National Identity and the "Canadian Way":

Values, Connections and Culture

Erin Tolley

Erin Tolley is a senior analyst with the Metropolis Project. The opinions expressed here are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Metropolis Project, Citizenship and Immigration Canada, or the Government of Canada.

ABSTRACT

This article outlines the Government of Canada's current definition of a national identity based on values, connections and culture, and the many practical ways in which it seeks to promote these three key elements. The author explores the language of diversity and nation-building, as well as the various successes and shortcomings of the Canadian model.

Diversity and the Canadian national identity are intimately – and almost indistinguishably – linked. Canada has so deliberately situated its identity in pluralism and multiculturalism that Canadians often conflate all of these concepts. This is not to say that the path has been a smooth one. Jenson and Papillon note that "Canadians have worried about national identity and maintaining unity in a context of cultural diversity for all of the country's history,"[1] which is perhaps because, as Uberoi points out, multiculturalism is believed to be at odds with a shared national identity.[2] In spite of this, Canada has, with relative success, melded diversity and a shared national identity. Diversity is institutionalized in laws, in the structure of government and in the Canadian psyche. Public opinion polling consistently shows that Canadians take pride in the country's multicultural reputation, and the 'mosaic' is one of Canada's most oft-invoked symbols of identity. We have a generous citizenship policy that allows for the extension of citizenship rights after just three years of residence, and continue to be seen as one of the world's most generous immigrant-receiving countries. We not only 'deal with' diversity, we embrace it, and this is a central part of the Canadian identity.

There is ample evidence of a conscious effort to accommodate and embrace diversity in Canada. Various policies, including the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms,* the *Official Languages Act,* the *Canadian Multiculturalism Act,* the *Employment Equity Act,* the *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act,* and anticipated legislation to amend the *Indian Act,* provide a legislative snapshot of the Government of Canada's response to diversity. The creation of the Canadian Race Relations Foundation, federal involvement in the World Conference Against Racism, and the funding of intercultural activities through the Multiculturalism Program are further examples of the Government's institutionalization of diversity. Academics have also had a hand in this, as evidenced in the growing body of research on diversity, and the creation of several university-based institutes mandated to look at matters related to diversity, such as immigration, disability, queer studies and gender studies.[3] In addition, a growing number have realized that diversity must be studied in more complex ways. Research related to intersectionality and the intersections of diversity is just one example of this.[4] In the non-governmental sector, the upsurge of active lobbying efforts on the part of ethnocultural organizations has served to further embed diversity in the public agenda and the Canadian identity.[5] These efforts to understand, accommodate and take diversity into consideration are woven into the Canadian identity and simultaneously enforce it.

Observers have come to regard this interplay between diversity and national identity as uniquely Canadian, and they variously refer to it as the "Canadian diversity model" or the "Canadian way." The nation-building 'model' is really a somewhat loose collection of ideas and strategies for bringing together people of diverse backgrounds and life circumstances. Articulations of the Canadian model are often imprecise and sometimes muddy, and the matter is complicated by the birth, with almost annual frequency, of new language for the model as scholars, pundits and policy-makers continue to put into words the components of Canada's approach to diversity and nation-building.[6]

This article sketches not the historical or theoretical underpinnings of the Canadian national identity, but rather looks at the Government of Canada's framing and promotion of a national identity based on values, connections and culture. In the absence of a single culture, language or religion in Canada, values, connections and culture are viewed by the Government as the basis of what Kymlicka calls "social unity." One of the first articulations of this approach was in a speech that our then Prime Minister gave at Duke University in 2000. Although the government has changed since this unveiling of the model, recent policy documents follow in a similar vein suggesting that the Canadian model has been ingrained to the extent that it can transcend changes in political leadership.

However, nation-building and identity formation are evolutionary. Identities – whether individual or collective – are complex and fluid, and so is the climate in which they develop. Canada's approach to nation-building has varied depend-

ing on the country's demographic make-up, economic realities, the international arena and political will. As such, this article is really only a snapshot, a singular portrait of the Canadian model at one point in time when values, connections and culture are at its heart.

Values

Values are a key, and perhaps *the key,* component of the Canadian model. This is evident in statements by senior government officials,[7] the Speech from the Throne,[8] recent government reports,[9] and various pieces of legislation.[10] Indeed, although the Canadian model is comprised of three parts, it is really from values that the Canadian model gets its lifeblood, its very definition. This is in part because there is no single culture, no single language, no single history onto which the Canadian identity can be pinned, or around which it can be strengthened; values are viewed as something that all can hold in common. Connections and culture function more as tools for strengthening, rather than shaping or defining, the model. This was reinforced in a recent speech by the Prime Minister that listed a range of future Government initiatives – including those that would fall under the rubric of culture and connections – but suggested that "we begin with our values."

This begs the question: what values? Are there "Canadian values?" The recent Citizens' Dialogue on Canada's Future, which was funded in part by the Government of Canada, suggested that shared community, equality and justice, respect for diversity, mutual responsibility, accountability, and democracy are all "core Canadian values."[12] An earlier exercise by the Canadian Policy Research Networks found that Canadians espouse the values of "self-reliance; compassion leading to collective responsibility; investment, especially in children as the future generation; democracy; freedom; equality; and fiscal responsibility."[13] A decision by the Supreme Court of Canada found that "the values of tolerance, equality and respect… [are] at the heart of Canadian citizenship."[14] The Government, for its part, tends to focus in various speeches and documents on respect for diversity, peace, equality, fairness and democracy.

Some argue that "Canadian values" really do not differ in any significant way from the values of other Western liberal democracies. This is a central critique of the model, and it is an argument that does, in some respects, have merit. Americans, for example, also identify democracy, equality and freedom as core values, but there are differences in how Americans rank these values and in the subtleties that come through when discussing how to put these values into practice.[15] For example, Americans view the role of government differently than do Canadians. As a result, statist approaches to diversity and multiculturalism have less currency. The model rests on the assumption not so much that Canadians have 'unique' values, although this argument is advanced, but rather that these values play themselves out differently in the Canadian context.[16]

Critics also argue that values alone are an insufficient basis for building a strong national identity. As Cairns notes, "We cannot act together unless we have some basis of cohesion. Sharing values is insufficient to provide that cohesion."[17] Norman suggests, perhaps more caustically, that the "ideology of shared values [is] a peculiar… bit of constitutional theorizing that Canadians should neither export nor continue to dump on the home market."[18] The criticism in much of the literature appears to be not so much that framing a country's national identity around values is inherently wrong, but rather that it is not enough. Something more is needed.[19] It is perhaps for this reason that the Government has added "something more" to its model in the form of connections and culture.

Nonetheless, a model based on 'shared' values, although seemingly innocuous, may unintentionally foster division by favouring particular paradigms or cultural, social, or religious identifications over others. An appeal to "Canadian values" is assumed to be neutral, but most of these values are based on Western liberal traditions and values proposed in religious discourse which, in Canada, has traditionally been Judeo-Christian.[20] This can lead to the construction of an 'us versus them' dichotomy that pits majority perspectives against minority perspectives.[21]

There does, however, appear to be an appetite for a values-based discourse. The Citizens' Dialogue on Canada's Future revealed that "as [participants] talked with each other across different backgrounds, socio-economic groups and ages, they were astonished and reassured by how much they had in common." The more citizens talked about their values, the better they understood their own values and those of others. Further, "citizens repeatedly stated their wish that they or other citizens could delve more deeply into many of the subjects they were able to consider only briefly."[22] Dialogues on values take place, often implicitly, everyday, but structured, institutionalized dialogues may be a means of further delineating, negotiating and articulating Canadian values and could lead to more informed debate, which Kymlicka and Norman as well as Coulombe all point to as being important.[23]

Unfortunately, much of the public discourse now contains a "limits of diversity" thread, which the focus on values appears to encourage. Many fear that diversity will "go too far" and may threaten a broad Canadian identity or impinge upon deeply held Canadian values. The report on the recent Citizens' Dialogue confirmed this, noting that Canadians' "respect for diversity is strongly affirmed, but is now seen as an important part of (and limited by) a broader set of core Canadian values."[24] Kymlicka suggests that "people are not averse to minority rights within limits, but they want to know that there are indeed limits… People who are willing to accept certain policies as pragmatic compromises may reject the same policies if they are seen as endorsing a new principle with potentially far-reaching implications."[25] The events of September 11th suggested that Canadians may be willing to allow some limits on entrenched rights, although they are selective about which rights could be infringed upon for reasons of national security, and this selectivity would most markedly affect those suspected of terrorism.[26]

We need to think this through. We need an articulation of Canada's model that does not exclude those who are viewed as different or "too diverse." Indeed, the very people targeted by the limits discourse are those that Canada is attempting to include through concerted nation-building. This is in part because the benefits of immigration, multiculturalism and diversity tend to be minimized or are viewed as accruing

to newcomers and "diverse" Canadians alone even though immigration, multiculturalism and diversity are valuable resources and contribute to the economy, population growth, cultural variety, and the intellectual pool.

The idea that immigration is mutually beneficial – for immigrants themselves as well as for established Canadians – is reinforced by various pieces of legislation that are based on a reciprocal understanding of diversity. Our multiculturalism policy, for example, suggests that diversity is the right and responsibility of all Canadians (not just newcomers and ethnocultural minorities), while the *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act* recognizes the "mutual obligations" that new and established Canadians have with respect to integration. In short, newcomers and ethnocultural minorities do not just benefit from the Canadian identity, they also contribute to and enrich it. A recent article in one of Canada's largest dailies suggests that this point bears repeating. The columnist noted that "the federal government in its endless propaganda incessantly reminds immigrants and refugees of their rights, rarely reminds them of their obligations to their new country, and preaches to Canadians that it is they, not the newcomers, who must adapt and that the onus of accommodation lies forever with them. There are those who consider these goals, if not always the result, noble; I'm not one of them."[27]

Although there are indeed limits in Canadian society – limits that are supported by our legislative framework[28] – articulations of the Canadian model need to be open to an understanding of identity that is based on reciprocity and flexibility, rather than being primarily grounded within a discourse of "limits."

Connections

Connections create ties among Canadians. These ties, built through sustained interaction, highlight points of commonality and provide a space for understanding – and perhaps even resolving – differences. The crux of the Canadian model really is the creation of opportunities that allow individuals to find points of commonality while respecting differences. In this space, a national identity can flourish while differences can be retained. The importance attributed to "connections" as part of the Canadian model is evident in the renewed interest in social capital, which crops up in the work of the Policy Research Initiative, Statistics Canada, and the Metropolis Project.[29] Connections can be built through various means which could be loosely organized under the categories of infrastructure, interaction, and sectoral collaboration. I will describe each of these in turn.

The first means for fostering connections is through infrastructure, which includes the national railway, the TransCanada Highway and the Government's commitment to bring broadband Internet service to every Canadian community. These are "bricks and mortar" initiatives to link Canadians together. The second means of fostering connections is interaction, which includes exchanges, such as the Government of Canada's five-week official language exchange program, or the Forum for Young Canadians, which brings young people from across Canada to Parliament Hill for a week-long learning program. The third means for fostering connections is sectoral collaboration, which includes grants and contributions programs, third-sector delivery of programs, and other initiatives that foster collaboration between institutions, the state, and communities.[30] These are initiatives that encourage diverse Canadians, communities and sectors to work together for common causes. The Voluntary Sector Initiative is one such example,[31] as is the renewed Multiculturalism Program, which cast the focus less on "heritage retention" through ethno-specific funding, and more on "common citizenship, participation and inclusion" through project-based funding that requires partnerships.[32] Increasingly, the Government is using the language of "interculturalism" to signal this shift.[33]

Although the Government has done much to encourage connections among Canadians, some of these programs do not go far enough. For example, Exchanges Canada, although an important element in fostering connections, largely does not target its programs to encourage connections between diverse groups. Representatives from Exchanges Canada recently participated in a conference hosted by the Association for Canadian Studies, which looked at the impact of diversity on youth exchanges; this is perhaps a signal of change. The Official Languages Summer Bursary Program, which provides language instruction and the opportunity to live with a family in the other official language is a notable exception, but exchanges that explicitly bring together Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples and those from diverse religious and cultural communities and regions all have the potential to bridge existing divisions. Traditional exchanges that encourage face-to-face contact should be encouraged, but experiments with online communities could also prove fruitful and more cost-effective. The HOST Program, which develops a mentoring or helping relationship between new immigrants and established Canadians is another model that could be extended to include other groups, including youth and the elderly, the employed and unemployed, and those from low- and high-income groups.

Culture

Culture – "our collective sense of who we are"[34] – is the third prong in the model. Culture is, in some ways, different than the other components of the model because, unlike values and connections, which are important because they create points of commonality, culture is important in large part because it creates a space where difference is accepted and can flourish. This contributes to the building of a strong national identity because it says to individuals that they belong, that their stories, their art, their heritage, are a part of the whole.

It is, in part, out of historical necessity that culture is included in the Canadian model; Canada has always been understood as a compact between "two founding nations" with different languages, religions, and traditions. Gradually, this understanding of Canada has expanded to include not only the country's "founding nations," but also the First Nations, who were blatantly excluded from the 'founding' conception of Canada, as well as the newcomers who have followed. Of course, Canada has not always been a stellar example of cultural inclusion. History is rife with examples of exclusion on cultural grounds: the expulsion of the Acadians, the internment of Japanese Canadians during the Second World War, and the placement of Aboriginal

children in residential schools[35] threatened and, in many cases, destroyed cultures. Thankfully, the Government has taken some steps to repair this damage.[36]

The Government has also supported initiatives to strengthen and promote Canadian culture. For example, the Canadian Television Fund provides resources to support Canadian television programming. Telefilm Canada administers programs to support Canadian films. The Aboriginal Peoples Television Network, which began broadcasting in 1999, showcases Aboriginal programming and issues and includes some broadcasting in traditional Aboriginal languages. The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) and Radio-Canada, the country's national broadcasters, bring news and culture to Canadians in both official languages on radio and television. The websites of Canadian museums, galleries, and the National Library and National Archives bring the country's culture and stories into the homes of Canadians. Canadian content regulations promote Canadian content on television, radio, and in print.

In spite of this, many criticize Canadians' knowledge of culture. Public opinion research indicates that Canadians are not informed about their own history; in 2001, only 17 percent could pass a test on Canadian history and institutions that was based on the citizenship exam for new Canadians.[37] Moreover, Magsino argues that Canadians do not fully understand the perspectives of those with different religious or cultural backgrounds because there is an "absence of study about religions and cultures" in school curriculum.[38] Following September 11th, the backlash against Muslim, Jewish, Hindu and Sikh Canadians, as well as those of Arab origin and "in at least one puzzling case, Aboriginal Canadians," pointed to the extent of our misunderstanding.[39] Culture can also be divisive; it may exclude or offend and some may not see themselves reflected in the cultural narrative. Moreover, even when a space for the construction, celebration and maintenance of one's culture exists, the loss or absorption of cultural identity by the mainstream remains a threat.[40]

Citizenship education is one means for instilling an awareness of history and culture in Canadians. The Government is cautious in this area, given that the Canadian constitution identifies education as a provincial responsibility, but still plays a role in citizenship education, most notably through Citizenship Week activities undertaken by Citizenship and Immigration Canada, as well as through the Canadian Studies Program at Canadian Heritage, which provides grants for the development of learning materials on Canada. Citizenship ceremonies are also a means of promoting Canadian culture, and further attention should be given to using them as an avenue for cultural education. Guidelines for hosting citizenship ceremonies, for example, suggest that a cultural component could be included; Britain has suggested that a cultural component be mandatory.[41] Partnerships with various media to showcase and teach Canadians about the cultures within our country could also be pursued.

Conclusion

Nations, identities, models… these are all works in progress and as a result are, of course, incomplete. Nonetheless, the Government has, since our former Prime Minister's unveiling of the Canadian model four years ago to our most recent *Speech from the Throne,* affirmed its approach in policy documents and numerous initiatives. So, is the "Canadian way" the right way? Are values, connections and culture enough to create a strong national identity? That other countries look to the Canadian approach for insight suggests that Canada is doing something right. At the same time, visible minorities continue to report occurrences of racism, polling reveals that support for immigration is tenuous, and there have been a rash of anti-Semitic incidents in Toronto and Montréal recently. One could see all of this as evidence that the Canadian model does not work, that values, connections and culture cannot create a strong national identity in the context of diversity. These incidents, along with the events of September 11th and the aftermath, have indeed tested our model, but the fact that they occurred is not so much an indicator of failure as a warning that the Canadian identity is fragile. The Canadian model is not perfect, but when we assess Canada's response to incidents that challenge it – a response based in part on values, connections and culture – it does, on the whole, appear to work. Of course, the challenges that Canada faces are multi-faceted and cannot be addressed by the model alone; we must couple values, connections and culture with other measures that facilitate inclusion in the social, economic, cultural and political arenas. Values, connections and culture by themselves are not a panacea, but if we want a strong national identity in the context of diversity, the Canadian experience suggests that they are absolutely key components.

Notes

1 Jane Jenson and Martin Papillon. "The 'Canadian Diversity Model': A Repertoire in Search of a Framework." Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks, 2001. p. 1.

2 See Varun Uberoi, this volume.

3 Mulholland's examination of Canadian theses and dissertations on diversity notes that "there is a marked and increasing presence of graduate research undertaken in Canada on immigration, integration, multicultural education, social justice, racism, hate and discrimination." See Mary-Lee Mulholland, "Annotated Bibliography of Canadian Theses and Dissertations on Diversity: 1980-2001" (Ottawa: Canadian Heritage, 2001).

4 See *Canadian Diversity* magazine on Intersections of Diversity (3.1 Winter 2004), the special issue of *Canadian Ethnic Studies* on Intersections of Diversity (Vol. 34, No. 3, 2003), as well as related papers on the Metropolis website at http://www.canada.metropolis.net/events/Diversity/diversity_index_e.htm.

5 See Peter S. Li. "Visible Minorities in Canadian Society: Challenges of Racial Diversity." *Social Differentiation: Patterns and Processes.* Ed. Danielle Juteau. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003. p. 138-139.

6 The most recent *Speeches from the Throne* are just one means of tracing the evolution of the terminology. Nation-building is grounded alternatively in social unity, social inclusion, social cohesion, shared citizenship and social foundations. See www.sft-dft.gc.ca.

7 In a speech at the Progressive Governance Summit in July 2003, the then Prime Minister of Canada noted that "our longstanding experience with bridging cultural, linguistic, religious and regional divides has resulted in a shared set of values and principles." Prime Minister Jean Chrétien, "Immigration and Multiculturalism in Canada," speech delivered at the Progressive Governance Summit (London UK, 12 July 2003).

8 The 2002 *Speech from the Throne,* for example, speaks of "the values of pluralism, freedom and democracy," the necessity to frame international and defence policies on the basis of our values, and notes that "our health care system is a practical expression of the values that define us as a country." The most recent *Speech from the Throne,* delivered on 2 February 2004, makes similar references to values. The text of these documents can be found at http://www.sft-ddt.gc.ca/sft.htm.

[9] The final report of the Romanow Commission on Health Care, for example, was entitled "Building on Values: The Future of Health Care in Canada." The Department of Foreign Affairs initiated a Dialogue on Foreign Policy in January 2003 and framed it in terms of "protecting the security of our nation and contributing to global security; increasing prosperity in Canada and expanding global prosperity; and promoting the values and culture that Canadians cherish."

[10] The *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act,* the *Canadian Multiculturalism Act,* and the most recent proposed revisions to the existing *Citizenship Act,* for example, include direct references to Canadian values. The *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* has been particularly influential. In a review of public opinion in Canada over the past 20 years, Mendelsohn notes that "most Canadians have embraced the identity laid out for them in the Charter of Rights. There is strong support for bilingualism and multiculturalism, and these have become cornerstones of the Canadian identity across the country. Canadians have also become more supportive of immigration." See Matthew Mendolsohn, "Canada's Social Contract: Evidence from Public Opinion," Discussion Paper No. P|01 (Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks, 2002) v. These findings were largely confirmed in a study on "The New Canada," which was done by the *Globe and Mail* and the Centre for Research and Information on Canada in the spring of 2003. Parkin and Mendelsohn note that "if the Charter's values did not fully reflect who we were as a country when it was adopted in 1982, they have shaped what we are today." See Andrew Parkin and Matthew Mendolsohn, "A New Canada: An Identity Shaped by Diversity," CRIC Paper No. 11 (Ottawa: Centre for Research and Information on Canada, 2003).

[11] Prime Minister Paul Martin, "Address by the Prime Minister in Reply to the *Speech from the Throne,*" 3 February 2004, www.pm.gc.ca.

[12] See Mary Pat MacKinnon, Judith Maxwell, Steven Rosell, and Nandini Saxena, "Citizens' Dialogue on Canada's Future: A 21st Century Social Contract" (April 2003) ix. Available at www.cprn.org.

[13] Suzanne Peters. *Exploring Canadian Values: Foundations for Well-Being.* CPRN Study No. F01, Revised Version (Ottawa: CPRN, 1995).

[14] *Lavoie v. Canada* [2002] SCC 23, line 15.

[15] Carol Goar. "We do have distinctive values." *Toronto Star* (April 21, 2003).

[16] See Michael Adams. *Fire and Ice: The United States, Canada the Myth of Converging Values.* Toronto: Penguin, 2003; Neil Nevitte. *The Decline of Deference: Canadian Value Change in Cross-National Perspective.* Peterborough: Broadview, 1996.

[17] Alan C. Cairns. "Introduction." *Citizenship, Diversity and Pluralism: Canadian and Comparative Perspectives.* Eds. Alan C. Cairns, John C. Courtney, Peter MacKinnon, Hans J. Michelmann, and David E. Smith. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1999. p. 19.

[18] Wayne Norman. "The Ideology of Shared Values: A Myopic Vision of Unity in the Multi-nation State." *Is Quebec Nationalism Just? Perspective from Anglophone Canada.* Ed. Joseph Carens. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1995. p. 137.

[19] See Rainer Bauböck. "Farewell to Multiculturalism? Sharing Values and Identities in Societies of Immigration." *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 3.1 (2002): 1-16; Will Kymlicka. *Multicultural Citizenship.* Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1995.

[20] Although Canada has been influenced significantly by Judeo-Christian traditions, Coward notes that the "various religions have never been distinct entities. In their instrumental forms, …the religions have constantly borrowed from and interacted with each other." See Harold Coward, *Pluralism in the World Religions: A Short Introduction* (Boston: Oneworld, 2000) 143. Coward's observation further weakens the "us versus them" discourse that has developed with respect to religion and was fuelled by the terrorist attacks of September 11th, 2001.

[21] This was particularly evident following the terrorist attacks of September 11th, 2001, which pitted so-called Muslim values (defined, largely, on the basis of the alleged terrorists' actions) against so-called Canadian values. Public discourse after September 11th highlighted not only the role that religion plays in defining values (real and perceived), but also the lack of knowledge on religious traditions.

[22] MacKinnon et al., 31-33.

[23] Will Kymlicka and Wayne Norman. "Citizenship in Culturally Diverse Societies: Issues, Contexts, Concepts." *Citizenship in Diverse Societies.* Eds. Will Kymlicka and Wayne Norman. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000. p. 8; Pierre A. Coulombe. "Citizenship and Official Bilingualism in Canada." *Citizenship in Diverse Societies.* Eds. Will Kymlicka and Wayne Norman. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000. p. 285.

[24] MacKinnon et al., v.

[25] Will Kymlicka. *Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Citizenship.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2001. p. 8.

[26] Environics Research Group, "Social Cohesion in Canada," report prepared for Canadian Heritage (Ottawa: Environics Research Group, 2002) 77.

[27] Christie Blatchford. "How multiculturalism breeds hate." *Globe and Mail* (March 27, 2004) M3.

[28] See, for example, the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms;* section 1 reads "The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantees the rights and freedoms set out in it subject only to such *reasonable limits* prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society" [emphasis added].

[29] Details on the Policy Research Initiative's horizontal project on social capital can be found at http://policyresearch.gc.ca/page.asp?pagenm=socap. Statistics Canada's General Social Survey on Time Use and Social Engagement will examine some aspects of social capital. Results are expected in 2004; see www.statcan.ca. Finally, a recent Metropolis Conversation examined Social Capital in government programs. A report is forthcoming on the Metropolis website, http://www.canada.metropolis.net/events/index_e.html.

[30] Metropolis Project, "Social Capital and Government Programs," Metropolis Conversation Series No. 11 (forthcoming).

[31] The Voluntary Sector Initiative, which was announced in June 2000, is a joint project of the voluntary sector and the Government of Canada, which aims to, among other things, "enhance the relationship between the sector and the federal government and their ability to serve Canadians." See Voluntary Sector Initiative, "About the VSI," http://www.vsi-isbc.ca/eng/about.cfm.

[32] Coulombe, 284; Marc Leman, "Canadian Multiculturalism," *Current Issue Review* 93-6 (Ottawa: Library of Parliament, 1999) p. 8.

[33] See, for example, the 2002 *Speech from the Throne.* It is important to note that Quebec has long articulated its model as one of interculturalism with a foundation of French as the language of public life. See Alain-G. Gagnon and Raffaele Iacovino, "Framing Citizenship Status in an Age of Polyethnicity: Quebec's Model of Interculturalism," Canada: The State of the Federation 2001, Canadian Political Cultures in Transition, Hamish Telford and Harvey Lazar, eds. (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2002) p. 327.

[34] Government of Canada, "Connecting to the Canadian Experience: Diversity, Creativity and Choice," Response to the Ninth Report of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage (Ottawa: Government of Canada, November 1999) p. 4.

[35] This was just part of a larger assimilation strategy that included disenfranchisement and the loss of Aboriginal status upon intermarriage.

[36] The Japanese Canadian Redress Agreement, which was signed in 1988, made some reparations for the internment of Japanese Canadians, including the creation of the Canadian Race Relations Foundation and the (largely symbolic) compensation of 16,000 people. See www.cr.ca. The Indian Residential Schools Resolution framework provides guidelines for compensating Aboriginal peoples who were placed in residential schools and suffered cultural and linguistic loss, as well as physical and sexual abuse. See http://www.irsr-rqpi.gc.ca. Reparations for the Acadian expulsion are less evident; thus far, the Canadian government has not apologized for the expulsion, although several Opposition motions in the House of Commons have encouraged this. However, the Government does provide support to Acadian communities through the Canada-New Brunswick-Acadian Community Agreement of the Official Languages Support Programs. See www.pch.gc.ca.

[37] Compas Inc., Global TV and the Ottawa Citizen, "I am Canadian? Canada Day Poll" (June 2001).

[38] Romulo F. Magsino. "Study of Religions for Citizenship: Why Not?" *Canadian Diversity / Diversité Canadienne* 2.1 (2003): 25.

[39] John Biles and Humera Ibrahim. "After September 11th, 2001: A Tale of Two Canadas," paper presented at the 7th International Metropolis Conference (Oslo Norway, 11 September 2002) p. 5.

[40] The department of Canadian Heritage noted in 2002 that "the continuing erosion of Aboriginal language threatens Aboriginal cultural survival and represents irreparable loss to the cultural heritage of Canada." The department estimates that "close to half of the 50 to 70 Aboriginal languages in Canada are near extinction or endangered, and 10 once-flourishing languages have become extinct over the last 100 years." See Department of Canadian Heritage, "Minister Copps Announces the Creation of an Aboriginal Languages and Cultures Centre," News Release (Winnipeg MB, 19 December 2002). The federal government committed to establishing an Aboriginal Languages and Cultures Centre, while the Action Plan for Official Languages looks at the preservation and promotion of official language minority communities.

[41] Alan Travis. "New Britons to pledge loyalty to country: Minister wants local flavour for Canadian-style citizenship ceremonies." *The Guardian* (26 July 2003).