialogue on human rights (Citizenship and Immigration 1958, 10).

From 1952 onward, the Branch used its involvement in immigrant integration and human rights as well as its responsibility for citizenship to increase the scope of its work to include groups concerned with adult education and the promotion of citizenship among Canadians of French and British origin. In addition, the Branch expanded its programming base to include integration of aboriginal peoples. As a result, by the early 1960s the Branch's mandate encompassed immigrant integration, integration of First Nations peoples, on-going communication with ethnic communities, human rights, adult education, and volunteer leadership development. Cultural diversity had ceased to be the sole focus of the Branch's work and was now an aspect of both parts of the Branch's dual mandate: integration, or that part of their work that concerned ethnocultural groups considered to be outside of the mainstream of Canadian society, and "general citizenship", those aspects of their work that addressed British and French Canadians. The two facets of the Branch's mandate were seen as compatible but separate. The Branch reinforced this view by trying to ensure
that agencies outside of the federal government were involved in either integration or general citizenship but not both.

During this period, which lasted from about 1952 to 1962, the cultural diversity policy consisted of three primary objectives. The major focus was immigrant integration which included work in immigrant education and work with community-based organizations with interests in immigrant settlement. The second objective was maintaining contact with ethnic communities. This objective was related to the first in that the Branch was mainly concerned with enlisting the support of ethnic communities in immigrant integration. Citizenship Branch officials saw the third objective, promoting intergroup relations, as part of general citizenship and therefore only indirectly related to integration. As a result, unlike the earlier period in its history, promoting intergroup relations was no longer linked to enhancing the sense of belonging among immigrants and members of non-French, non-British ethnic groups. Instead, promoting intergroup relations was seen as part of building a stronger community.

In the 1960s there was a renewed interest in national unity and national identity. It was against the backdrop of a public debate on these two issues and a massive government reorganization that the Citizenship Branch was asked to review its mandate and programming. By the mid-1960s the Branch was arguing that its mandate be redefined as general citizenship and that general citizenship, which was now being defined to include
work with immigrant and ethnic communities, was, in fact, synonymous with national unity. At the same time, the Branch was trading on its self-identified mandate in national unity and its long-standing connection with ethnic communities to establish a working relationship with the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission.

In 1966 the Branch was transferred to the Department of the Secretary of State and officials began to define their area of work as "small 'c' culture" rather than general citizenship. "Small 'c' culture" contained many of the elements of general citizenship as well as a focus on supporting aspects of ethnic folk arts. The 1966-67 Annual Report of the Secretary of State announced that "[t]he continuing role of the [Citizenship] branch [was] the development of intergroup and interregional understanding throughout Canada and encouragement, at the local level, of fuller participation by all ethnic groups in community activities." (Secretary of State 1967, 7). Thus cultural diversity once again became the central focus of the work of the Branch.

Although the revised mandate seemed to indicate an emphasis on intergroup relations, in fact it signalled the beginnings of a focus on working with non-French, non-British ethnic groups in areas unrelated to immigrant integration. Within its newly restated mandate, the Branch continued its work in integration and human rights and it expanded its work with ethnic communities. Its declared interest was no longer in simply
communicating with ethnic groups but in encouraging those groups to develop aspects of their cultural identity within Canada.

By the time the official multiculturalism policy was announced in 1971, the cultural diversity policy still included immigrant integration and intergroup relations, but its stated purpose was promoting ethnic participation and ethnic identity development. The policy now contained three separate objectives with goals that were not always compatible. This was most evident in the relationship between immigrant integration and ethnic participation. As I noted in the previous chapter, some officials of the Branch were concerned that the work with ethnic groups promoted ethnocentrism and, in turn, impeded integration. Further, although the language associated with immigrant integration had changed from earlier times, the programs had not. Thus, while the definition of integration had become "...enabling immigrants, through formal and informal organized groups and associations, to achieve full and complete participation in Canadian society" without "the loss of an individual's identity and original characteristics or of his [or her] original language and culture" (Government of Canada 1970, 5), the Branch continued to support projects that were very similar in form and content to projects it had supported in the days when integration meant voluntary assimilation. As a result, programs that had been designed to promote voluntary assimilation in the 1950s were now expected to support the maintenance of ethnic identities.

From this brief synopsis it is clear that cultural diversity
policy was additive in nature. The policy began as no more than a
series of initiatives designed to foster patriotism among members
of non-British, non-French ethnic communities. It grew to
incorporate objectives that encouraged acceptance of "newcomers"
by "established" Canadians, assisted immigrants to prepare for
naturalization, facilitated integration of immigrants, promoted
intergroup relations, advanced participation of members of non-
French, non-British ethnic groups in the wider community and
supported ethnic identity development. Given that status within
the bureaucracy is traditionally measured by "turf" and
resources, and that budgets and staff complements generally
increase as a result of expansion, it is not surprising that the
cultural diversity policy developed by constantly adding new
components.

One of the results of this development pattern was that the
policy grew to contain objectives and programs that were not
necessarily consistent with each other. The clearest example of
this occurred during the 1960s when ethnic identity development
was added to the policy. Policy statements were made which
attempted to reconcile existing work in immigrant integration
with the new focus on ethnic identity development but work in
integration continued to promote voluntary assimilation while
work in ethnic participation encouraged groups to maintain
distinctive identities.

Throughout its evolution, the purpose of the cultural
diversity policy remained relatively consistent. The policy was
meant to instill in members of immigrant and non-British, non-French ethnic groups a sense of loyalty to Canada and to encourage members of these groups to integrate into Canadian society. What changed over time was the meaning of integration and the understanding of how best to instill loyalty. Work in cultural diversity and education was, in part, responsible for introducing the ideas that supported these changes.

Cultural Diversity and Education Policy

Education was one of the first means identified to implement cultural diversity policy. In much the same way that cultural diversity policy took on a life of its own separate from yet related to citizenship policy. Goals, objectives, and programs were established in the area of cultural diversity and education that established it as a policy in its own right. Because it was never considered a separate policy area, there were few statements of any substance about cultural diversity and education thus the policy was defined almost entirely through a series of actual and attempted initiatives.

During the War, efforts of the federal government in the area of cultural diversity and education were limited to developing resource materials and establishing contact with educators and education officials. The focus of education initiatives was the group known as "established" Canadians, namely, Canadians of French and British origin and the purpose was to explore the myth of race. Four projects were undertaken to
achieve this goal: a radio series called "Canadians All", a
publication also called Canadians All, a film titled "Peoples of
Canada", and a pamphlet published under the name The Problem of
Race. The first three of these were tools for public education
and the fourth was produced specifically for teachers by the
Canadian Teachers' Federation. All of these projects shared a
common message. They attempted to expose the "myth of race" by
pointing out that race was equated with physical characteristics
rather than nationality or language and that no race could be
considered inherently superior or inferior to another (Canadian
Teachers' Federation 1944, Kirkconnell, 1941a). They informed
people that what divided Canadians was not race but loyalty to
different nations and traditions and that unity could be built by
developing "the sense of a great common tradition [which]
transcends these linguistic or cultural group loyalties."
(Canadian Teachers' Federation p.20). At the same time, there was
a recognition that ethnic diversity existed within the country
and that a certain amount of diversity would continue to exist.
As a result, the "achievement of national unity [would] be
bravely assisted if we encourage in every possible way a
sympathetic mutual knowledge of our respective group traditions."
(Canadian Teachers' Federation p.22). Thus people were taught
about race and cultural difference in the hopes that this would
help them move beyond their differences and build a common sense
of nationhood.

While the cultural diversity policy justified this work as
part of the effort to promote loyalty among members of the
"other" ethnic groups by encouraging their acceptance among
members of the British and French majority, the resources
themselves identified a different purpose. The impetus for work
in cultural diversity and education, according to The Problem of
Race, was the War which "brought the problem of race forcibly to
the attention of all thinking people." (Canadian Teachers'
Federation p. 1). In addition, the author of Canadians All
identified a fear that Nazis might attempt "to undermine the
moral and physical resistance" (Kirkconnell 1941a, 3) of
Canadians by breeding dissention among people of different ethnic
backgrounds. Nowhere did the documents mention the need to be
accepting of "newcomers" in order to increase their feeling of
belonging to the country. Consequently, the purpose of the
cultural diversity and education initiatives during the War was
to convince "established" Canadians that racism was unpatriotic.
Although this was compatible with the cultural diversity policy's
goal of promoting acceptance of "newcomers", it was clearly a
different objective.

We have seen that in the immediate post-war era the official
focus of the cultural diversity policy shifted away from
promoting patriotism to encouraging immigrants to become
naturalized citizens. Within this mandate, education was to be
used as a strategy to prepare immigrants for naturalization. In
1946, the federal government, through the Citizenship Branch,
proposed to:
lay before [immigrants] through properly prepared material, prepared perhaps by non-governmental organizations who have the sanction of educational authorities, historians, and so on, facts which will inform them not only of the opportunities and the privileges which they will acquire as future Canadian citizens but of the obligations."

As we have seen in Chapter 5 of this dissertation, the Citizenship Branch's work in education went far beyond the narrow parameters set forth by the Citizenship Act.

The work of the Citizenship Branch in education in the late 1940s and early 1950s fell into two categories: immigrant education and education for "established" Canadians about "newcomers". There were two major projects undertaken in the latter category. The first was the production with the NFB of a film on racial discrimination. The final product was a compilation of three American films on racial discrimination with an introduction by the Director of the Citizenship Branch in which he spoke of the applicability of the information to Canada. The second project involved Ontario Education and the CBC in the development of a series of radio broadcasts using drama to explore the views and concerns of "established" Canadians about immigrants and immigration. The proposal for the project noted that the series would provide information on the backgrounds of immigrants entering the country after the War and examine prejudicial and sympathetic attitudes towards immigrants. The goal of the project was "[t]o define for Canadians 'good citizenship' in terms which can and should be achieved by all [people] who live in Canada. Among other things, special emphasis
to be laid on assisting newcomers to achieve this." The Citizenship Branch's financial support to this project indicated support for these objectives.

The majority of the Branch's financial resources and staff time in the late 1940s and early 1950s was spent in support of immigrant education. In this area, the Branch was involved in three significant initiatives: provision of English as a Second Language textbooks to provinces, development and distribution of citizenship materials, and support to the Citizenship Council's Immigrant Education Program. The first initiative began as a gesture of support, if not appeasement, to the provinces. When officials of the Department of the Secretary of State met with provincial deputy ministers of education in 1947 to discuss federal involvement in citizenship education, they heard that the provincial officials were not concerned about citizenship education but were worried about the additional costs they would have to incur for English language education for immigrants. Some of the provinces argued that the federal government should take on the responsibility for funding language classes. Federal officials were not prepared to accept this position but did finally agree to provide provinces with language education materials. From that time, language instruction became the focal point of the Citizenship Branch's work in immigrant education.

The second initiative, provision of citizenship resource materials, also involved the federal government working with and through the provincial governments. Three citizenship resource
booklets, on history, geography, and the responsibilities of citizenship, were produced by the Citizenship Branch in consultation with the Citizenship Council and the Canadian Education Association and were distributed by the Branch to departments of education. While the Branch was ostensibly doing this as a way of preparing immigrants to become naturalized citizens, it convinced the provinces to use the resources by marketing them as supplementary material for language classes.

The third project, the Citizenship Council's Immigrant Education Program, supplemented the work of the Branch and the provinces in language education. The Citizenship Council hired an English as a second language expert, Florence Gaynor, to provide workshops for teachers working with immigrant adults and children and to develop supplementary teaching materials for English as a second language classes. Through this program the interests of the Branch in immigrant education expanded to include teacher training and the development and distribution of resource materials for classes for immigrant adults and children.

Cultural diversity and education policy at this point in its history had two goals. The main goal was to assist adult immigrants to learn English and, in the process, to learn about aspects of the country so that they could more easily assimilate into Canadian society. At the same time, the policy continued to be concerned with the education of "established" Canadians on the topic of race and cultural difference. Being accepting of others was no longer necessary to ward off the Nazi threat but it was
still considered part of good citizenship. Helping immigrants learn English supported the cultural diversity policy's goal of assisting immigrants to "adjust themselves more rapidly to the Canadian way of life" (Citizenship and Immigration 1950, 9). The second goal was consistent with the cultural diversity policy goal of promoting unity among the various ethnic groups in Canada but responded to it only in part as it focussed on teaching members of the majority groups that tolerance was an important citizenship value. No programs existed to convey this message to members of immigrant and non-British, non-French ethnic groups.

In 1952 the cultural diversity and education policy took a new turn as the Citizenship Branch began to negotiate its first set of federal-provincial agreements on immigrant education. Under the terms of the Citizenship Instruction agreements the federal government agreed to pay for part of the salary of English as a second language teachers instructing adult immigrants. Concurrently, the Branch forced the non-governmental organizations with which it was associated to move out of the area of immigrant education. Using its power as a funding agency, the Branch redirected the efforts of non-governmental organizations into the area it called general citizenship which included intergroup relations education. Branch officials then began to work very closely with Ontario Education to develop and implement policy and programs in cultural diversity and education.

The Community Programs Branch of Ontario Education, with the
support of the Citizenship Branch, took on two major projects in
the mid-1950s: a summer training program for teachers of English
as a second language from across the country and an annual
workshop on intergroup relations. The program for English
teachers, which involved teachers of adults and children, was the
apparent successor to a program that had been initiated by
Florence Gaynor and the University of Manitoba but which was
discontinued when the Citizenship Branch stopped funding the
Citizenship Council's Immigrant Education Program. The workshop
on intergroup relations was similar to seminars conducted by non-
governmental organizations and universities in other parts of the
country. The objectives of the sessions, alternately called
citizenship seminars or workshops in human relations, were to
provide:

an opportunity for Canadians of different
language, religion, race, ethnic origin and
culture to come to know each other in that they
not only work on common projects but often live
together on the campus of the university. Workshop
participants learn the facts of race and culture
from anthropologists, sociologists, psychologists.
They are taught the most modern techniques to be
used in the classroom, the office, the community
for improving human relations. (Citizenship Branch
1955, 10)

The association between the Citizenship Branch and the
Community Programmes Branch was much more than a simple funding
relationship. Representatives of the two Branches met frequently
to discuss the direction of cultural diversity and education
programs, particularly those in the area of immigrant education.
From 1955 to 1960 one issue that was consistently a topic of
discussion between the two branches was resource materials for language instruction. The Citizenship Branch had been supplying copies of one English as a second language textbook to all provinces since the 1947 meeting with the deputy ministers of education. By 1959 officials of the Community Programmes Branch were arguing that this one textbook was no longer sufficient. They felt that it was important for teachers to have a variety of resources available to them and therefore recommended that the Branch change its policy to allow teachers to choose among the available texts. The Citizenship Branch eventually acceded to the request and by 1963 a second set of federal-provincial agreements had been negotiated through which the federal government undertook to provide funding to the provinces so that they could purchase their own textbooks.

The other major policy issue which came to the fore as a result of discussions between the Community Programmes Branch and the Citizenship Branch was the Citizenship Branch's involvement in the education of immigrant children. The Citizenship Branch had had a peripheral involvement in the education of immigrant children first through its support of the Citizenship Council's immigrant education program and later through its assistance to Ontario Education's teacher training initiatives. In addition, there is some evidence that suggests that the citizenship materials produced by the Citizenship Branch for adult immigrants were being used by elementary and secondary school teachers. In 1956, the director of the Community Programmes Branch officially
requested that Ontario Education be authorized to use some of the language texts and citizenship materials to teach immigrant children. Citizenship Branch officials were favourably predisposed to this idea but the Minister and Deputy Minister of Citizenship and Immigration did not wish to appear too eager to begin an overt involvement in the education of children. They therefore instructed the Branch not to respond until the request was renewed. The request was never renewed so the Citizenship Branch did not act on this decision.

From the 1950s to the early 1960s the cultural diversity and education policy continued to have two major objectives, namely, intergroup relations education and immigrant education. Intergroup relations education, like its predecessors, education on race and education for tolerance, still focused on teaching about race and cultural differences. It differed from its predecessors in that it was directed at members of British, French and "other" ethnic groups. Furthermore, whereas in the past the Branch's involvement had been largely restricted to the development of resource materials, during this period the Branch funded and participated in structured programs. Participants in these programs were encouraged not simply to learn about concepts but to develop strategies for improving intergroup relations in communities, workplaces, and classrooms.

The majority of the Branch's time and resources in the area of education continued to be devoted to immigrant education which still had language education as its main focus. The Branch
continued to provide resource materials and support teacher training opportunities but it was now working exclusively with and through the provinces in this area. A significant change during this period was that the Branch expanded its area of support to include direct instruction costs. As well, the Branch was prepared to become explicitly involved in the education of immigrant children.

It was during this period that a meaningful rift occurred between the cultural diversity and education policy and the cultural diversity policy. The work in immigrant education continued to support the cultural diversity policy goal of integration as voluntary assimilation but work in intergroup relations education, to a certain extent, undermined this same goal. While the cultural diversity policy saw intergroup relations as only peripherally related to immigrant integration, intergroup relations education was explicitly linked to immigrant integration. At the Ontario Education sponsored workshop on intergroup relations in 1955, for example, the entire focus of discussion was the responsibility of "ethnic" and "old Canadian" leadership in facilitating the integration of immigrants'. The 1957 version of the same workshop concentrated on "the responsibility of labour, management, government, and volunteer organizations with respect to the economic, social and cultural impact of large numbers of immigrants in the community." (Citizenship and Immigration 1958, 10). Moreover, work in intergroup relations education encouraged the view that immigrant
and ethnic groups should not have to relinquish their cultural identity in order to become part of Canadian society. At the same time, under the auspices of immigrant integration, the Citizenship Branch was encouraging its officers to assist immigrants to sever ties with their ethnic communities. Thus the views being promoted through intergroup relations education stood in direct opposition to the integration objective of the cultural diversity policy.

From 1963 to 1971 the Citizenship Branch continued the work it had undertaken during the 1950s. It maintained its close relationship with the Ontario government through the Citizenship Division, the successor to the Community Programmes Branch. Because the Ontario government had turned over responsibility for its intergroup relations workshop to the Ontario Welfare Council in 1959, immigrant education was the only area in which the two agencies worked together during this period. The Citizenship Branch continued to fund the teacher training program and the Citizenship Division maintained responsibility for administration of funds received through the two federal-provincial agreements. By 1969, the Citizenship Branch was also providing funding to the Citizenship Division for the development of curriculum and resource materials for English as a second language programs. In addition, representatives of the two agencies continued to confer on a regular basis until at least 1970.

Work also continued in the area of intergroup relations education but this area was not given the profile or priority it
had had in the 1950s. Intergroup relations seminars received support at least until 1967 but the only new projects undertaken in this area between 1963 and 1971 were publications. A study guide titled Let's Take a Look at Prejudice and Discrimination, which had earlier been published as two separate pamphlets, was prepared in 1963 and distributed to educators and community leaders. One year later, the Branch published a compilation of articles under the title Cultural Contributions of Newcomers to Canada and some individual articles on race and culture appeared in the Branch's periodical Citizen/Citoyen. The express purpose of these publications was to improve intergroup relations and to provide additional resource materials to educators (Citizenship and Immigration 1965, 9).

The major influence on the direction of cultural diversity and education policy from 1963 to 1971 was the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission. We have already seen that as a unit, the Citizenship Branch had tied its future very closely with the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission. Initially, as it worked to establish its relationship with the Commission, the Branch proposed to redirect its work in immigrant language education toward the broader area of language education for all those wishing to learn French or English. Building on its existing work in teaching English and French as second languages, in 1965 the Branch proposed that it expand its involvement in language instruction. It wished to provide support to universities to train specialists in English and French as second
languages who could, in turn, teach teachers. More importantly, the Branch also suggested that it be allowed to extend its language training programs to include people of First Nations origin and native English and French speakers wishing to learn the other official language\textsuperscript{11}. Ultimately the Branch did not proceed in this direction because the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission did not support these proposals.

The Commission saw the Branch as the unit responsible for "other ethnic groups", consequently, Branch officials were made to focus their attention on education issues arising from Book IV of the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission Report, namely, language education for immigrant children and non-official language education. When Book IV was published in 1970, the Branch was much more prepared to respond to the recommendations on immigrant children than those addressing non-official languages. As I have noted above, the issue of immigrant children was initially brought to the fore by Ontario Education in 1956. Ontario was also responsible for reintroducing it as a topic of discussion in 1964. On both occasions Branch officials recommended that the federal government accept the proposal but both times, for different reasons, the federal government did not act on these recommendations. In 1970, the Branch, with the assistance of the Ontario Citizenship Division and the Toronto Board of Education, developed a detailed proposal in response to the Bilingualism and Biculturalism recommendation that the federal government assume responsibility for the language
education of immigrant children. However, the government chose once again not to accept the Branch's recommendation.

The Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission made two recommendations on the teaching of non-official languages in public schools. We have seen in Chapter 7 that the Branch was somewhat reluctant to work in this area so it made proposals that responded only indirectly to the recommendations. The Branch's initial response was to propose further study on the issue and to suggest that it would provide funding for summer cultural camps through which ethnic groups could teach children about their culture and language. Later it also proposed that the government broaden the mandate of the Language Research Council and provide the Council funds to conduct research on non-official languages. Thus the Branch began its tentative involvement in education for cultural retention.

The primary focus of the work in cultural diversity and education from 1963 to 1971 was language education. At the same time that the Branch maintained and expanded its involvement in immigrant language education, it attempted to become involved in official language education for other groups, however, it was forced into the area of non-official language education instead. Throughout this period, the Branch also continued to have an interest in intergroup relations education, which, during this period was kept alive largely through the publication and distribution of resource materials. By 1971, then, cultural diversity and education included immigrant education, intergroup
relations education, and education for cultural retention.

The distinction between the cultural diversity policy and the cultural diversity and education policy became even more pronounced during this period. The main objective of the education policy was immigrant education which continued to have an assimilationist focus. The focal point for the cultural diversity policy of the same period was ethnic participation and ethnic identity development. Thus while the education policy focused on immigrants and promoted assimilation, the cultural diversity policy was beginning to focus on "ethnics" and encouraged maintenance of difference.

Like the cultural diversity policy, the cultural diversity and education policy was additive in nature. It began as a program to promote awareness of race and cultural difference in "established" Canadians. It grew to incorporate education for immigrants, including education in English and French as second languages and basic instruction on Canadian history, geography, and government. Meanwhile, education on race developed into education for tolerance and, later, intergroup relations education. Finally, the policy reluctantly expanded to encompass one aspect of education for cultural retention, specifically, non-official language education. Like the cultural diversity policy, the education policy contained the contradictory objectives of promoting assimilation and encouraging diversity. Where intergroup relations education and its predecessors encouraged the acceptance of cultural differences, and non-
official language education promoted cultural maintenance, immigrant education sought to eradicate differences. Ironically, while work in intergroup relations education was responsible in part for preparing the way for cultural diversity policy to include ethnic identity development, the guardians of the education policy were reluctant to allow ethnic identity development to become a part of cultural diversity and education. Much of the explanation for this phenomenon lies in how the cultural diversity and education policy was developed and who was involved in this process.

Defining the Policy Process

Scholars have generally described the policy process as a progression of steps that begins with issue identification and moves through to goal-setting, implementation, and evaluation (e.g. Majone 1989; Hogwood and Gunn 1984). Given that the cultural diversity and education policy was largely unplanned, the policy process did not follow these sequential steps. Instead, policy developed through a collection of measures that were originally meant to allow the federal government to implement cultural diversity programs in an area of provincial responsibility. Because the provinces and other groups involved in cultural diversity and education had their own agendas, it was occasionally necessary for the Branch to modify its cultural diversity objectives in order to maintain or increase its involvement in education. Thus each of the strategies the Branch
employed to implement its policy in this sector became sites of negotiation and compromise.

Branch officials had two ways in which they could become directly involved in the development or delivery of educational programs. They produced or supported the production of resource materials or they acted as advisors or resource people to specific projects. We have already seen how, in describing the purpose of resource materials, the Branch, in effect, articulated part of its cultural diversity and education policy. Working as advisors or resource people afforded Branch officials the opportunity to form professional and personal relationships with other individuals and groups that had interests in cultural diversity and education. This gave those individuals an avenue through which they could potentially influence federal policy. At the same time it gave federal officials the chance to influence the policy and programs of the groups with which they were working. In addition, both producing resources and acting as advisors helped reinforce the Branch's image as an expert in the field.

Funding was another avenue through which the Branch became involved in projects. By 1948 the Branch had a small grants budget through which it could fund the work of non-governmental organizations. This funding was used to support the Canadian Citizenship Council and allowed for the development of projects like the Immigrant Education Program through which the Branch expanded the scope of its own work to include areas in which it
later took a more direct interest, in this case, teacher training and the education of immigrant children. Later, as the grants budget expanded, grants were also used to support projects like the intergroup relations workshops which effectively redefined the Branch's goals in the area of intergroup relations education. By funding non-governmental organizations the Branch helped create for itself a constituency with a vested interest in the Branch's survival and growth.

In addition to its grants budget, the Branch was also able to obtain resources that it could give directly to provinces to support certain initiatives. From 1947 to 1963, for example, the Branch was able to use funds to purchase language textbooks which it then distributed free of charge to the provinces. In 1953 and again in 1963 the Branch argued successfully for funds with which to establish the two federal-provincial agreements in immigrant language instruction. In these instances the resources were used to support and extend the work of the provinces and to secure provincial support for the Branch's involvement in immigrant education.

At two points in its history the Branch obtained special funds for specific projects carried out by the province of Ontario. As I have described in Chapter 6, the funding, which was used in the 1940s to support a radio series and in the 1950s and 1960s to support teacher training, intergroup relations seminars, and, later, curriculum development for English as a second language programs, was only one aspect of the relationship
between the Branch and Ontario's Community Programmes Branch. The two agencies collaborated on projects and conferred on a number of policy issues. Generally, neither the activities nor the funds used to support them were publicly reported thus the Branch managed to maintain the public appearance of non-involvement. As a result, neither agency had to expend any energy justifying the Citizenship Branch's involvement in the area and the Branch and the province were able to develop policy and programs with little or no political or public attention. Furthermore, in supporting the provincial agency's projects, the Branch helped to establish Ontario as the province with the greatest expertise in cultural diversity and education. The Branch later traded on Ontario's status when it referenced the province's concerns about immigrant children and language textbooks in its attempts to modify its policy in these areas.

Another strategy the Branch used periodically to help justify or extend its work was to organize a consultation. From Robert England's consultation with the Canadian Council of Education for Citizenship to the 1970 consultations on the response to the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission Report, this strategy was used primarily as a way of garnering support for a particular position favoured by the Branch. Because Branch officials usually set the agenda, controlled who would be invited to the consultation, and wrote the subsequent report on the outcomes of the event, the consultation appeared to be a fool-proof way for the Branch to be assured of support for the policy
direction it wanted to propose. But it was also frequently a vehicle through which new issues were introduced into the discussion. In 1947, for example, the provinces succeeded in getting the Citizenship Branch to redefine citizenship education to include language instruction. Consultations were inevitably followed by a period in which the Branch made recommendations for change which were often accepted by senior officials likely because the Branch was able to claim the support of a constituency for new policy and program directions.

Because the cultural diversity and education policy developed in a piecemeal fashion through these various strategies, the policy process was diffuse and ad hoc rather than linear and continuous. Programs and projects were developed in response to the organizational, political, and social needs of a particular moment. Since the process was not systematic, existing programs and projects were rarely, if ever, evaluated. Instead, they were either allowed to continue indefinitely or terminated when they ceased to be politically or organizationally important. Consequently, it is not surprising that the policy grew to incorporate conflicting objectives.

By engaging with other groups through the implementation strategies, the Branch developed and sustained for itself both a constituency interested in the Branch's survival and a community involved in the development of cultural diversity and education policy. The policy community included agencies from within and outside the federal government. Those from within the government
were part of the community by virtue of their own interests in areas related to cultural diversity. Those from outside of government became part of the community only if they were successfully able to establish a relationship with the Branch.

The Policy Community

From the outset, the federal government exercised significant control over the direction of the cultural diversity and cultural diversity and education policies because it had the power to determine who would and would not be involved in the policy process. I have noted earlier that there was considerable work being done in the area of cultural diversity prior to the federal government's entry into the field. Ethnic groups, mainstream volunteer organizations and businesses, especially the railways, all had interests in the area. Cultural diversity and education also existed as a field of activity prior to the Second World War. Educators and public schools were concerned with preparing children of immigrant and non-French, non-British ethnic backgrounds to fit into Canadian society. Women's groups and church-based organizations worked to facilitate the assimilation of adult immigrants. Ethnic groups helped newer members of their communities learn English and organized heritage language classes for children. A small number of scholars were interested in using education to reduce negative attitudes towards non-British, non-French ethnic groups. Most of these groups continued their work both during and after the War.
However, relatively few of them were involved in the development of federal policy and programs in cultural diversity and education.

When the federal government decided to enter the field of cultural diversity, of the several groups to which officials could have turned for advice and assistance, they chose to seek out scholars and educators. The first federally-constituted body with responsibilities in the area of cultural diversity was the Advisory Committee on Cooperation in Canadian Citizenship the membership of which was almost entirely scholars and educators. Members of this Committee were also involved in developing all of the cultural diversity and education initiatives during the War. In addition, in 1944, one of the original members of the Advisory Committee, Robert England, wrote the report which recommended the federal government continue its work in cultural diversity after the War.

In the immediate post-war period the three groups apart from the Citizenship Branch that had the greatest influence on the cultural diversity and cultural diversity and education policies were the provincial departments of education, other federal government departments, and the Canadian Citizenship Council. It was as a result of discussions with deputy ministers of education that the Branch decided to become involved in immigrant language education. The other federal departments that were most interested in the work of the Branch were those that were already engaged in the fields of immigration or immigrant settlement,
especially the Department of Mines and Resources and the Department of Labour. The Citizenship Council was the Branch's first important non-governmental ally as well as the only non-governmental organization to receive funds from the Branch from 1947 to 1951. The Canadian Education Association acted as a representative of the provincial departments of education. One of the key ways in which all of these groups participated directly in the policy process was through the Advisory Committee on Citizenship, an interdepartmental committee struck by Cabinet to provide the government advice on citizenship policy.

From the early 1950s onward, there existed no body comparable to either of the advisory committees of the past. Officials of the Citizenship Branch made recommendations directly to senior officials within the Department of Citizenship and Immigration. The groups that influenced the policies of the Branch did so largely by virtue of the fact that they were able to establish close relationships and on-going contact with Branch officials. In the years from 1952 to 1963, as we have seen, in the area of immigrant education the Citizenship Branch began working exclusively with the provinces and, in particular, embarked on a close and lengthy association with the province of Ontario. In addition, it began to support the efforts of adult education organizations, particularly the Canadian Association for Adult Education, in a field it called general citizenship. This was the first time in its history that the Branch's policies and programs in immigrant education and intergroup relations
education were being influenced by different sets of organizations.

From 1963 to 1971, three groups in addition to the Citizenship Branch played significant roles in the development of cultural diversity and education policy. The body with the greatest influence on both the Branch's cultural diversity and cultural diversity and education policies was the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission. The Commission rejected the Branch's attempts to become involved in official language education and instead directed the Branch's attention to non-official language education and education of immigrant children. The Commission also provided ethnic groups with an avenue through which they could meaningfully influence the work of the Branch in both cultural diversity and cultural diversity and education. Apart from the Commission, the one other group that played an important role was the Ontario Citizenship Division. The Division continued to work closely with the Branch in the area of immigrant education.

One of the interesting discoveries as we look at who was, and was not, involved in cultural diversity and education is that those extra-governmental groups that received funding from the Citizenship Branch to carry out projects in the area were generally the same as those with influence on policy. It appears that the Branch used its resources to build a policy community and that policy developed largely as a result of interaction between the Branch and the members of this community. It is also
clear that certain groups were deliberately excluded from membership in this community. In the 1940s, for example, the Branch was aware of the work of women's groups, church-based organizations, and ethnic associations in immigrant education but these groups neither received funding nor became part of the Branch's policy community. As a result, cultural diversity and education policy was determined largely by government officials, educators, and representatives of select government-sponsored, if not government-created, organizations.

Power and Influence in the Policy Process

Specific aspects of the policy were determined through a process of negotiation between Citizenship Branch officials and members of the policy community. The most significant factors in the negotiations were power, credibility, and legitimacy. The amount of influence a particular group had on the precise nature of policies was determined by one or more of the following: the degree of power it held in relation to the Citizenship Branch, the credibility of individuals within the group, and the amount of legitimacy the group, or the activity it was proposing, could help confer on the Branch.

The two government-appointed bodies that played a significant role in the policy process, the Advisory Committee on Cooperation in Canadian Citizenship and the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission, both held power over the Branch. The members of the Advisory Committee had substantial credibility
because they were scholars and educators and because senior officials knew them, either personally or by reputation. The credibility of these individuals undoubtedly contributed to the legitimacy of the federal government's project in cultural diversity. As we have seen in Chapter 4, prior to the establishment of the Advisory Committee some individuals associated with the Bureau of Public Information were working in the area of cultural diversity but it was not until the Committee was formed that senior officials in Department of National War Services were able to argue successfully for the creation of the Nationalities Branch. The source of the Advisory Committee's power over the Branch then was the nature of its relationship with the agency which began life as simply the executive arm of the Committee.

The relationship between the Citizenship Branch and the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission was not as one-sided as the relationship between the Branch and the Advisory Committee. The source of the Commission's power was the relationship the Branch itself had cultivated with the Commission. The Commission appeared at a time when the future of the Branch was uncertain. The Branch chose to associate itself with the Commission in hopes that this connection would eventually lead to a more secure future. In so doing, the Branch became, in effect, a secondary administrative support unit for the Commission. As a result, the Commission was able to direct much of the Branch's work toward ethnic groups and away from official language communities. At the
same time, the Branch was able to use its status as the government expert on ethnic communities to influence the work of the Commission. As we have seen in Chapter 7, the participation of ethnic groups in the Bilingualism and Biculturalism process was to a large extent mediated by the Citizenship Branch. Branch officials provided information to the Commission on ethnic groups in Canada, arranged the regional consultations, made recommendations to the Commission on groups with which the Commission should hold special meetings, and helped Commission representatives get invitations to attend meetings of the Ethnic Press Association and the Folk Arts Council. At the same time, the Branch encouraged certain ethnic groups to make submissions to the Commission and provided support to some ethnic groups to discuss cultural diversity within their communities (Citizenship and Immigration 1964, 11).

While they existed, then, both the Advisory Committee on Cooperation in Canadian Citizenship and the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission were able to exert significant influence over the direction of cultural diversity and cultural diversity and education policies. In addition, both bodies left the Branch with a legacy on which to build future policies and programs. From the Advisory Committee the Branch inherited a mandate that included working with ethnic communities and working in education. The Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission helped to reinforce the Branch's profile in ethnic relations and left it in a position to assume control of Book IV of the Bilingualism
and Biculturalism Commission Report. In addition, Book IV helped the Branch to convince elected officials to adopt the government's first official policy statement on cultural diversity.

The relationship between the Branch and other federal government agencies with an interest in immigrant settlement focussed upon the Branch's struggle for "turf" within the federal bureaucracy. When the Secretary of State and the Citizenship Branch were given responsibility for the Citizenship Act, there were already four other federal government departments involved in work with immigrants and immigration - Mines and Resources, Health and Welfare, External Affairs, and Labour. Of the four, Mines and Resources and Labour expressed the keenest interest in the establishment of the Citizenship Branch. Mines and Resources supported the Branch and its proposed mandate whereas Labour perceived the Branch as a threat. In 1947, while the Branch was still trying to overcome opposition from senior officials within the Secretary of State, Labour had begun to work in immigrant settlement and language education and was establishing a network of extra-governmental contacts in the area. Labour was therefore in a stronger position to make a claim on the area of language education. But the Branch, with the assistance of Mines and Resources and the Citizenship Council, was able to engineer the creation of the Advisory Committee on Citizenship which helped to establish the Branch as the lead federal agency in immigrant education and immigrant settlement.
The Advisory Committee on Citizenship, which was established in 1948, was never actually disbanded but was only fully functional from 1948 to 1950. It was meant to be a federal interdepartmental committee that would advise the government on citizenship and cultural diversity policy but the Citizenship Branch was able to argue successfully for the inclusion of two external bodies - the Canadian Citizenship Council and the Canadian Education Association. The latter, at the time, acted as a representative of the provincial departments of education. The Advisory Committee, which was chaired by the Under Secretary of State, served as a forum for the Branch, the main agencies through which it was implementing its programs, and its potential and actual allies and detractors within government to meet and discuss policy and programs. Unlike the wartime Advisory Committee, this body did not actually develop policy and programs. Instead, it reacted to proposals brought forward by the Citizenship Branch. The Committee made three major contributions to cultural diversity and education policy. First, it supported the Branch's decision to provide resources to the provinces for immigrant language instruction and thereby confirmed the Branch's role in immigrant education. Second, its support of the Branch's involvement in the Ontario Education/CBC radio project helped the Branch to maintain its presence in education on race and tolerance. Third, it supported the establishment of regional liaison positions for the Citizenship Branch. This decision increased the Branch's staff complement and gave it the mandate
and ability to work with local educational authorities.

Despite the strides the Branch made in securing its position in immigrant language education, the Department of Labour did not lose its interest in the area. In 1952, the Branch discovered that Labour was considering a request from a province to provide funding for English language instruction for immigrants. This event was the catalyst for the development of the first federal-provincial agreements on immigrant language instruction. Thus both support and opposition from other federal government agencies were significant factors in the development of cultural diversity and education policy.

The Citizenship Branch's relationships with provincial government departments were generally regulated by the fact that each party had something the other wanted. Initially, the Branch wanted to establish a place for itself in immigrant education and the provinces wanted the federal government to pay for immigrant language instruction. The Branch argued that the federal government could not provide funding but addressed some of the provinces' concerns by agreeing to provide resources for language instruction. The provinces, in turn, allowed the Branch to enter their constitutionally sacred ground. The only exception to this rule was the province of Quebec which steadfastly refused to allow the Branch to work directly with or through its Department of Education. This did not mean that the Branch was not able to work in the province. The province was willing to accept the Branch's assistance as long as it was channelled through agencies
like the Montreal Catholic School Board or La Société canadienne d'enseignement postscolaire. In the final analysis, Quebec's position on the Branch's involvement in immigrant education was not much different than that of the other provinces: it did not wish to give up jurisdiction over education but it was willing to accept funds from the federal government. The relationship between Quebec and the Branch was different because the provincial government refused to work directly with the Branch.

Ontario was the one province with which the Branch established a close working relationship. As a result, Ontario was the province that exerted the greatest influence on the cultural diversity and education policy. In the association between the Branch and the province of Ontario, the province wanted resources and the Branch appeared to want status as the centre of expertise and power in the area of immigrant education in Canada. The fact of mutual benefit led to a degree of collegiality and cooperation in the relationship that tended not to exist with other groups with which the Branch was associated. The nature of the Branch's relationship with the provincial agency was also influenced by personal ties between Branch officials and provincial officials. By entering into this special relationship with Ontario Education, the Branch also confirmed Ontario's position as the province with the most interest in cultural diversity and education. Accordingly, Ontario also became the province with the greatest influence on the federal policy.
In the end, all of the provinces influenced federal policy to the degree that they could help the Branch gain a central position in the field of cultural diversity and education. The Branch, in turn, influenced provincial policies by providing financial support and other resources.

The Branch's relationships with non-governmental organizations were more complicated than those described above. After the War, the Branch established a somewhat symbiotic relationship with the Canadian Citizenship Council. The Branch helped establish the Council as the main national non-governmental agency in immigrant education and integration and then became the Council's primary funder. For its part, the Council helped to convince the Secretary of State and his colleagues to create the Advisory Committee on Citizenship and supported the Citizenship Branch's proposals at Committee meetings. At this point, the Branch was intimately involved in developing the Council's policy and programs and the Council held a similar position in relation to the Branch. By the early 1950s, however, the Branch was well-established and the support of the Council had ceased to be pivotal to the Branch's existence. In addition, Frank Foulds who, as director of the Branch, had worked to establish the connection with the Council passed away. The new director, Eugene Bussière, was more interested in adult education than immigrant integration and thus did not pursue the relationship with the Council. At the same time, the Deputy Minister of Citizenship and Immigration was concerned with
establishing the Branch as the central authority in immigrant education. Consequently, the relationship between the Branch and Council became little more than that of funder-client. At this juncture, the Council ceased to have any significant influence on the work of the Branch or the cultural diversity and education policy.

The basis for the Branch's relationship with the Canadian Association for Adult Education was different than the basis for its relationship with the Council. The Association had not been propped up by the Branch nor was it ever primarily dependent on the Branch for its funding. In the late 1940s and early 1950s it held only a peripheral position in the Branch's universe. But the Association did have an considerable reputation in the field of citizenship education. The establishment of a relationship with the Association was facilitated by the fact that Eugene Bussière, having worked in the field of adult education prior to assuming the role of director of the Citizenship Branch, already had a good personal and professional relationship with Roby Kidd, the Executive Director of the Canadian Association for Adult Education. The Branch thus turned to the Association for advice as it expanded its programming in general citizenship and adult education. Some of the Association's long-held views became reflected in the cultural diversity and cultural diversity and education policies. For example, Roby Kidd firmly believed that one of principal goals of citizenship education should be to help Canadians develop a cultural identity which would include
distinct ethnic identities within a common national identity (Selman 1991, 51). In addition, the Association viewed tolerance and acceptance of others as an important citizenship value. This is possibly one of the reasons intergroup relations came to be associated with general citizenship rather than immigrant integration. Thus the Canadian Association for Adult Education became influential in the development of cultural diversity and education policy in the 1950s.

The pattern for the Branch's relationship with ethnic groups was established during the War when the Advisory Committee was given the mandate to interpret the needs of ethnic groups to the government and the public at large. Implicit in the statement was the view that ethnic groups were not capable of representing their own concerns and therefore needed a government-constituted body to act as their voice. When the Citizenship Branch was established in 1944, it took over this responsibility. Furthermore, until at least 1959, the Branch saw "interpreting ethnic groups to Canadians" as part of its mandate. Throughout most of the history of the Branch, if ethnic groups were consulted on policy, it was only after important decisions had already been made. For example, in 1944, Robert England consulted with ethnic groups on the establishment of the Citizenship Branch after he had submitted his report to the Minister of National War Services. Moreover, until the discussion of non-official languages emerged as one of the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission's areas of interest, ethnic groups were absent from
all policy discussions on cultural diversity and education. Yet even when ethnic groups entered the discussions they had minimal influence on policy. As we have already seen, Branch officials avoided the establishment of substantial programs in non-official language education by claiming that provincial government officials were opposed to such programs. In the end, the Branch recommended measures in this area because they felt they needed the support of ethnic groups in order to convince elected officials to approve their proposed cultural diversity policy and program. In short, immigrant and ethnic groups were perceived primarily as beneficiaries of the programs and policies of the Branch rather than as credible participants in the policy process. It was not until the 1960s, when ethnic groups were perceived as having some political power, that they were included in the policy process. Even then they had only limited influence on the direction of cultural diversity and education policy.

One group that seemed to have minimal involvement in the policy process was elected officials. Although they were not totally absent from policy development, their influence was mitigated by the type of participation they had in the process. Donald Savoie (1990) has categorized ministers into four groups according to the type of participation they have in the policy process. Status participants are those who are more interested in their own public image than the substantive work of the department. They have little interest in policy or programs except as they enhance the minister's public image. Mission
participants come to government with a particular cause, such as fiscal restraint, or point of view, such as strongly held religious beliefs. Their actions are measured against the cause or point of view. Policy participants have a specific area of expertise and a strong desire to shape public policy in that area. Process participants are primarily interested in ensuring that the department's bureaucrats, clientele, and political constituency are all reasonably satisfied. Thus they tend to support the policy direction recommended by their departmental officials (Savoie pp.189-201). Of the ministers who held responsibility for cultural diversity policy from 1940 to 1971, most were process participants, particularly in the development of cultural diversity and education policy. The two exceptions were Paul Martin and Robert Stanbury who were policy participants. I have already noted that, in drafting the Citizenship Act, Martin helped to open the door for federal involvement in immigrant education. Similarly, Stanbury, with his interest in establishing a new citizenship policy in the late 1960s, gave officials of the Citizenship Branch a strong base from which to begin their discussions of a new ethnic participation policy.

Elected officials other than the ministers participated in the policy process only when the topic of cultural diversity and education was discussed in Parliament. This happened only three times during the evolution of the policy - during the debates on the Citizenship Act and the Multiculturalism Policy and in 1964
when support for the education of immigrant children was discussed. The discussion on education was a relatively small part of the debate on the Citizenship Act and the Members of Parliament who spoke were primarily concerned that the federal government not usurp provincial authority in education. When the issue of immigrant children was raised in 1964, government politicians were quick to assert that the education of children was an area of provincial responsibility. In the course of the discussions on the Multiculturalism Policy, officials decided to ignore Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission's and the Citizenship Branch's recommendations on education for immigrant children. It is likely that this was justified on the same basis as it had been in 1964. What we see then is that the few times elected officials, apart from the ministers, were involved in the cultural diversity and education policy process, they tended to focus on the issue of provincial responsibility for education. This preoccupation proved to be a barrier to the expansion of the policy.

From 1940 to 1971, then, largely under the direction of federal officials, a policy community developed around cultural diversity and education. Key members of the community were government agencies, educators, and government-supported groups particularly the Canadian Citizenship Council and the Canadian Association for Adult Education. Even when other groups were included in the process through a special avenue such as the
Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission, the concerns of the more powerful members of the policy community were given primacy over the recommendations of these other groups. In addition, elected officials were largely not part of the discussions on cultural diversity and education policy. The two federal ministers who played a significant role in policy development simply helped open the door for policy development in the area. Other elected officials, when they were involved in the process, tended to impose limits on the scope of the policy based on the argument that education was constitutionally a responsibility of the provincial governments.

**Summary**

Cultural diversity and education policy was an unintended by-product of the meeting of the objectives of the federal cultural diversity policy with the political and organizational concerns of a federal government agency trying to establish, expand, and maintain its "turf" while working an area of provincial jurisdiction. The cultural diversity policy was concerned with developing among members of non-British, non-French ethnic groups a sense of loyalty to Canada and with successfully incorporating those same people into the mainstream of Canadian life. It began with a focus on promoting patriotism among members of immigrant and non-British, non-French ethnic groups and encouraging British and French Canadians to accept "newcomers". After the War the policy became linked to
naturalization of immigrants but work continued in promoting
loyalty to Canada and in encouraging "established" Canadians to
accept newcomers. Through the 1950s work with immigrants and non-
French, non-British ethnic groups expanded to include a variety
of initiatives designed to assist immigrant settlement and
integration and the area of promoting acceptance developed into
intergroup relations. By 1971 the policy included fostering the
development of ethnic identities within Canada as well as
promoting immigrant integration and intergroup relations.

Education was originally to have been one of the strategies
through which the cultural diversity policy would be implemented
but it developed into a policy in its own right. Because cultural
diversity and education was never intended to be a separate
policy area, the policy developed and was articulated through a
series of initiatives. During the War work in cultural diversity
and education focussed on teaching British and French Canadians
about the concepts of race and racial discrimination as well as
the culture and history of Canadians of "other " ethnic. The
primary objective of this work was to convince British and French
Canadians that racial discrimination was unpatriotic. After the
War, some work continued in the educating British and French
Canadians about discrimination and acceptance of newcomers but
most of the initiatives in cultural diversity and education were
in the area of immigrant language education. The former was
designed to advance the notion that tolerance was an important
aspect of citizenship and the latter to encourage immigrants to
assimilate into Canadian society. Through the 1950s and early 1960s work in immigrant language education expanded and the area of education for acceptance grew into education to promote intergroup understanding. Education of immigrants continued to promote integration or voluntary assimilation while intergroup relations education encouraged acceptance of "others" and began to promote the view that ethnic groups in Canada should be encouraged to maintain their distinct identities. Through the 1960s some work continued in intergroup relations education and tentative steps were taken in the area of education for cultural retention but the main focus of the cultural diversity and education policy remained immigrant language education which continued to encourage assimilation. Thus by 1971, when the cultural diversity policy was attempting to promote ethnic participation and ethnic identity development, the cultural diversity and education policy remained firmly rooted in its assimilationist objectives.

The cultural diversity and education policy developed the way it did because of the nature of the policy development process and because of the organizations and individuals involved in that process. Because of the unplanned nature of the policy it did not develop through a logical sequence of steps. Instead it was shaped by a series of actions and strategies that were used by Citizenship Branch officials to carry out their work in the area of education. Each strategy and initiative became a site for negotiation and compromise between the Branch and other members
of the policy community. The policy was the cumulative result of these negotiations and compromises. In addition to the Citizenship Branch the principal members of the policy community were other federal government agencies with interests in cultural diversity, provincial departments of education, and selected non-governmental organizations. Ethnic groups tended to be on the periphery of the policy community as constituted by the Citizenship Branch. Elected officials, including the Ministers responsible for the work in this area had only sporadic involvement in policy development.

The strategies that the Branch used to implement cultural diversity in the education sector were designed to allow the Branch to establish itself, expand its area of work, and to increase its resource base. In other words, the strategies the Branch employed were meant as much to improve its status within the bureaucracy as to develop and implement its cultural diversity policy. In the immediate post-war period, the Branch's involvement in education enabled it to claim "turf" that none of its federal competitors had been able to occupy and thus education became an important focus for its work. Later, it was largely on the basis of this involvement that the Branch was able to argue for increases to its resource base. Moreover, probably because the Branch never had a very large resource base, it also derived status from its position as an expert within the field of cultural diversity and education. Those groups that were able to enhance the Branch's status by their participation in any of the
implementation strategies were the ones that had the greatest power and influence over the policy process.

Conclusions and Considerations

This study has shown that there is indeed a long history of federal involvement in the area of cultural diversity and education. In the period from 1940 to 1971, this involvement led to the development of a federal policy in the area. In tracing the development of this policy and describing its objectives I have shown how the policy and related initiatives carried out by federal officials had a direct influence on the work of individual educators as well as provincial and local educational authorities. As I noted earlier, existing literature in the field of multiculturalism and education all but ignores this connection. I believe it will be important to continue to explore this connection from 1971 onward in order to fully understand how the field of multicultural education in Canada has developed to this point.

The study has also shown conclusively that the origins of the federal multiculturalism policy date back to the 1940s rather than to 1963 as is widely believed. I do not contend that current policy on multiculturalism is the same as earlier policies on cultural diversity but that vestiges of those earlier policies do continue to exist within multiculturalism policy and programs. Scholars who have failed to acknowledge this history have developed inaccurate accounts of policy development in this
field. Scholars such as Jean Burnet and Howard Palmer (1988) who have attributed the origins of the multiculturalism policy to the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission have contributed to the fallacy that ethnic groups were the driving force behind the establishment of the 1971 policy (Burnet and Palmer pp. 223-224). Others, like Keith McLeod (1992), in arguing that the policy began as an attempt to promote a positive view of cultural pluralism, have failed to account for the assimilationist tendencies that continue to exist within government programs designed to implement multiculturalism.

I have also demonstrated that the federal government has had a significant involvement in the area of cultural diversity and education. This work adds to the small body of literature that examines federal involvement in education and provides a detailed example of how the federal government began and maintained its involvement in this area. This may prove to be useful to scholars interested in federal involvement in other areas of education. It also provides the background for research into the continuing involvement of the federal government in multiculturalism and education.

This examination of cultural diversity and education policy has also shown that the study of process does indeed provide valuable insights into understanding the policy. Existing studies that examine the origins of multiculturalism policy have tended to focus on the role of bureaucrats in the development of the policy. While this does provide a base from which to begin, it
does not provide a complete picture of the complexity of the policy development process. I have argued that other federal government agencies, provincial government departments and officials, and non-governmental bodies played a significant role in the development of the cultural diversity and education policy. I believe that similar investigation into the development of cultural diversity policy, multiculturalism policy, and multicultural education policy would also yield valuable insights into the nature and content of these policies. I also believe that other approaches to the study of these policies, while they may provide valuable insights, would not allow for the detailed examination of the interplay between the members of the policy community nor would they allow for the analysis of policy as an organizational, political, and societal enterprise.

This study has clearly demonstrated that policy cannot be understood in isolation from the process through which it is developed or implemented, particularly in areas where the policy development process has been diffuse and ad hoc. Policy is the cumulative result of negotiations between members of the policy community. Members of that community do not hold equal power over the outcomes of the negotiations but all members of the community are able to influence the policy to a certain extent. Thus, policy is not simply the reflection of the values of bureaucrats or politicians. Policy is also not simply an authoritative statement. Policy is constantly in development. Statements of policy represent simply the state of the policy at the moment the
statement is made.

This conception of policy differs greatly from the traditional view of policy as an authoritative "guideline for discretionary action" (Downey 1988, 18). The traditional view holds that elected officials determine the content of public policy and bureaucrats are responsible for the implementation of programs in support of the policy. In reality, bureaucrats along with other members of the policy community are involved in the development and implementation of policy. Furthermore, as we have seen in this example, it is possible for policy development to occur without significant involvement by elected officials.

This particular study has led to two specific findings about the nature of the cultural diversity and education policy process which, I believe, deserve further investigation.

The first involves the way in which membership in the policy community was determined. Throughout the process, federal government officials made deliberate decisions about who to include in and exclude from the policy process. Therefore, one significant side effect of the policy process in cultural diversity and education was that it undermined one of the principles of both the citizenship and cultural diversity policies. In 1946, Paul Martin defined citizenship as "the right to full partnership in the fortunes and future of this nation." (Martin in National Identity Task Force 1991, 12). As I have noted in Chapter 5, this was, in effect, a statement of belief in equality and full participation. It was not until the 1960s that
this principle became one of the explicit goals of the cultural diversity policy. By deliberately excluding ethnic organizations and other volunteer-based groups from the policy process, the Citizenship Branch violated the principle of promoting citizen participation in all aspects of Canadian life. Furthermore, if equality is measured either by access to decision-making or by equal power over outcomes, then clearly ethnic and volunteer-based groups were not equal to government-supported groups, educators, or government departments in the development of cultural diversity and education policy.

Notwithstanding the impact of the decisions, I believe that the architects of the policy did not intend to foster exclusion and inequality. Rather, I contend that the exclusion was a consequence of having to negotiate this policy across a constitutional boundary. As I stated in Chapter 2, both Susan Hargraves (1981) and Hugh Stevenson (1981) have commented on the fact that federal initiatives in education are often well-hidden. Hargraves has also noted that this results in a policy process that is inaccessible and unaccountable to legitimate interest groups (Hargraves p.23). But she has not speculated on the reasons why the process is carried out in this manner. It is clear that, in the case of cultural diversity and education policy, the times when the policy process was the least public were the times of greatest growth in the policy. This is the second finding that I believe deserves further examination.

Cultural diversity and education programs and policy
flourished in the 1950s and early 1960s. The two federal-provincial agreements were signed during this period, work in teacher training expanded, moves were made to officially include the education of immigrant children in the work of the Branch, and several intergroup relations education programs were established. This was also the period when the Citizenship Branch began working exclusively with the provinces in the area of immigrant education and when the work of the Branch received the least amount of attention from elected officials. I believe that the growth and success of the policy during this period was a direct consequence of both of these factors. It appears that when the Branch was able to work directly with provincial agencies their work was most hidden and elected officials were least interested in it. When elected officials were not involved in cultural diversity and education the issue of jurisdiction was rarely raised and the policy was able to thrive. I believe that participation in the process was limited in order to facilitate the expansion of the policy. This expansion furthered the political and organizational goals of the government agencies involved. It also furthered the goal of facilitating language learning among immigrants. Thus while the process excluded members of immigrant and non-British, non-French ethnic communities, it resulted in greater resource allocations for second language programs.

These two findings lead to questions about how policy communities are formed or determined, who is included and who is
excluded, and why certain groups are included while others are excluded.

I believe that the process approach to the study of policy allows us to understand the complexity of policy in a specific area. Public policy is the result of the interaction between groups and individuals with significant interest in a particular field. Agencies of the state have considerable control over who is allowed to participate in the policy process but that control does not translate into control over outcomes. The outcomes of the various struggles and negotiations that occur in the field are dependent upon the resources of the actors involved. This approach has particular relevance for a field such as cultural diversity and education because of the diffuse and ad hoc nature of the policy process but I believe it would be equally useful in exploring other policy fields.
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