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ABSTRACT

The Settlement Renewal Consultation process was, at its core, about transforming policy values. It was about a concerted effort by the federal government to transform thinking within the National Settlement Services Policy Community. The federal government knew that in order to fundamentally change the governance structure for immigrant settlement services, it had to change the popular values that held federal control over immigration dear. To shift administrative responsibility away from the central government toward provincial governments, members of the policy community would need to conceptualize immigrant settlement services within a new cognitive framework. The Settlement Renewal Initiative was a sequential process designed to transform that framework. If successful, the Renewal Initiative would create the intellectual environment for a significant policy change.

In reviewing the Settlement Renewal Consultation process from its inception in 1994 to its completion in 1996, this thesis addresses the following questions. Did the Settlement Renewal Consultations transform policy values, among the individuals, groups, and organizations that comprised the National Settlement Services Policy Community? Was the political and social environment modified to the point where true social learning could occur and thereby have institutionalized traditions re-evaluated? Was the stage adequately set for paradigmatic policy change? This thesis provides data that suggests that all of these questions can be answered in the affirmative.
This thesis provides data which indicate that social paradigms can be changed through social learning that is facilitated by the strategic use of consultation processes. Moreover, it indicates that changes in social paradigms can lead to fundamental changes in policy paradigms.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Case Study

In 1994, the National Settlement Services Policy Community entered into a strategic policy evaluation process that was initiated, designed, and administered by the federal government. The intent of the process was to fundamentally alter the existing social paradigm that saw the federal government as the desirable dominant actor in immigration settlement services. ‘Settlement Renewal’ was a comprehensive, cross-Canada (save Quebec) consultation process that was administered in different ways in various provinces but shared common federal government directives. The underlying goal of Settlement Renewal was to change significantly the roles of key policy actors within the Settlement Services Policy Community. More specifically, the renewal process was designed to reduce the role of the federal government in managing and delivering settlement services.

Through the 1994-1996 Settlement Renewal Consultation process, the national government took a decided break from the past. In essence, it attempted to draw provincial governments, ethnic organizations, and other groups involved in the settlement of immigrants into a policy-making undertaking. Active membership in the policy community was enlarged as service delivery organizations and numerous other societal groups accepted an invitation to participate in the consultations. These organizations
dedicated human and financial resources to learning about the policy and the policy process. In doing so, they developed both independent and joint policy positions.

The consultation process and the policy positions taken by participating organizations were influenced by political, economic, social, and historical factors. The federal government believed that a national approach to immigrant settlement would no longer work within a decentralized Canada. Many social programs were taking direction from regional entities rather than following past practices of federal control. Some viewed this transition as a means for the federal government to cut federal costs and responsibility; others viewed the transition as a means to increase effectiveness and reduce duplication. But the question remained, would a regional settlement services system, managed by provincial governments and/or non-governmental agencies, work better than a nationally driven one? Would societal entities embrace such a change? These were questions that the consultation process attempted to address and influence.

The consultation process consisted of three phases. The first phase was a series of hearings and roundtable discussions undertaken by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration from June to November 1995. The second and third phases consisted of two consecutive rounds of provincial workshops, Round I and Round II respectively, undertaken by the federal Department of Citizenship and Immigration Canada between November 1995 and June 1996. Workshops were held within each province but the specific design and delivery mechanisms of the workshops varied from province to province.
1.2 Central Research Question and Objectives

How did the federal government's 1994-1996 Settlement Renewal strategy affect the nature of the settlement services policy environment in terms of its readiness for paradigmatic settlement services policy change? In answering the central research question, this study will examine:

1. the historical context of settlement services policy paradigms held by the federal government, provincial governments, and societal groups, in the period of 1944-1994;
2. the membership in the National Settlement Services Policy Community and the degree of relative involvement in policy processes by members within that policy community;
3. the nature of the 1994 federal government strategy to reduce the role of the federal government in settlement services policy vis-a-vis the other National Settlement Services Policy Community members; and,
4. the nature of the participation of the federal government, the provincial governments, and societal organizations in the Settlement Renewal Consultation process that was conducted between 1994-1996.

1.3 Theoretical Framework

Howlett and Ramesh differentiate between change that involves small adaptations of policy and change that involves fundamental shifts of policy. The former is labeled 'normal policy change' and the latter is labeled 'paradigmatic policy change'.
Normal policy change occurs frequently but paradigmatic change is a complex slower process that occurs very infrequently.

Paradigmatic change is infrequent because it involves “a fundamental long term change in the underlying beliefs, values, and attitudes toward the nature of the problem and the solutions to them on the part of policy makers.” The main reason for its infrequency is not solely because it is too difficult, but also because it is rare that ‘normal’ policy change does not suffice. It is the exception in policy processes that policy makers desire drastic shifts in policy that would involve changing belief systems.

As Kernaghan and Siegel point out, there are several models of public policy making. They acknowledge that many public policies are changed only incrementally, which is consistent with the ‘normal’ policy change identified by Howlett and Ramesh. Charles Lindbloom explains that other forms of policy change are less utilized for the simple reason that “new policies must be accepted by existing organizations and groups” and that it is “difficult to implement policy if it is not accepted by societal groups.” Lindbloom believes that ‘ingrained ideological and institutional biases’ constrain the government from doing anything but incremental policy changes.

But significant shifts in policy do transpire and, in fact, paradigmatic changes in policy have the most impact on society. Once they have been identified as the desired type of policy change, policy makers need to develop a comprehensive strategy to move toward that end. Howlett and Ramesh argue that such complicated change is most often the result of ‘social learning’. Social learning entails changes in the thinking that underlies a policy. Strategies for encouraging social learning, then, must attempt to change the beliefs and value systems of society in relation to the relevant policy. Thus,
social learning usually occurs within large publicly participative policy communities and affects the constraints and capacities facing policy makers. One strategy that has met some success in initiating and encouraging social learning is employing the tools of policy evaluation.

Elections, plebiscites, and referendums are all types of evaluation tools used occasionally by governments. A more common and more meaningful type of policy evaluation process involves consultations with other members of the relevant policy subsystem. Policy makers can choose between several forms of consultation which include: public hearings, administrative forums, consultative committees, and/or task forces. A wise government will consider which form of evaluation will best help them attain their goals; the design of the chosen form is also a strategic decision. For example, consultations “...can range from small meetings of less than a dozen participants and lasting only several minutes, to multi-million dollar inquires which hear thousands of individual briefs and can take years to complete.”

Many policy evaluations are not, by their inherent nature, open and unbiased. Howlett and Ramesh contend that this “does not undermine their significance because their objective is rarely to improve the government’s policy but to support or challenge it.” According to Howlett and Ramesh, there are two relevant variables that affect the potential for evaluations to lead both to social learning and to some form of policy change: the organizational capacity of the state, including especially its expertise in the subject area; and the nature of the policy subsystem, especially whether and to what
extent links exist between its state and societal members. Strategies for fundamental policy change must involve both of these aspects.  

Table 1.1, below, outlines the inter-relationships between state capacity and the policy subsystem (or community).

### Table 1.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES AFFECTING SOCIAL LEARNING</th>
<th>Links Between State and Societal Actors in Policy Subsystem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Administrative Capacity</strong></td>
<td><strong>high</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ts</td>
<td>Social learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal evaluations</td>
<td>Informal evaluations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This model suggests that for social learning to occur, a state must have a high administrative capacity and a high level of linkages between itself and the societal actors within the policy subsystem. The model appears to be a static model; it does not allow for situations in which the state is the dominant actor but then, in recognizing that a well developed societal sector is needed for social learning to occur, drives the development of the societal sector through the evaluation process that it employs.

As Howlett and Ramesh caution, "Effectiveness (of the evaluation process) often depends on whether the views heard are congruent with those of the government, which in turn depends on the criteria utilized to assess success or failure of a particular policy or program." This is particularly true when the evaluation process is state-directed: the state develops the overall consultative process as well as all related consultative
discussion papers and evaluative criteria. However, the process must appear open enough to generate sufficient interest and participation in the consultations to encourage social learning.

When social learning occurs there will likely be an accompanying alteration in the policy subsystem’s inter-relationships which was previously inhibited by deeply held values and beliefs. Only marginal policy change can be expected without a radical change in beliefs and subsequent reconfigurations of the policy community membership. New sets of relations and perceptions can be explored through the social learning process which, in turn, can result in a change in the social paradigm. If this happens, paradigmatic policy change becomes possible. The following two quotes, the first by Jenson and the second by Hall, highlight the relationship between a social paradigm and a policy paradigm. According to Jane Jenson, a societal paradigm is:

A shared set of interconnected premises which make sense of many social relations. Every paradigm contains a view of human nature, a definition of basic and proper forms of social relations among equals and among those in relationships of hierarchy, and specification of relations among institutions as well as a stipulation of the role of such institutions.  

Peter Hall defines a policy paradigm as:

The broad goals behind the policy, the related problems or puzzles that policy-makers have to solve to get there, and, in large measure, the kinds of instruments that can be used to attain these goals. Like a gestalt, this framework is all the more powerful because it is largely taken for granted and rarely subject to scrutiny as a whole. It seems likely that policy makers in all fields are guided by some such paradigm, even though the complexity and coherence of the paradigm may vary considerably across fields.

A linkage thus exists between a social paradigm and a policy paradigm if they share a common intellectual construct; the linkage can best be understood through the policy subsystem or the policy community. The linkage is the set of ideas held by the
policy community membership. Those same ideas shape the perceptions of both problems and related solutions. “Its [the linkage between social and policy paradigms] effects are pervasive because policy makers take it so for granted that they are often not even aware of its influences.” ¹⁰

Hall has developed a model that offers insight in paradigmatic policy change and the complex stages that it involves. Hall’s model has been expanded for this thesis to show where social learning fits into the paradigmatic change process. This is shown in Table 1.2 on the next page.

Different theorists have offered rationales for paradigmatic changes in policy. In Hall’s view, “competition between paradigms is likely to be resolved not simply by the endogenous effects of scientific inquiry and intellectual debate [consultation], but in terms of exogenous shifts in the power of key actors and a broader struggle among competing interests in the [policy] community.” ¹¹ Therefore, two phenomena operate concurrently to set the political environment for social learning and resultant shifts in policy paradigms: 1) an innovative, participative policy evaluation process; and 2) a realignment in policy community inter-relationships.

This thesis will apply Hall’s Paradigmatic Policy Change Model to the 1994-1996 Settlement Renewal Consultation process and the context within which that process took place. The analysis will help to explain paradigmatic shifts in both social and policy paradigms that occurred through social learning as a result of the Settlement Renewal Consultation process. The Paradigmatic Policy Change Model will be supplemented by theories related to policy communities, policy networks, pressure group activities, and evaluation processes. ¹²
Table 1.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Paradigm Stability</td>
<td>in which the reigning orthodoxy is institutionalized and policy adjustments are made, largely by a closed group of experts and officials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*the paradigm is unchallenged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Accumulation of Anomalies</td>
<td>in which ‘real world’ developments occur which are neither anticipated nor fully explicable in terms of the reigning orthodoxy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*challenges to the paradigm begin to build up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Experimentation</td>
<td>in which efforts are made to stretch the existing paradigm to account for the anomalies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*challenges to the paradigm lead to some tentative/experimental changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fragmentation of Authority</td>
<td>in which experts and officials are discredited and new participants challenge the existing paradigm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*experts disagree openly with each other regarding the paradigm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Contestation</td>
<td>in which debate spills into the public arena and involves the larger political process, including electoral and partisan considerations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*the disagreement between experts goes public and the relevant policy community is dramatically enlarged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. New Paradigm</td>
<td>in which after a shorter or longer period of time, the advocates of a new paradigm secure positions of authority and alter existing organizational and decision-making arrangements in order to institutionalize the new paradigm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*a new paradigm is institutionalized</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* model expanded by Cathi Loescher

1.4 Findings

This study concludes that when a significant divergence in social paradigms co-exists in a unitary policy community, comprehensive consultation can lead to social learning which, in turn can lead to a change in the social paradigms held by the membership of the policy community. In the case of Settlement Renewal, this study
finds that social learning did occur during the Settlement Renewal Consultation process, although to varying extents in different provinces. Evidence of social learning having occurred is found both in a change in the fundamental policy values and a change in policy community inter-relationships. The two conditions, identified by Howlett and Ramesh, for social learning were achieved by the federal government: its capacity was high and it was able to develop a strong linkage with societal members of the policy community.

The Settlement Renewal Initiative was able to foster a change in the social paradigm underlying immigration settlement services policy (in most provinces) and set the stage for resultant paradigmatic policy change. These changes can be attributed to the nature of the consultation process undertaken. This case study demonstrates the intrinsic value of well-designed consultations as a component of complex policy change initiatives.

1.5 Research Data

This study is based on an in-depth analysis of all documents related to the consultation process of the Settlement Renewal Initiative. These documents include briefs submitted by service providing organizations, government issue and discussion papers, Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence for the Standing Committee on Immigration and Citizenship, workshop reports, and the transcripts for roundtable discussions. Government documents guided discussions and set the criteria for policy evaluation. Societal groups and organizations responded through written and oral presentations; these presentations reveal the thoughts, preferences, and values of
members of the policy community. By following the documents through the entire two-year process, it is possible to assess organizational presentations and identify changes in the social paradigms espoused by the organizations.

1.6 Thesis Organization

This thesis is organized into seven chapters. Chapter one consists of the introduction and provides an overview of the thesis both in terms of its theoretical applications and data sources.

Chapter two reviews settlement services policy and social paradigms from 1940-1994. The chapter finds that, generally (save Quebec), all members of the National Settlement Services Policy Community valued a leading federal government role in settlement policy and programs. However, the historical review also reveals that challenges were mounted against that policy paradigm at various times over those fifty-four years. The chapter highlights experimental changes to the paradigm and societal reactions to those changes. The review shows that, by the 1990s, the effectiveness of nationally directed settlement policy was seriously questioned given the increasing diversity of Canada’s peoples, increased influence of unit governments, the increased fragmentation of Canadian society and the new management style of the federal government. The policy paradigm that existed with only marginal changes for over fifty years was no longer stable in 1994.

Chapter three reviews the objectives and logistics of the consultation process itself. Chapter three provides a comparison of the consultation process logistics for the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta. This chapter compares the details of
the strategy undertaken by the federal government and notes the impact that those details had on the nature of policy community membership participation within the consultation process. This comparative approach reveals that each of the three provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta held unique consultation processes and that each of these consultation processes produced different forms of policy participation. The manipulation of the consultation process logistics impacted the nature of participation and, accordingly, the ability of the consultation process to meet its objectives.

Chapter four examines the 1994 membership configurations within the National Settlement Services Policy Community. A review of initial Settlement Renewal documents revealed who the policy actors were at the beginning of the consultation process in 1994. This thesis was able to position each policy actor on the National Settlement Services Policy Community map based on an analysis of the roles played by each policy actor early in the Settlement Renewal Consultation process. The policy roles performed by the policy actors are explained fully in chapters five and six of this thesis.

Chapters five and six of the thesis examine the nature of the participation of state and societal actors within the consultation process. Their objective is to examine the roles played by various actors in either constraining or encouraging shifts in the social and policy paradigms related to immigrant settlement services. The roles played by state and non-state policy actors are analyzed with particular attention paid to how the design and management of the consultation process affected the roles of the policy players.
More specifically, chapter five considers the degree of state capacity and autonomy as these two characteristics relate to the federal government strategy employed to facilitate a paradigmatic social and policy change. Chapter six examines the policy roles of societal actors in response to that federal strategy for change. Chapter six provides insight into the legitimation and communication functions served by societal policy community members in policy making processes. The case of the 1994-1996 Settlement Renewal Consultations is an exemplary case of the roles that societal policy community members can play in policy processes. Chapter six highlights the performance of these roles in conjunction with social and policy paradigms.

Chapter seven summarizes the major findings of the thesis. Following the summary, chapter seven examines the usefulness of Hall’s Paradigmatic Model for policy change and draws lessons for policy makers regarding strategies to fundamentally change policy and social paradigms.
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2.1 Introduction

When reviewing immigrant settlement services policy, from 1944 until early 1994, the first four stages of Hall’s model of paradigmatic change appear to be present and orderly. The fact that this is true is significant when choosing a policy change strategy. It is when these first four stages exist in the life of a policy that the type of policy change involved in Hall’s Paradigmatic Change Model is likely to be embarked upon. It is in these four stages that the policy paradigm is formed. This is the time when the norms and inter-relationships within the policy community are developed. It should be noted that there is not a start and stop point for each stage in the model; the stages are continuous and each one leads into the next.

Societal organization evolves during these stages to the point, near the end of the fourth stage, where there are organized challenges to the policy paradigm as it exists. There are calls for sharing policy decision-making and authority. The paradigmatic change model is a reactive model, a model that reacts to a specific set of circumstances. The circumstances are found in sequence within the life of the policy.

Viewing the policy paradigm through the framework of Hall’s model allows decision-makers to understand the scope of the existing policy paradigm and the
problems that it faces. This chapter follows the life of settlement services policy from 1944-1994 in Canada and, in doing so, demonstrates that settlement services policy exhibits the set of sequential circumstances that constitute the first four stages in Hall’s Paradigmatic Change Model.

Inherent in any policy paradigm is an underlying social paradigm that serves as the value foundation, supporting that policy and providing it with stability. This chapter reviews both the ‘settlement services policy paradigm’ and the ‘settlement services social paradigm’ that existed from 1944 to 1994. This review highlights both periods of social and policy paradigm stability and instability.

In fact, this chapter reveals that different social paradigms were held concurrently by different policy actors within the National Settlement Services Policy Community. The evidence suggests that, between 1944 and 1994, provincial governments and federal governments held both conflicting and mutual settlement services related social paradigms. Societal groups, generally, have shared the social paradigm of the federal government and supported the dominance of the federal government in settlement services policy.

The following historical review will draw attention to the correlation between changes in the policy paradigm and changes in social paradigms. In accordance with Hall’s model, the review demonstrates that significant changes to the policy paradigm were usually preceded by fluctuations in related social paradigms. Shifts in the social paradigms of some members in the policy community usually resulted in paradigm conflict, of both the policy and the social type, within the membership of the National Settlement Services Policy Community. The degree of conflict determined both the
nature of the subsequent policy change as well as the strategy used to create and implement it.

Settlement services policy is a sub-policy of immigration policy and is directly related to it. Thus, when examining the policy and social paradigms of settlement services policy it is insightful to examine settlement services policy paradigms within the context of immigration policy paradigms. This approach is particularly useful in the early stages of the life of settlement policy because the birth of settlement services as a defined policy of the federal government was a policy response to changes in the federal government’s immigration social and policy paradigms. The following analysis, then, considers early immigration policy and settlement services policy from 1944 to 1994.

2.2 Stage One: The Period of Policy Stability

Stage one of Hall’s model focuses on the period of a policy’s life when that policy enjoys a lengthy period of policy paradigm stability. Paradigms held by various members of the policy community remain relatively cohesive. The policy community could be configured in different ways: there could be a single dominant policy actor or a group of dominant policy actors; there could be a relatively small policy community in which there are a few other policy actors who operate independent of each other; or there could be a very cohesive large policy community. But what is of significance to this study is not so much the configurations themselves but the changes, or lack of changes, to these configurations in the National Settlement Services Policy Community (NSSPC).
Within this period, there were minimal changes to the inter-relationships between members in the NSSPC. Moreover, during this period of policy stability, the majority of the members of the policy community shared a similar social paradigm related to the stabilized policy paradigm. Externally, there were minimal contradictions between the policy paradigm and the greater social, economic, and cultural environment.

Settlement policy was a very nominal and uncomplicated policy during the years leading up to the 1960s. The settlement of immigrants was largely undertaken by families, neighbours, land agents, churches, and other non-governmental organizations. A coordinated approach to immigrant settlement was not really needed given that the culture of most new arrivals matched closely that of welcoming citizens. Preferred status in immigration policy was unequivocally given to British subjects. Prime Minister Mackenzie King, in 1947, stated that “The people of Canada do not wish to make a fundamental alteration in the character of their population through mass immigration”. The government was opposed to large-scale immigration from the Orient out of concern that it would give rise to social and economic problems which could lead to serious international difficulties. The government had no intention of changing the regulations governing Asiatic immigration “unless and until alternative measures of effective control had been worked out”. It is clear that an institutionalized set of programs to help immigrants settle was an idea far removed from the policy considerations of the McKenzie King Government.

The prevailing social paradigm was not concerned with settlement issues because it generally supported, or at least, did not mount challenges to, the restrictive immigration policy. The participation of social organizations in settlement services
policy processes was minimal as policy making was left to governments. The prevailing social paradigm, then, was largely defined by the dominant governmental policy members in the NSSPC and naturally reflected governmental values and perceptions. This lack of conflict between governmental policy actors and societal groups continued until the early 1960s, at which time some differentiation appeared in the social paradigms between provincial governments as well as between societal groups.

2.3 Stage Two: Challenges to the Policy Paradigm Surface

Stage two of the policy paradigm model is characterized by challenges to the policy paradigm. The challenges can originate internally (within the membership of the NSSPC), externally (within the policy environment) or through a combination of internal and external factors. The challenges can take many forms. NSSPC members may begin to challenge the dominate policy actor for a share of the policy power. Societal interests may begin to question the values, goals, and/or delivery system of a particular policy. External changes in the social-political-economic environment may place pressure on the policy paradigm. Contradictions will likely begin to surface between the existing policy paradigm and the underlying social paradigm. Conflicts between paradigms espoused by the various members of the policy community will arise out of the contradictions. The review of settlement services policy from the 1960s to the early 1970s highlights these types of shifts. These shifts were fluctuations in the previously coherent social paradigm associated with the stability of the settlement services policy paradigm.
The policy paradigm that was upheld between the years following World War II and 1960 changed under John Diefenbaker's Conservative Government in 1962. This policy change was significant as it,

eliminated racial discrimination as a major feature of Canada's immigration policy. In only one respect did the new regulations retain any vestiges of discrimination and that was in the provision that allowed European immigrants and immigrants from the Americas to sponsor a wider range of relatives.  

Further,

A wider cultural mix, including readmission of Asiatic peoples, barred since 1927, brought large numbers from increasingly diverse origins, few of whom would have kin or organizational contacts capable of providing assistance upon arrival. For resettlement, a proliferation of federal, provincial, and municipal governmental services and agencies emerged which oversaw and contracted out services specifically for newcomers.  

The significance of the policy change was widespread for all Canadians and, more specifically, for the membership of the NSSPC. The demographics of the population changed quite quickly and the need for settlement services magnified. The membership of the NSSPC experienced immediate growth as new societal organizations were created to meet the needs of new ethnic groups. Established organizations took on new roles and responsibilities to help meet the settlement services needs. Consequently, the NSSPC grew in size, diversity, and capacity.

These groups were generally organized around similar values and goals. Thus, they shared a common social paradigm with respect to settlement services. The policy actors who had dominated the NSSPC, namely, the federal government and its officers, maintained their dominant policy role despite the expanded membership in the NSSPC. But within the NSSPC, the province of Quebec began to challenge the dominant federal role in immigration and settlement services policy.
Social paradigms in Quebec, in numerous policy sectors, changed during the 1960s “Quiet Revolution”. Quebec, as a province, began to assert itself in matters that had previously been under the unchallenged leadership of the federal government. Immigration settlement policy was one of these areas. It was a particularly sensitive area and was closely tied to the values that drove the entire Quiet Revolution. These values depicted Quebec culture virtuous and in need of promotion and protection. Quebec began to challenge the immigration and settlement services policy paradigm on the basis of its inability to recognize, meaningfully, the unique character of Quebec. The province of Quebec began to challenge the policy dominance of the federal government in the NSSPC and offer, as an alternative, increased roles for the provincial government of Quebec.

Despite the challenges posed by the Quebec provincial government, the federal government continued to perform a leadership role. Policy paradigms reinforced a dominant federal role and the social paradigms held by non-Quebec members of the NSSPC continued to support federal government dominant policy paradigms. The following description of the federal government’s role in the 1970s exemplifies this point.

Government was no longer a laissez-faire overseer of immigration flows: it would become actively involved as an agent in the resettlement process. Responsibility, therefore, shifted from the individual immigrant/refugee, and by implication, interested individuals and groups in the private sector, to the government as a collectivity, now assuming the role of animator for the very activity it once regarded passively.

It (this shift) may also be read as the provision of services as a matter of right or entitlement: the status of “landed immigrant” or “refugee” is both necessary and sufficient to ensure provision of settlement services. 18

By the late 1970s, access to settlement services on the basis of individual need was solidified as a right of entitlement upon landing. This right was universally applied.
Despite challenges, Quebec was not recognized separately or treated differently from other members of the NSSPC.

The NSSPC expanded considerably during the 1970s. The attitudes and values of society became increasingly relevant in policy processes as individuals and groups within society became involved, either as clients or as delivery agents, in settlement services policy. The prominent social paradigm held by the majority of the membership of the NSSPC considered settlement services important and valued the dominant federal government policy role. Quebec, on the other hand, held a policy paradigm that valued a more influential policy role for the province of Quebec. Quebec was not the only disgruntled member of the NSSPC, an additional opposing social paradigm existed in the minds of individuals and groups who did not agree with the new open immigration policy and/or with the associated dedication of resources to settlement services.

These opposing social paradigms were beginning to place conflicting pressure on settlement services policy processes and policy paradigms. Despite the rise in membership in the NSSPC and the development of a few opposing social paradigms, the federal government remained the dominant actor and its bureaucracy provided leadership across the country.

2.4 Stages Three And Four: Experimental Policy Changes and the Fragmentation of Policy Authority

Stage three of Hall’s model is marked by fluctuations in policy and social paradigms among and between members of the NSSPC. These fluctuations result in conflicts between social paradigms and subsequent challenges to policy paradigms. In this stage, the policy paradigm usually experiences some tentative or experimental
policy changes that are designed to meet the challenges presented. Particularly significant to this stage of the model is society's reaction to tentative policy changes and the impact that the policy change has on other sectors in the policy environment. Some reconfigurations in relations among the policy community membership can be expected.

Stage three and stage four of Hall's Paradigmatic Change Model are best discussed together as the policies that were experimented with in stage three had the reciprocal effect of slowly fragmenting the policy authority. Some of the challenges that were mounted against the policy paradigm questioned the policy legitimacy and the policy authority of the federal government as the dominant policy actor. Within the NSSPC, there were many potential voices of dissent: small societal groups, umbrella organizations for societal groups, municipal governments, provincial governments, bureaucrats, individuals, political parties, and/or legislatures. The forces that questioned the policy authority of the federal government were diverse but most of the dissenting policy community members originated in Quebec. Those voices of dissent that originated in other provinces were largely in response to the policy challenges presented by the Quebec provincial government.

To reiterate, within stages three and four of the Hall's Paradigmatic Change Model, policy authority is weakened as challenges to the established policy paradigm build. As this authority weakening process unfolds, other members of the NSSPC are encouraged to re-evaluate social paradigms. Within this stage, members of the policy community will openly debate and disagree about structural and functional aspects of the existing policy paradigm.
The settlement services policy paradigm experienced experimental and tentative changes in the 1970s and 1980s. During these same years, the social paradigm became fragmented as different members of the NSSPC disagreed about some of the underlying values, goals, and structures of the policy paradigm. A major experimental change that had wide and deep implications was the 1971 Multiculturalism Policy of the federal government. Although this policy was not specifically announced as a 'settlement services' policy, it was a designated allocation of financial resources to immigrant groups (or other organizations involved in ethnicity, culture, and the celebration of differences between people) for purposes of enhancing contributions and peaceful relations within Canadian society.

Prime Minister Trudeau articulated the 1970s governmental philosophy when announcing multiculturalism policy in the House of Commons. This announcement exemplifies a fundamental shift in the social paradigm held by the federal government.

The policy I am announcing today accepts the contention of the other (not English or French) cultural communities, that they, too, are essential elements in Canada, and deserve government assistance in order that they can contribute to regional and national life in ways that derive from their heritage, yet are distinctively Canadian. 19

Unfortunately the social paradigm shift, as reflected in the multiculturalism policy, was a shift primarily within the social paradigm of the federal government and was not reciprocated by society as a whole. The magnitude of the values intertwined in multiculturalism policy were too vast and came too suddenly for the social paradigm held by the wider society to embrace them. Some groups in society did embrace them, though, and became quite vocal proponents of it. Some ethnic groups took advantage of financial programs tied to multiculturalism policy and formed new formal ethnic organizations that
joined the NSSPC. The multiculturalism policy drew many challenges, from many sources, and many societal groups began to disagree openly with each other regarding the policy and the social paradigm that underlies it.

Another example of policy authority fragmentation was the federal government’s creation of the Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism. This had representation from 101 ethnic groups. Although its influence was more symbolic than actual, its creation demonstrates that policy authority was becoming more fragmented than it had been in previous decades.

Another experimental policy change of significance was the revision of the Immigration Act in 1976. Its revisions allowed for federal consultation with the provinces regarding immigrant integration. The legislative changes gave the Minister authority to enter into agreements with provinces regarding immigration. This change was significant and reflected a federal government recognition of the growing discontent with the federal policy monopoly on immigration and settlement policy. The federal government’s policy paradigm had changed to allow for shared immigration and settlement policy power and authority. But the underlying social paradigm of the federal government was only selectively adapted following the policy paradigm change. In fact, the social paradigm of the federal government accepted shared policy power with the government of Quebec but would not accept the idea of similar enhanced policy roles for the other nine provinces.

In essence, in the late 1970s, the federal government held two conflicting social paradigms regarding immigration and settlement services. Both were important. The first maintained the status quo in terms of policy inter-relations between the federal
government and nine provincial governments. The second social paradigm accepted a unique role for the province of Quebec in immigration and settlement services policy. The conflict between these two opposing social paradigms was evident in the experimental policy paradigm change that was made in 1978: the Cullen-Couture Agreement between the Quebec government and the federal government that gave Quebec the right to select its own independent class immigrant.

Quebec held a social paradigm that envisioned Quebec as a policy leader for matters affecting Quebec. These matters included immigration and settlement services policy. The social paradigm and subsequent policy paradigms of Quebec were very different from those of the other provinces. Agreements were signed in some of the other provinces but were much different in substance from the Canada-Quebec Agreement. As Joseph Garcea found in his study,

The agreements signed in Saskatchewan and some of the other provinces (1978) merely provided them with limited consultative roles and, at most, some determinative roles in relatively minor facets of planning and managing immigration. Alberta was the only one that wanted to perform more substantial co-determinative and determinative roles in planning and managing immigration....However it was able to get such an agreement...because the federal government was reluctant to devolve any significant authority for planning and managing immigration on a national basis to any of the provinces other than Quebec.

Between the late 1970s and the early 1990s, several provincial governments did approach the federal government in pursuit of a federal-provincial agreement on immigration and settlement services policy. However, they experienced a great reluctance on the part of the federal government to endorse the transfer of roles and responsibilities to any provincial government other than Quebec. Provincial governments, other than Quebec's, did not aggressively push negotiations for agreements with the federal
government largely because of doubt of public support for an increased provincial role in immigration and settlement policy.

…they felt that there would not be much public support for their demands within their provinces because, as in the past, the prevailing attitude was that immigration should be planned and managed by the federal government. 21

Secondarily, the provincial governments seemed somewhat content to allow the federal government to continue to dominate immigration and settlement policies. Garcea summarizes the prevailing social paradigm of the nine provincial governments that did not yet experience an increased settlement services policy responsibility.

Between 1980 and 1991 there were no major negotiations…between the federal governments and their counterparts in Ontario, Manitoba, or the Atlantic provinces regarding their respective roles in the various phases of the immigration process. In 1991, none of these provinces wanted to perform any key roles in the various phases of the immigration process comparable to those performed by their Quebec counterparts…. 22

A second significant experimental policy paradigm change occurred 1991 when the Canada-Quebec Agreement was signed between the federal government and the provincial government of Quebec.

Some key provisions in that Agreement, but particularly those regarding the level of federal compensation to Quebec for settlement services, which was deemed to be relatively generous, heightened the Western premier’s interest in constraining the federal government to examine the alignment of roles and responsibilities in immigration. 23

This Agreement between the federal government and the provincial government of Quebec caused the social paradigms of several of the other nine provinces to adapt to the new policy paradigm reality. Money, in particular the level of financial compensation to Quebec to settle immigrants, became the focus as the other provinces felt that fair and equitable treatment between all provinces and the federal government should fit in the policy paradigm.
What was especially pertinent was the fact that Quebec, through provisions in the 1991 Canada-Quebec Agreement, would receive substantially more money than the other provinces would receive from the federal government for comparable functions. It was this unequal distribution of money that prompted change in the social paradigms of many of the remaining provinces. Fairness and financial considerations entered social paradigm constructs. This social paradigm change would lead to challenges to the existing policy paradigm that provided for preferential inequitable treatment for Quebec by the federal government.

2.5 Paradigms Just Prior to the 1994 Settlement Renewal Initiative

At this point, just prior to the 1994 consultation process on settlement services policy, the federal government wanted to reduce its policy role. The policy challenges had been strong and numerous since the inequitable 1991 Canada-Quebec Agreement was signed. During the early 1990s, the federal government was very concerned with debt and sought ways to reduce their involvement in many policy sectors which included immigration and settlement services. The social paradigm of the federal government just prior to the 1994 Settlement Renewal Initiative substantiated their desire to devolve policy authority and decision-making processes to other members of the National Settlement Services Policy Community.

Between 1991 and 1994, the provincial governments of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and Ontario all indicated a desire to renew negotiations for a settlement services bilateral agreement. Within their social paradigms during this period, the provincial governments valued a federal recognition of equality between provinces.
They also valued a federal government recognition of their needs and their efforts related to the settlement of immigrants within their respective provinces.

Within provincial policy environments, provincial governments were feeling financially burdened and gave priority to finding new ways to attract additional funds to boost provincial revenues. An agreement similar to the 1991 Canada-Quebec Agreement, with comparable financial figures, would fit well with the social and policy paradigm ideals held by provincial governments during the 1990s. However, these ideals were not shared widely with societal organizations within those provinces.

Societal organizations, generally, valued a strong federal role in setting immigration and settlement services policy. They believed in universal programming for immigrants and common principles and goals. Serving primarily as settlement services delivery agents prior to the 1994 Settlement Renewal Consultation process, they were not, for the most part, involved in other aspects of the policy process.

The social paradigms of societal members of the National Settlement Services Policy Community, outside Quebec, had not changed much between 1944 and 1994. Not even the 1991 Canada-Quebec Agreement had a significant effect on the social paradigm of these organized societal interests. They wanted a national policy and program with national objectives and standards that were set and enforced by the federal government. They were concerned that devolution of the management of settlement services to the provinces would compromise settlement services in the future.
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CHAPTER THREE
SETTLEMENT RENEWAL CONSULTATION PROCESS

3.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the Settlement Renewal Consultation process that began in 1994 and continued until 1997. For analytical purposes the component parts of the process are first identified and then analyzed in relation to each other. The analysis is summarized in Tables 3.1 to 3.8 at the end of this chapter. The major findings in the analysis are three-fold:

1. The consultation process was federally-driven yet unique within each provincial jurisdiction;

2. The consultation process drew provincial governments into the federal policy agenda for settlement policy renewal; and,

3. The consultation process facilitated the development of social paradigms that would allow for a major shift of policy responsibility from federal entities to provincial entities.

3.2 Overview of the Consultation Process

The Settlement Renewal process was initiated by the Chretien cabinet. Minister Sergio Marchi directed both his bureaucratic arm, the federal department of Citizenship
and Immigration, and his parliamentary arm, the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration (which was dominated by Marchi’s caucus colleagues) to engage in a two year process of renewal consultations. Each of these two entities entered into two distinct and unique processes.

The first such process, which preceded the second, was conducted by the Standing Committee. This Committee called individuals and organizations to make submissions to them in hearings across Canada. Some of the submissions were formal and written, others were oral, and still others were contributed during round table discussions. The second process was led by the federal Department of Citizenship and Immigration. This Department conducted regional workshops, focus group discussions, and interviews in each provincial jurisdiction. Provincial offices for the Department of Canadian Immigration and Citizenship (CIC) contracted with third party consultants to conduct these consultations. Each province underwent a unique process, some of which were more inclusive and meaningful than others.

The Department of Citizenship and Immigration Canada had administrative offices within each provincial jurisdiction. These provincially based CIC offices were the strongest provincial policy leaders in the years leading up to the policy renewal process, in all provinces except Quebec and British Columbia. The participation of provincial governments in the Settlement Renewal Consultations was negligible in the early rounds of the process but their levels of participation increased as the consultation process evolved. As was discussed in chapter two of this thesis, provincial governments, generally, had been in unsuccessful discussions with the federal government in the years prior to the 1994 Settlement Renewal Initiative. No agreements
arose from those discussions because the preferred policy paradigms of the provincial governments were incompatible with those of the federal government.

Provincial governments, then, were not anxious to join in the 1994 federally guided consultation process that reflected the federal government’s ideal policy paradigm for the administration of settlement services policy. Ottawa state actors saw provincial governments as primary candidates for leadership in the renewed policy administration system. They were identified as such in discussion documents that were circulated to all participant organizations prior to when workshops would commence. Thus, provincial governments were drawn into the consultation process despite the reality of policy and social paradigm conflict.

The federal government wanted to reduce its policy role; both the social and policy paradigms of the federal government supported greatly reduced federal policy roles across many policy sectors. The federal government also wanted to reduce its costs related to settlement services. The provincial governments of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia and Ontario had been trying to get increased roles and increased compensation for their roles since the Canada-Quebec Agreement was signed in 1991. To reiterate the discussion in chapter two, the social paradigms in these five provinces strongly valued equitable treatment between the provinces. There was deeply rooted resentment toward the federal government based on the large financial contribution to the settlement services of Quebec which greatly outweighed contributions to the other provinces. The provincial governments were also experiencing increased costs because immigration and refugee numbers were steadily increasing.
During the early 1990s, societal groups still valued a strong federal role in immigration and settlement services policy and did not view the provincial governments as ideal settlement services policy leaders. Society based members of the National Settlement Services Policy Community were appreciative of the opportunity that the 1994 Settlement Renewal Initiative gave them. Reluctance to participate was minimal; however, societal organizations did question the relevance of such a consultation process, as the majority saw no need to change the existing policy paradigm.

Societal paradigms were in contradiction with the social and policy paradigms of both the federal government and the provincial governments. Just prior to the beginning of the 1994 Settlement Renewal Consultation process, societal groups did not want the federal government to reduce their role nor did societal groups want the provincial governments to increase their policy roles. Societal organizations in British Columbia were an exception. An enhanced policy role for the provincial government in British Columbia did not conflict with the social paradigms of societal groups in that province. The provincial settlement services policy community was quite cohesive and more developed in British Columbia than in the other provinces (save Quebec).

3.3 Objectives of the Process

The renewal process introduced the idea of a reduced federal government role to societal organizations, considered alternative administrative structures, and, most importantly, established a basis for supporting the new administrative structure (whatever it may have turned out to be). Because the federal government relied so heavily on a non-governmental service delivery system, they could not afford grassroots
level resistance to a policy change. Such resistance could lead to sector confusion and weak services. Reaction to the policy change needed to be anticipated and manipulated in order to minimize negative backlash.

Further exacerbating potential conflict was the fact that many of the service delivery organizations were formed on the basis of ethnicity or culture. If the policy change were taken as a personal affront to one or more specific ethnic groups, conflict could have arisen between organizations themselves, between the organizations and the government, and/or between individuals in neighborhoods throughout Canada.

3.4 Logistics of the Process

It was not only the objectives of the consultation process that affected the process; planning logistics were also tools open to manipulation. Decisions such as having Round I and Round II workshops organized along provincial geographic boundaries caused members of the national policy community to be subdivided for the duration of the process and reorganized on a provincial basis. This design feature may have been deliberate or accidental but, at any rate, it helped groups get comfortable with functioning as a provincial policy community subunit and prepared them for the renewed system of provincial administration.

Further, the extent and timing of promotional activities affected the capacity of groups to participate, both as individual organizations and as associational systems. "Participants also expressed their concern and frustration with the very short time frame and time of year. (just before Christmas and after the Christmas/New Year break)" 24 They were disappointed that there was not enough time to permit good preliminary
discussion with their agencies and communities. State generated discussion documents, then, were followed very closely with little diversion from the focus intended by the federal government. Additionally, the timing did not give opposing groups much time to mobilize organized rebuttals to the federal proposals contained in the documents.

The decision to use third party provincially based consultants as consultation facilitators greatly influenced the nature of the process as well as process outcomes. Workshop facilitators, within each province, were left with the discretion of whether or not to have civil servants participate in workshop discussions. Discussions that had participating bureaucrats were much more state-issue based than those that had bureaucrats participating only in a resource capacity. Because the quality of the third-party consultants contracted to conduct the provincial consultations varied, the precise nature and quality of consultations also varied from province to province. The Department of Citizenship and Immigration workshops, then, differed from regional jurisdiction to jurisdiction and forced groups to organize and interact provincially rather than nationally.

The tables that follow in this chapter, Tables 3.1 to 3.8, show the consultation processes for Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta. These tables reveal three main facts inherent in the consultation processes:

1. The processes became uniquely provincial rather than national;
2. The strategic use of process logistics affected the nature of participation; and,
3. The level of participation of provincial governments increased as the process evolved.
3.5 Conclusion

To reiterate, the consultation process was used to accomplish specific policy objectives, defined by the federal government in Ottawa. The process mechanics were well-devised and measurably successful. The federal government and its Ottawa based bureau maintained control over the process to ensure that it did not stray from its planned path. The process was much more than an exercise in information gathering, public awareness, or perception change. The process was, in fact, designed to facilitate social learning in order that there could be a change in social paradigms underlying settlement services policy in Canada.

This chapter has described the fifth stage of Hall’s Paradigmatic Policy Change Model. The Settlement Renewal Consultation process involved, and in fact was designed to generate, open debate regarding social and policy paradigms related to settlement services policy. The paradigm conflicts that existed just prior to the 1994 Initiative were an integral part of consultation workshops and presentations. The stated intent of the consultation process was to propose and impose the idea of a reduced federal role in settlement services policy.
### Table 3.1

**PROMOTION OF ROUND I CONSULTATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saskatchewan</th>
<th>Manitoba</th>
<th>Alberta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>-“Finding a new Direction for Newcomer Integration” -Document and workbook sent to participants prior to workshops</td>
<td>-1000 invitations and kits mailed -Federal-Provincial working group information meetings – as requested by organizations (8 in Winnipeg, 1 in Brandon) -Evening public information meeting in Winnipeg held two weeks prior to workshop (75 participants) -Open-line program on local news -Pre-workshops training for recruited neutral facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of participants</td>
<td>113 (plus 42 questionnaires)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.2

**PROMOTION OF ROUND II CONSULTATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saskatchewan</th>
<th>Manitoba</th>
<th>Alberta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>No information available</td>
<td>-February 1996 Report from Round I distributed to all participants -May 1996 Federal Round I Summary document circulated -May 1996 information letters regarding Round II mailed -May 27, 1996 invitations mailed to representative groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of participants</td>
<td>35+</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of participant organizations</td>
<td>“Representation from Federal Government remained with the group throughout the day to answer questions and provide clarification. Provincial representatives were present as observers and to address questions that required provincial input.” (p. 5)</td>
<td>Participants came from Medicine Hat, Lethbridge, Red Deer, Fort McMurray, Edmonton, and Calgary – represented 47 different agencies, by sector: Federal Government (13) Provincial Government (includes educational institutions) (8) Local Government (includes school boards) (7) NGO (43)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.3

**ROUND I CONSULTATION PROCESS: MANITOBA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manitoba</th>
<th>Winnipeg</th>
<th>Winnipeg</th>
<th>Winkler</th>
<th>Brandon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dates</strong></td>
<td>Nov. 30/95</td>
<td>Dec. 2/95</td>
<td>Dec. 15/95</td>
<td>Jan. 10/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership</strong></td>
<td>Institute of Urban Studies, U of W</td>
<td>Institute of Urban Studies, U of W</td>
<td>Institute of Urban Studies, U of W</td>
<td>Institute of Urban Studies, U of W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process</strong></td>
<td>1 day workshop</td>
<td>1 day workshop</td>
<td>1 day workshop</td>
<td>3 day workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant type</strong></td>
<td>Winnipeg School Division #1 (22) Red River Community College (19: 6 ESL instructors and 13 ESL students) Other ESL affiliates (12) - 43.8% of all participants were involved with ESL in some way Other participants were from a cross-section of organizations and government (i.e.) health, etc.</td>
<td>School Division SPOs Business ESL Churches Government (health, housing employment, township)</td>
<td>School Division SPOs Business Ethnic organizations Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># of participants</strong></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manitoba</th>
<th>Thompson</th>
<th>Provincial</th>
<th>Provincial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dates</strong></td>
<td>Jan. 6/96</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Institute of Urban Studies, U of W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership</strong></td>
<td>Institute of Urban Studies, U of W</td>
<td>Institute of Urban Studies, U of W</td>
<td>Institute of Urban Studies, U of W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process</strong></td>
<td>1 day workshop</td>
<td>Briefs presented in person (2 day session)</td>
<td>Written submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant type</strong></td>
<td>School Division SPOs Municipal government</td>
<td>2 delegations heard both ESL</td>
<td>3 SPOs 2 ESL 1 assessment and placement organization 1 politician 1 private business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># of participants</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Fed/Prov working group did not participate in discussions; they just provided background information. "This pre-planned non-participatory role of Fed/Prov personnel was intended to allow the free flow of discussion without the opinions of Fed/Prov workers." (p. 7) 26
Table 3.4

ROUND II CONSULTATION PROCESS: MANITOBA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Winnipeg</th>
<th>Brandon</th>
<th>Winkler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership</strong></td>
<td>Institute of Urban Studies, U of W</td>
<td>Institute of Urban Studies, U of W</td>
<td>Institute of Urban Studies, U of W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process</strong></td>
<td>3-1 day workshops</td>
<td>1 day workshop</td>
<td>1 day workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># of participants</strong></td>
<td>36 (74% of those invited)</td>
<td>4 (50% of those invited)</td>
<td>7 (50% of those invited)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See Note 1: “But a number of people phoned the Institute with comments and one written response was received.” (p. 6)"
Table 3.5

ROUND I CONSULTATION PROCESS: SASKATCHEWAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saskatchewan</th>
<th>Regina</th>
<th>Saskatoon</th>
<th>Regina</th>
<th>Saskatoon</th>
<th>Nipawin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Nov. 22/95</td>
<td>Dec. 5/95</td>
<td>Dec. 13/98</td>
<td>Dec. 4/95</td>
<td>Dec. 6/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Private Consultant</td>
<td>Private Consultant</td>
<td>Private Consultant</td>
<td>Private Consultant</td>
<td>Private Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>1 day workshop, participants given workbook prior to</td>
<td>1 day workshop, participants given workbook prior to</td>
<td>1 day workshop, participants given workbook prior to</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant type</td>
<td>CIC Staff</td>
<td>Cross section of organizations</td>
<td>Cross section of organizations</td>
<td>Newcomers</td>
<td>Newcomers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of participants</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saskatchewan</th>
<th>Yorkton</th>
<th>Regina</th>
<th>Swift Current</th>
<th>Regina</th>
<th>Saskatchewan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Private Consultant</td>
<td>Private Consultant</td>
<td>Private Consultant</td>
<td>Private Consultant</td>
<td>Private Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>Questionnaires distributed to applicants waiting to have citizenship exams marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant type</td>
<td>Newcomers</td>
<td>Newcomers</td>
<td>Newcomers</td>
<td>Provincial Interdepartmental Committee on Settlement Renewal</td>
<td>Applicants for citizenship, applications not yet approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of participants</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Consultant, Kathy Abernethy, was contracted for the consultations. She worked closely with the Saskatchewan Settlement Renewal Co-ordinator.
### Table 3.6

**ROUND II CONSULTATION PROCESS: SASKATCHEWAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saskatchewan</th>
<th>Regina</th>
<th>Saskatoon</th>
<th>Provincial</th>
<th>Provincial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dates</strong></td>
<td>June 11, 1996</td>
<td>June 1996</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership</strong></td>
<td>Private Consultant</td>
<td>Private Consultant</td>
<td>Private Consultant</td>
<td>Private Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process</strong></td>
<td>1 day workshop</td>
<td>1 day workshop</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant type</strong></td>
<td>NGO (9) Educational Institutions (6) Provincial Representatives (2 observers) Federal Reps (3)</td>
<td>NGO (7) Educational Institutions (5) Provincial Representatives (2 observers) Federal Reps (1)</td>
<td>Provincial Interdepartmental Committee on Settlement Renewal</td>
<td>CIC Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># of participants</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: “Participants were also encouraged to submit written briefs, however none were received.” (p. 1)
Table 3.7

ROUND ONE CONSULTATION PROCESS: ALBERTA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alberta</th>
<th>Red Deer</th>
<th>Grande Prairie</th>
<th>Fort McMurray</th>
<th>Red Deer</th>
<th>Medicine Hat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Nov. 27 &amp; 28/95</td>
<td>Dec. 4/95</td>
<td>Dec. 7/95</td>
<td>Dec. 15/95</td>
<td>Dec. 18/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership *See Note 1</td>
<td>Private Consultant</td>
<td>Private Consultant</td>
<td>Private Consultant</td>
<td>Private Consultant</td>
<td>Private Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>2 day workshop</td>
<td>1 day workshop</td>
<td>1 day workshop</td>
<td>1 day workshop</td>
<td>1 day workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant type</td>
<td>CIC Staff</td>
<td>Cross-section</td>
<td>Cross-section</td>
<td>Cross-section</td>
<td>Cross-section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of participants</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alberta</th>
<th>Lethbridge</th>
<th>Calgary</th>
<th>Calgary</th>
<th>Edmonton</th>
<th>Provincial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership *See Note 1</td>
<td>Private Consultant</td>
<td>Private Consultant</td>
<td>Private Consultant</td>
<td>Private Consultant</td>
<td>Private Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>1 day workshop</td>
<td>1 day workshop</td>
<td>2 independent 1 day workshops</td>
<td>2 independent 1 day workshops</td>
<td>Written submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant type</td>
<td>Cross-section</td>
<td>Multi-funders group</td>
<td>Cross-section</td>
<td>Cross-section</td>
<td>Cross-section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of participants</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Private consultants, Jim Klingle and Peter Faid, were hired to conduct consultations.
**Table 3.8**

**ROUND TWO CONSULTATION PROCESS: ALBERTA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alberta</th>
<th>Edmonton</th>
<th>Calgary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dates</strong></td>
<td>June 1996</td>
<td>June 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership</strong></td>
<td>Private Consultant</td>
<td>Private Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>See Note 1</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process</strong></td>
<td>1 day workshop</td>
<td>1 day workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant type</strong></td>
<td>Cross-section (Previous Round I participants: government &amp; NGO)</td>
<td>Cross-section (Previous Round I participants: government and NGO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># of participants</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Private consultants, Jim Klingel and Peter Faid, were hired to conduct consultations.
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CHAPTER FOUR
NATIONAL SETTLEMENT SERVICES POLICY COMMUNITY

4.1 Introduction

This chapter maps the National Settlement Services Policy Community as it was configured at the beginning of the Settlement Renewal Consultation process in 1994. In order to understand the full effects of the consultation process, it is necessary to review all of the state and societal actors involved. The map derives its theoretical base from the policy community literature as presented by Winks and Wright, Coleman and Skogstad, and Paul Pross. The map was created by examining policy participation and influence rates at the initial stages of settlement renewal. These rates were determined through an analysis of the Minutes and Proceedings of the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration; all related government discussion documents and issue papers; and written/oral submissions during workshops, hearings, and roundtable forums held in various locations across the country.

4.2 Policy Community Theoretical Overview

Policy community concepts offer a framework for understanding the policy players and the nature of their inter-relationships. The policy community approach emphasizes structures at both state and societal levels. It examines inter-organizational differences in political power and policy influence by grouping sector organizations
according to whether they can be classified as either a state or a societal policy actor. State organizations typically include legislatures, government departments and departmental staff, and any other state-directed organization. Societal actors are typically voluntary associations with volunteer boards. Some societal organizations have paid staff and others do not. Additionally, some societal organizations are affiliated with larger associations, often referred to as umbrella groups. The settlement services policy community has membership of both the state and societal type. There are several reasons why an organization of one type may have an abundance of policy strength or, alternatively, very little.

Winks and Wright, along with Coleman and Skogstad, define a policy community as “all actors or potential actors with a direct or indirect interest in a policy area who share a common policy focus and who, with varying degrees of influence, shape policy outcomes over the long run.” 29 Paul Pross defines policy communities in a slightly different manner:

A policy community is that part of a political system that – by virtue of its functional responsibilities, its vested interests, and its specialized knowledge – acquires a dominant voice in determining government decisions in a specific field of public activity, and is generally permitted by society at large and the public authorities in particular to determine public policy in that field. 30

Within the policy community literature, organizations within a particular policy community are subdivided into two segments: the sub-government and the attentive public. Members may move from within the sub-government into the attentive public or from the attentive public into the sub-government. Any member can occupy any circle of influence within the policy community at any time. Table 4.1 outlines the organization of policy communities
At the time of the settlement renewal process, the settlement renewal policy community became extremely active and increased its membership numbers. Beginning in 1994, when the policy renewal process was first announced, organizations involved in settlement services either in an administrative role, a service delivery role, or an advocacy role participated in the consultation phase of the settlement renewal process. Numerous organizations, both of state and societal type, became policy-making participants for the very first time.

Coleman and Skogstad believe that political reality is structured within institutions that determine the terms of political discourse. Institutions are defined as the structures and organizations of the state, the society, and the international system. These
structures are organic. An organization’s power position within a political system changes and adapts through time. As their positions change so do their policy preferences, areas of activity, and organizational values. Howlett and Ramesh concur: “Institutions, groups, classes, and states participating in policy processes no doubt have their own interests, but the manner in which they interpret and pursue their interests, and the outcome of their efforts, are shaped by institutional factors.” At an organization’s most fundamental core, institutions have a presence; they condition perceptions of interests and, thereby, constrain some choices and facilitate others.

This structural/institutional approach emphasizes structures at both state and societal levels in examining differences in political power and policy influence. Structural position determinants will likely vary across the spectrum of organizations involved in any policy area. Coleman and Skogstad review each actor on its own merits before looking at how the actors link. Their analysis, aimed at identifying sources of policy influence, divides the pool of policy actors into two distinct categories: state and society. This study of the National Settlement Services Policy Community will use the same division. Figure 4.1, on the following page, depicts the National Services Policy Community as it was configured in 1994.

4.3 National Settlement Services Policy Community Defined

The National Settlement Services Policy Community finds its center of policy strength in state entities. These national state entities essentially controlled the renewal process and the policy thought that accompanied it. From 1994 to 1997, there were six major actors at the federal level: a Liberal caucus; a Liberal Cabinet; the Office of
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Figure 4.1
Minister Sergio Marchi; the Department of Citizenship and Immigration Canada; a Parliamentary Standing Committee of Citizenship and Immigration; and parliament.

Provincial governments were also state actors, but each provincial government played a unique role in the settlement renewal process. British Columbia and Quebec had provincial governments highly active in immigration. All other provinces played a relatively minor policy role during the initial phases of the consultations.

The federal and provincial governments were served by bureaucracies. Generally, these institutions function to assist cabinet in the fulfillment of policy responsibilities and held high degrees of policy power.

However, the reality of modern government is such that their role goes well beyond what one would expect of a 'servant'. Indeed, bureaucrats are very often the keystone in the policy process and the central figures in many policy subsystems." 32

Various societal actors also held degrees of policy strength within the policy community. Implementing settlement policy and delivering settlement services had been the primary, and often only, function of many societal service providing organizations. However, when their ability to operate effectively as an organization, and thereby meet the needs of those they served, was about to be redefined, these organizations put resources and energies into articulating their policy positions. Further, some organizations attempted to add strength to their policy position by joining together with like-mined organizations to present a united front. The future of their organizations was at stake.
4.4 Conclusion

To reiterate, the objective in this chapter has been to identify the policy players in the Settlement Services Policy Community with respect to power inter-relationships as they were defined in 1994. Viewing the players as a national policy community highlights national state actors as dominant policy players relative to provincial and societal policy players. The intent of the consultation phase of Settlement Renewal, and in fact the result, was to reallocate that policy power and responsibility. Figure 4.1, in this chapter, depicts the policy community as it was in the very early stages of the renewal initiative.

The policy inter-relationships changed as the consultation process evolved. In the middle stages (following Round I of the consultations and leading into Round II) societal interests gained policy strength and became quite influential in the policy process. Their influence and power put pressure on reluctant provincial governments and helped to draw them into more active policy roles. Accordingly, provincial governments exhibit relatively high degrees of policy strength at the end of the consultation process. Thus, a map constructed at the end of the consultation process (1996-97) would be reconfigured to show varying degrees of policy power held by different provincial state entities. This latter map would show that the policy power of some provinces exceeded the level of policy power held by federal state entities. This reconfiguration, however, was made possible through a deliberate decision of the powerful national state entities to relinquish the power that they had held in previous decades.
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CHAPTER FIVE
SETTLEMENT RENEWAL STATE ACTORS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the role state actors played in the settlement renewal consultation process. There were four distinct categories of state actors involved: the minister, legislative staff, and the Standing Committee; national offices of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration; provincial offices of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration; and provincial governments. Analyzing the role that each of these entities played in the consultation process provides insight into the nature of policy power as it was distributed in the state sector. The analysis looks at policy power as it was prior to the beginning of the renewal process, during the process, and at the end of the process. The analysis will show that the manner in which the consultation process was undertaken affected policy power allocations and subsequent power shifts. The analysis measures policy strength based on degrees of autonomy and capacity. The work of Howlett, Ramesh, Coleman, and Skogstad provide the theoretical framework for this analysis.

5.2 Theoretical Overview

Recent theorists have disaggregated the state, recognizing that its unique components hold varying degrees of strength and policy influence. These components
include federal and provincial legislatures, legislative committees, cabinet, caucus, individual ministers, state agencies, and bureaucracies. Analysis begins with elected officials and then broadens to include appointed officials. Elected officials in the cabinet make and implement policy: a role derived from their constitutional authority to govern the country. Officials in the legislature hold governments accountable to the public and are not directly involved in making and implementing policies. The policy influence of legislative members, who are not in Cabinet, is limited largely to voting on budgets and debating bills. Even legislative committees are dominated by members of the executive. Thus it is the executive, not the legislature, which is the focus of policy analysis in this chapter.

Another component of the state is a conglomerate of appointed officials, serving as civil servants in the bureaucracy. This institution functions to assist cabinet in the fulfillment of policy responsibilities. In reality, bureaucracies hold a great deal of policy power and influence as they are the body responsible for implementing government directives and policy. As such, they have control over the timing and nature of policy implementation. In fact, bureaucracies are central figures in many policy communities.

Policy strength within sectors can move between sectoral policy players. State actors may, individually or cooperatively, hold the wealth of policy strength or, alternatively, may be barren of it. At any rate, it is important to remember that “ultimately the state alone has the authority to impose its will on the interest community. It may delegate that authority but it does not alienate it.” 33 The degree of state policy strength depends upon the extent of autonomy and capacity of state actors, within each policy domain.
Autonomy and capacity do not always serve each other. An autonomous state may not necessarily have the resources to design and implement policies, particularly if the policies face societal opposition. The state players may not be able to manage societal interests in such a way as to maintain control over the policy agenda and the policy network. On the other hand, states may have capacity without the ability to act independent of societal interests. Howlett and Ramesh have an insightful perspective: "...we must devote efforts to examining empirically the role of governmental institutions in reinforcing or weakening state policy capabilities [and autonomy] and their effects on the actor’s behavior in the policy process." 34 Thus, the analysis is two-fold. We must first understand the characteristics of the institutions and then examine how those characteristics are used in the policy process to affect the policy process. It is important, then, for analytical frameworks to measure both state autonomy and state capacity.

5.3 State Autonomy

Understanding state strength requires study of the degree of independence experienced by each state player. "The goals of an autonomous state, including its diagnosis of societal problems and the formulation of societal alternatives to deal with these problems, are internally generated and not simply reflective of societal interests or demands." 35 The autonomy of a state can be measured by the degree to which states control the policy agenda and control access to the network of interests involved in that particular policy area. In some circumstances there is a fine line between whether the state or the society maintains these controls.
In fact, states may make a deliberate decision to pursue interdependence or shared power. This mutual involvement makes it difficult to discern which player actually drives the policy. As Coleman and Skogstad write, “Sectoral state actors appear to be more likely to control the policy agenda when they enjoy the support of well-organized client interests.” Settlement Renewal was a deliberate attempt by the state to secure the “support of well-organized client interests” for a policy change. In the guise of consultation, the renewal process was able to educate settlement policy community members regarding the federal government’s withdrawal from direct administration of settlement services and, additionally, to quiet reluctance to restructuring. Exploring how policy development processes are managed will often lead to the discovery of hidden objectives and how the process is designed for their realization.

Coleman and Skogstad have identified four political instruments which states may employ to enhance and preserve their autonomy. In Settlement Renewal, the state employed all instruments except the first. The first involves the exploitation of a state’s jurisdictional base but there is no evidence in Settlement Renewal to suggest that the state engaged in any form of exploitation. Secondly, states may define their legislative mandate so as to “leave extensive pools of discretionary power in the hands of cabinet ministers and officials.” Minister Marchi, as a member of the Chretien cabinet, exercised a great deal of discretionary power. It was under his direction that the consultation phase of the Settlement Renewal Initiative was undertaken.

Thirdly, states may increase their independence by making symbolic and/or minor substantive concessions that do not threaten the state’s ability to maintain control
over the policy agenda. The national state actors hired independent researchers to conduct the provincial consultations. Symbolically, the use of independent researchers rather than state actors gives the impression of impartiality and sincerity of openness to input. The federal government was trying to create the perception that it was giving some policy strength to the societal sector and thereby encouraged their participation in the process.

However, these researchers worked closely with Settlement Renewal CIC staff and committees. Also, all consultations were preceded by government produced discussion documents that were designed in such a way to focus the discussion on the issues and options that were solely generated by the government. Thus, the process appeared, at its beginning, to be open to the ideas and concerns of participating service providing organizations, but in fact was just carefully crafted. The process was designed to guide societal ideas toward state objectives.

The fourth political instrument identified by Coleman and Stogstad focuses on strong bureaucratic agencies that fully support state directions. The theory claims that their existence will enhance the preservation of state autonomy. Atkinson and Coleman have defined indicators of bureaucratic strength. Strong bureaus will have the following:

1. internal value systems consistent with a clearly defined and well understood role;
2. broad public support for the bureau’s role;
3. functional mandates rather than clientele mandates;
4. the information needed to pursue a mandate, generated internally; and,
5. a corpus of law and regulations, to administer, that explicitly define their responsibilities and those of societal groups. 38

In 1994, the most powerful bureaucracy in the Settlement Services National Policy Community was the Department of Citizenship and Immigration. To fully understand this bureaucracy, it is helpful to analyze it according to its constituent parts. The Department has a central Ottawa bureau as well as provincial branches of that bureau. The Ottawa bureau had a clearly defined and well-understood role before and after settlement renewal was initiated. All issue papers and discussion kits were designed on a national level within the central bureau of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration.

The bureaucrats in the central bureau, then, knew what their role had been and were not hesitant to the change in role that was promoted in the consultation documentation. The new administrative system did not advocate a replacement for the Ottawa level of the Department. It was reiterated again and again that the central CIC offices should maintain their commitment to immigrants by ensuring that national standards and principles be maintained within the new structure. The funds would still have to be allocated and accounted for through a central office. The Minister responsible would still have to respond to Parliament and would thus need a bureaucracy to track how the money was being spent and monitor department programs. Jobs within the Ottawa bureaucracy were not at stake and their policy power would be maintained.

The Government recognizes that without satisfactory means to measure the relationship between investment of public funds and advances in newcomer integration, there is not an acceptable accountability to Parliament, to the public or to the clients who are intended to benefit from these investments. The
government would work with stakeholders to develop appropriate common indicators of integration and related results measures for accountability and evaluation purposes. 39

The provincially based CIC officials were not as confident as their Ottawa counterparts. The policy strength of provincially based CIC offices would likely be reduced if the federal government’s role were reduced. In fact, as the policy strength of other actors grew during the consultations, the policy strength of the CIC offices weakened. Transcripts of workshops reflect these sentiments. Nevertheless, both levels of the federal bureaucracy enjoyed broad support from the public. Comments and concerns raised during the consultations were strong indicators of support. “The strongest view from workshop participants is that the federal staff now involved in settlement services should be transferred to the provinces.” 40 “There was considerable concern expressed about the possible loss of federal government personnel with years of experience and expertise in the field of settlement services.” 41

For the most part, the Ottawa arm of the public service operated in administrative and management roles while the provincial arms dealt more directly with immigrants and immigrant serving agencies. Thus, in terms of Atkinson and Coleman’s indicators of bureaucratic strength, the federal arm again rates stronger than provincial arms. The information needed to pursue the mandate of policy renewal was in fact generated at the federal level and then channeled through the provincial levels of the bureaucracy. On this criteria, then, the federal bureau exercised greater policy strength than the provincial offices.

Decentralizing settlement policy responsibility in Canada was complicated by the provincial level of government. Many provinces had not been actively involved in
settlement services for immigrants and resided in the 'attentive public' sphere of the Settlement Services Policy Community prior to Settlement Renewal. This lack of prior involvement and general reluctance to participate left service providing organizations skeptical of increasing the role of the provincial government in setting and implementing settlement policy. Most members of the policy community advocated a strong continued commitment of the federal government and questioned the rationale for a drastically reduced federal government role. Gaining support for the federal initiative was a hidden objective of the settlement renewal consultation process. The role of provincial governments will be further explored in later sections of this thesis.

5.4 State Capacity

This is the second category of measurement of state strength and refers to the ability of a state to draw on specific institutional resources both to design policy that will realize its policy objectives and to implement those policies. State capacity may change over time, especially during periods of national fiscal restraint. The resources available to both components of the state are outlined in Table 5.1.

The federal government stated its role early in the consultation phase of Settlement Renewal and distributed the message throughout the Policy Community, reaching even the smallest service providing organization. 'Round I Consultations Issues Paper 1995' was constructed and circulated by the Department of Citizenship and Immigration in Ottawa. It is not clear whether the thoughts communicated in this early
document originated in the Minister’s office or in the senior levels of the bureaucracy. It is definitely clear that the Department handled the distribution. In this Issue Paper the federal government stated that it would continue to participate in local priority setting and decision-making bodies, and that it would continue to set national priorities. The Issue Paper also stated that the federal government would withdraw from the direct administration of settlement services and funds.

In general theory, it is noted that elected officials face several conditions that make their task difficult, despite their resources. Firstly, the size, scope, and complexity of government has magnified, thus complicating individual elected representatives’ ability to keep abreast of all aspects of policy issues. Cabinet ministers are constantly bombarded with societal demands that often contradict one another but are tied to much needed voter support. In fact, an important information link for elected officials is their vote base, both in terms of individual voters and organized interests within their

---

Table 5.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elected Officials (Cabinet/Legislature)</th>
<th>Appointed Officials (Bureaucracy)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constitutional prerogative</td>
<td>Laws may confer decision-making discretion to bureaucrats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to mass media</td>
<td>Unmatched access to material resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to bureaucracy</td>
<td>Wide range of skills and expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over timing of policy process</td>
<td>Extensive familiarity and experience with issues (permanence of bureaucracy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over information</td>
<td>Access to vast information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can deny access to other policy actors by making internal secret decisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
constituencies. Representation of these interests often occurs in the legislature: a crucial forum for highlighting social problems and demanding corrective policies. Actual design and implementation of policies is the responsibility of cabinet and its bureaucratic arm.

Instrumental to state capacity and autonomy is the division of powers inherent in the Canadian federal system. The ability to deal with issues in a timely and consistent fashion is inhibited; problems are aggravated in areas of jurisdictional overlap. Further complications arise when the courts have been involved in adjudicating jurisdictional disputes.

Federalism has been cited as a major reason for weak policy capacity of governments in Australia, Canada, and the United States. It has constrained these states’ capacity to develop consistent and coherent policies. National policies in most areas require intergovernmental agreement, which involves the federal and provincial governments in complex, extensive, and time consuming negotiations with no guarantee that negotiations will conclude in the manner envisioned by the initiating government. 45

The state thus held great degrees of autonomy and capacity: they thrust these strengths into Settlement Renewal, creating a well-crafted consultation process that could help them achieve their dual objective of regionalizing settlement services and not, in any significant way, increasing the federal expenditures allocated to settlement services. Societal actors responded, in many ways, as anticipated by state actors.

5.5 Conclusion

To reiterate, this chapter examined the policy strength of state entities in the Settlement Renewal Consultation process. The state held the bulk of policy strength (found both in capacity and autonomy) and used this strength to design and facilitate a
consultation process that would meet its multi-dimensional complex objectives. The process was conducted nationally yet was regionally based. Considerable foresight that would be needed for such a comprehensive effective consultation process that would not only consult but also lay the groundwork for a major policy change would have been extremely substantive. This foresight can be credited to the state entities who controlled the policy for over 50 years. Although the individuals operating within those entities would have changed, the power was entrenched in the institutions. The change envisioned and initiated in 1994 was substantial and would relinquish the power that was so strong.
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CHAPTER SIX
SETTLEMENT RENEWAL SOCIETAL ACTORS

6.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the role that interests, organized for involvement in settlement services on a societal level, played in the Settlement Renewal Consultation process. More specifically, the analysis in this chapter focuses on the effects that the consultation phase of Settlement Renewal had on the communication and legitimation functions of organized societal interests in the settlement sector. The analysis reveals that the manner in which the state directed consultations had the following direct implications: enhanced policy roles for service providing organizations; a realignment of associational systems; and a change in the societal social paradigms of many provinces that reflected a healthy policy atmosphere for a major shift in policy power. This chapter shows that societal actors were instrumental in the creation of that healthy environment, even though their participation was calculated and manipulated by the state. However, societal interests were not just pawns in the process; they were able to advance and protect their own interests through their participation.

6.2 Roles of Societal Interests

Interests, within society, organize for policy purposes largely to promote the interests of their members. Other motivational factors, such as self-preservation, may
come to dominate but most groups have sincere beginnings in interest aggregation. Paul Pross defines this goal: “to draw people together with common interests and bring about agreement on how those common interests can best be served.” Interests which are aggregated can, at any time, perform interest articulation functions, thus engaging in pressure group activity. As Paul Pross cautions, “few groups exist solely as pressure groups”. But, for policy analysis purposes, analysts focus on group involvement in policy processes. The heart of pressure group influence in the modern state is:

the sense, in the minds of both group representatives and policy makers that pressure groups speak for a significant part of the public, a part that can be mobilized into political action should its interests not be reasonably accommodated in public policy.

Organized societal interests, then, perform systemic functions that help to facilitate the workings of the broad political system. The two main functions engaged in by societal groups are communication functions and legitimation functions. This chapter will first explore the communication function and then undertake an analysis of the legitimation function. Both of these two policy functions will be reviewed based on societal group participation in the 1994-1996 Settlement Renewal Consultations.

6.3 Communication Function of Societal Players

Paul Pross outlines four different directions in which groups can send messages: from special groups to governments; from government to special publics; between groups themselves; and between one government department and another. These communications concern the vital interests of the groups involved in transmitting them. Different groups will transmit different messages depending on their special interests and the degree to which issues affect their interests. The significance of societal groups’
communication role is stressed by Pross: “Without that multidirectional flow of messages modern government could not respond effectively to its environment, influence that environment, or attempt to create within it an element of order and stability.” 50

Settlement Renewal took advantage of each of these four forms of communication. The consultation process encouraged communication of all four types. The process began with the federal state communicating to service providing organizations. Under the direction of Minister Sergio Marchi, the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration (Standing Committee) conducted cross-Canada hearings on Settlement Renewal, from June to November 1995. Minister Sergio Marchi asked the Standing Committee to examine three issues: accountability, local advisory committees, and the ongoing role of the federal government. Following the hearings, the Standing Committee reported its findings and observations to the Government and the Government produced a report in response. The contents of these two reports review policy positions of policy actors in the early stages of the consultation process.

The Standing Committee recommended that national principles and standards should be established through ongoing consultations with stakeholders. The Government concurred and reiterated one of their primary objectives for conducting consultations in their response. The Government stated:

Suggested national principles have been discussed extensively with stakeholders throughout the Settlement Renewal consultations and have also been discussed informally with provinces. The objective of these consultations and discussions is to arrive at a set of shared principles, acceptable to all involved, that would guide the administration and delivery of settlement. 51

68
The Standing Committee also recommended, based on submissions at the hearings, that the Canadian Government should ensure that the national principles and standards, once established, are maintained by withholding settlement funds if it is satisfied that there has been a substantial non-compliance. 52

But the Government responded by stating:

A key goal of Settlement Renewal is to enable regions and local communities to determine the right mix of services for the unique circumstances of their jurisdiction. Shared principles, a common set of integration indicators, results based accountability and an advisory process that balances stakeholder views, would all help to ensure that funds are being spent effectively for intended purposes. 53

There was no mention of withholding funds in the Government response. The language used was very participatory and region-driven, rather than federal government controlled.

When the federal government began its series of provincial workshops through the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, it listed several principles to which stakeholders could respond. The principles suggested in consultation documents were indisputable, however, and through the power of suggestion, left little room for innovative thought regarding principles. By including the principles listed in discussions, the consultation process was able to gain national consensus on a common set of values or guiding principles for the entire national settlement services policy community.

In attempting to determine a transitory process for a renewed administration system, the Standing Committee recommended that the Canadian government should:

establish regional transition committees composed of representatives from the federal, provincial and municipal governments (where these are involved in the provision of settlement services) and representatives of service providers to advise on the specific details of settlement renewal in their areas, particularly on
the functions of local advisory groups. The committees should terminate when the initiative is completed in 1998.\textsuperscript{54}

The Government responded by saying that they would not impose such a structure, again reiterating a region-driven format:

The Government sees the advantages of multilateral committees to provide advice on a region by region basis through any transitional period. However, the form and nature of such involvement would not be unilaterally imposed.\textsuperscript{55}

When instructing the Standing Committee on areas of consultation, the Government requested that an advisory committee concept be explored. The Government thus gave the impression that they were actually considering such a system as an alternative to the current system of federal administration of settlement programs and services. By creating this perception, societal interests felt an immediate stake in the consultation process, feeling that it may be possible that an organization of interests would now be determining their future, in terms of funding, service priorities, and/or clientele. Many organizations were concerned and felt a need to contribute. This was what the government wanted and was able to achieve.

The Standing Committee took their instructions seriously and, thus, came back with quite detailed ideas on advisory committees:

In devising the local advisory committees, the definition of “local” in the various regions must be carefully considered, with close attention to the needs of both small communities and major centres distant from the main concentration of immigrants.

The method of appointment to the local advisory committees could vary according to structures established in the various regions; the Canadian government should consider appointing a majority of the members so as to enhance accountability in cases where the settlement programs in question are fully or largely funded by it.

Local advisory committees could perform a variety of tasks, including identifying local priorities, overseeing research, fostering cooperation and advising on policy. In order to avoid both the appearance and possibility of
The Government response to the Standing Committee’s recommendation is noteworthy, whereby they admit that a system of formal advisory committees may not be feasible or likely, despite their initial direction to explore the idea.

The Government agrees with the intent of the recommendations [re: local advisory committees]. In the administration and delivery of settlement and integration services, it is important to find effective ways to ensure representative community involvement in areas, such as priority setting, research facilitation of local cooperation and policy development. The Government is not, however, inclined to impose a system of formal advisory committees. This could be counterproductive to existing local and regional planning processes and may be unnecessarily costly.

The Settlement Renewal Consultation process also involved communications from ‘special publics to government’. Following these interactions through the consultation process indicates governmental objectives were at the forefront of all discussions. For the most part, special publics (consisting of service providing organizations and umbrella groups) responded to government produced documents and discussion topics rather than generating original thoughts. But the process was designed this way.

Round I of Manitoba CIC Consultations had participants doubting the purpose of the process and questioning the rationale specifically for the federal withdraw and, more generally, for the consultation process itself. The Round I Manitoba Report states: “Participants in the workshop expressed considerable skepticism that their involvement in the consultation process would really make a difference.” Further, the report showed, “considerable concern about the federal government removing itself from the program administration arena because many felt it may result in the loss of any concise
and consistent national direction in immigration.” Some participants were hostile to the proposition of federal withdrawal. In the words of one group: “Immigration is a federal issue. We pledge allegiance to the country not to the provinces.”

In rural Manitoba areas, outside of Winnipeg, similar sentiments persisted with a strong endorsement of an enduring federal role. “The majority felt that the federal government should not withdraw from a hands-on administrative role.” Participants from both within Winnipeg and outside of Winnipeg feared that placing the provinces in charge of policy would change the face of immigration. Winnipeg participants stated, “In Manitoba there is a growing reluctance, on the part of the province, to be open to admissions of most in need immigrants, there is a greater effort to attract investor immigrants. This is one area where the federal partner must keep the provincial partners accountable.” Rural Manitoba participants concurred, “More control by the provinces would only drive us further away from the humanitarian approach to focus strictly on investment, immigrants with money.”

Participants in Round I Saskatchewan were equally hesitant but the dynamic differed from that in Manitoba. Manitoba had federal and provincial officials at their workshops but only to provide background information; they did not participate in the discussions. Hired to conduct the Manitoba consultations, the Institute of Urban Studies at the University of Winnipeg understood the impact that governmental officials would have on the process. “This pre-planned non-participatory role of federal/provincial personnel was intended to allow for the free flow of discussion without the opinions of federal/provincial workers.” Saskatchewan, on the other hand, had an initial one-day workshop with CIC staff prior to workshops for service providing organizations and/or
newcomers. When the workshops for service providing organizations and newcomers were underway, government officials sat beside non-governmental officials, as full participants in the discussions. Not only were they privy to prior, more-detailed information but they also had already spent a day as a group in discussions regarding the federal proposals. Thus, the opinions of the governmental participants tended to dominate and guide the Saskatchewan workshops.

Some of the comments coming out of the Saskatchewan Round I Consultations Report exemplify this bias. For example, "A federal government employee thought that the plan was already set and that the consultations were just for show." Some blatant animosities were communicated. "Some CIC employees felt awkward, and at times angry about participating in the consultation process. Settlement Renewal means the loss of jobs for some of them." Because the CIC provincial office held the wealth of policy strength within the province of Saskatchewan, the comments of CIC civil servants were very influential with other provincially based policy community members.

The groups in Saskatchewan were telling the government that they did not support the federal withdrawal; they did not appreciate the rationale or the implications. Although their message to the Government was negative, the Government had succeeded in both getting service providing organizations involved and in getting such organizations thinking about a policy change that involved a reduced federal role.

A third type of communication is between groups themselves. The Renewal Consultation process involved a series of workshops in each provincial jurisdiction. These workshops were attended by numerous organizations and individuals. Simply by being there and taking part, inter-group communication could not help but manifest
itself. Within some provinces, groups held their own consultations prior to the CIC workshops; they discussed topics and arrived at some united solutions. This was more common in provinces which had well developed provincial policy communities such as Alberta. The Alberta Association of Immigrant Serving Agencies (AAISA) is an umbrella group stationed in Alberta. It took concerted efforts to ensure that itself and its membership were well informed:

AAISA and its members have been involved in learning about and discussing Settlement Renewal since it was first brought to our attention. Specifically, AAISA's membership discussed this issue at our semi-annual consultations in the spring and fall of 1995, held a special meeting in November 1995, set up 5 subcommittees to examine special topics and prepared this, [AAISA Response 1996], position paper which was reviewed and approved by our membership. In addition, AAISA has participated in the Alberta consultation process by having two representatives on the Alberta Steering Committee on Settlement Renewal and our members and staff participated in several consultations held in Alberta. Some member agencies also participated in Settlement Renewal discussions at the 1995 spring and fall CCR Conferences.

Saskatchewan and Manitoba had no such umbrella group, but British Columbia, Ontario, and the Maritime provinces enjoyed a level of organization and inter-group communication unknown to Saskatchewan and Manitoba. Larger interest group associations such as AAISA offered a higher level of policy participation to its members. Policy positions in such provinces were more proactive rather than reactive because one of the main roles for umbrella groups is policy advocacy; they have permanent human and financial resources dedicated to that purpose.

The fourth form of communication offered by Pross involves communications between varying government departments. Settlement Renewal was about a somewhat different but closely related type of interaction. It was about communication between the federal level of government and the provincial level of government. Early in the
process, communications were channeled through the service providing organizations engaged in the Renewal Initiative. These organizations varied in their formations: not-for-profit, for-profit, non-governmental, and government-affiliated such as school divisions and community colleges. Later in the process, by Round II, communications between the federal and provincial levels of government became more direct.

Essentially, the consultation phase of settlement renewal required the participation of provincial governments, many of whose previous participation in immigration and related services was focused more on financial compensation than on policy roles or principles. Within each phase of the three-phased consultation process, provincial governments became more and more involved, growing in policy strength and influence. The increased provincial role was built into the design of the renewal process; reluctant provinces became less reluctant because of the way that the federal government managed its resources within the process.

Beginning with the Standing Committee hearings, a message of an imminent policy change was introduced. Following these hearings with two consecutive sets of intra-provincial workshops engaged members of the policy community in the policy change. A similar progression of thought can be traced within each jurisdiction, although the intra-provincial workshops differed between provinces in terms of who participated, how many individuals and groups participated, and who was contracted to facilitate the workshops.

The first set of intra-provincial workshops (Round I) was quite general, designed to facilitate open discussion and high levels of participation. Approximately two months later, the second set of workshops (Round II) were held. By this time, members of the
policy community was more accepting of the federal proposal to withdraw from direct administration of settlement services. Further, the provinces were beginning to take some ownership of settlement policy and the service-providing organizations were beginning to accept that change in ownership. Thus, the consultation process was able to achieve its federally-defined objectives. The workshop reports from Round I and Round II highlight this shift in perspective.

Round I in Manitoba reported, "Some people argued strongly for a limited provincial role." They argued that, "we cannot allow provinces to make the rules or we will end up with problems in equity between the provinces." There were concerns that "provinces may reallocate settlement dollars and that funding might be reduced if transferred to provinces". By Round II there was "General agreement that the Province was the 'right' partner."

A similar phenomenon occurred in Saskatchewan but because civil servants were full participants in workshop discussions in this province, communications took a different tone. "Participants at the provincial focus group stated that provincial governments are wary of taking over any federally devolved programs; it may set a precedent and there is a suspicion that funding would continue to be reduced in the future." The provincial representatives became aggressive and attempted to exert some influence over the consultation process itself.

Provincial government representatives stated that the province does not want the federal government to enter any negotiations with municipal governments without the provinces being present. The province is a major contributor to municipal government revenues.
Attempts to exert influence became stronger in Round II as provincial government workshop participants blatantly stated: “If the provincial government becomes the new partner, it would develop its own policies.” 74

Round I in New Brunswick indicated great reluctance to the Province becoming the new administrative body for settlement services. The report stated: “At this time, the Province of New Brunswick has indicated that they do not intend to assume administration of settlement programs.” 75 Workshop participants went on to say that “the preferred option for administration of settlement services in New Brunswick was for a modified status quo.” 76 But by Round II, New Brunswick participants were more accepting but still somewhat skeptical. The report states, “given that the province is the preferred partner, all reporting from provincial to federal government should be clear and public.” 77 Thus, service providing organizations and their umbrella groups could monitor administration and funding allocations. These groups were not prepared to fully trust the province to ‘administer’ in the best interests of immigrants and service delivery organizations.

The Settlement Renewal Consultation process, then, involved all four forms of communication identified by Pross. In fact, these communications were integral to the success of the federal government’s well-planned policy renewal initiative. All of the four directions proved valuable: state to societal groups; societal groups to the state; societal groups to societal groups; and the federal government to the provincial government. The federal government educated policy community members and created a supportive atmosphere for the intended policy change. The participation of societal
groups in the process was instrumental in terms of facilitating communications but also in terms of legitimating the state-directed policy change.

6.4 Legitimation Function of Societal Players

Stemming out of the organized interests’ communication contributions is a legitimation function. With interests aggregated into identifiable groups, the demands made on the state by members of the group are legitimated simply by the fact that they are coordinated and articulated by groups rather than individuals. In addition to advancing group objectives, aggregated interests can also advance state objectives. “As well as expanding the range of information available to government, group involvement in policy discussions can be used to neutralize group objections to proposed legislation and to engage support for it.” 78

The Settlement Renewal Consultation process did exactly that and more. By preparing societal interests for a policy change that would involve a greatly enhanced provincial government administrative role, this role was almost carved out for provincial governments without the willful consent of the governments themselves. The province of British Columbia is a notable exception as it was already quite active in the Provincial Settlement Services Policy Community and, in fact, held its own policy development process (including consultations) at the same time as the federal process was underway. Quebec was also an exception as Quebec was operating within the Canada-Quebec Accord. However, all other provinces were left with few options other than to seriously consider a federally-delegated role that already had the participatory support of relevant societal interests.
Theorists have acknowledged that this legitimation function can act as a catalyst for some government agencies to actively encourage the organization of interests. Many groups will welcome government incentives to organize because government recognition can enhance a group's stature and guarantee a measure of influence over policy decisions. Within Settlement Renewal, should groups choose not to participate in the workshops, they would effectively lose their voice and potentially become subject to decisions made by other, perhaps competing, interests.

Groups could not afford to appear indifferent to the process and, intrinsically, their organizational mandate required that they serve their clientele. A policy change of the magnitude proposed by the federal government would necessarily affect immigrant services themselves as well as the manner in which they are administered and delivered. Service providing organizations were obligated, by the nature of their own organizational mission, to participate in the renewal consultation workshops. Active organized interests were then, and still are, crucial to the effective functioning of settlement services policy.

The federal government believed that it had to devolve its own policy power to regional jurisdictions. Settlement services policy in Canada had evolved, through Canadian history, to the point where a centrally structured system was no longer effective. Canada, as a nation, suffers regional differences in many respects, including economics, climate, lifestyle, social issues, political affiliation and governance. Canada's regions have different immigrant settlement patterns in terms of pure numbers as well as related percentages: countries of origin, immigrant class, education levels, as well as formal and informal settlement networks. Figure 6.1 depicts differences in the
pure numbers of immigrants entering each province. These statistics do not allow for secondary migration, which accounts for Ontario and British Columbia’s claim to even higher immigrant numbers.
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**Figure 6.1**

It is logical that a provincially based settlement structure would improve the overall effectiveness of settlement services. The difficulty facing the federal government was to gain support for a regional system despite fears of a reduced federal commitment both in terms of funds and also standards and principles. The federal government needed to convince societal interests, as they are organized and represented in service providing organizations, that a regional system was one to be desired. Pressure would then be placed on the provincial governments to become the governing body for that system.

The federal government wanted organized interests to become influential in the policy change process. The more involved they became the greater communication and legitimation role they could play. The consultation process served to strengthen the
policy role of societal interests both as individual organizations as well as collectively, as an organized system of interests.

Table 6.1 lists the activities which policy-active organizations take part in. The first determinant outlined coincides directly with the Settlement Renewal Consultation process: organizations were invited to partake in a policy process; they gained policy knowledge through preparing for and participating in workshops and policy discussions; they developed policy positions and articulated them. None of these activities would have occurred in this fashion or forum had it not been for the careful deliberations of Minister Marchi and his Department. Societal organizations wanted to influence those holding policy power; however, in many instances, this desire stemmed from the federal proposal and call for participation. Some umbrella groups or peak organizations held previous policy advocacy mandates but the majority of participating organizations were involved only in policy implementation and deliverance prior to Settlement Renewal. The other determinants refer to intra-organizational structures and activities that are primarily out of the scope of this thesis' analysis of the consultation phase of Settlement Renewal.

It is clear that the Settlement Renewal Consultation process was designed to encourage groups to grow in their ability to influence policy but it had an interesting side effect of strengthening provincial associational systems. This phenomenon enhanced the communication and legitimation functions of societal interests with respect to Settlement Renewal.
**Table 6.1**

### INTEREST ORGANIZATIONS: DETERMINANTS OF POLICY INFLUENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DETERMINANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the organization engage in persuasion tactics?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it persistent?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does it have adequate knowledge of political processes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does it have knowledge of issues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are policy positions consistent with organizational objectives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are organizational objectives developed internally, by the group's membership?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is the organization formally structured?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does the organization have an extensive membership list? Are the members due-paying?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is there sufficient organizational capacity for interest aggregation and articulation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Does the organization enjoy autonomy for choosing methods of interest articulation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Does the organization make autonomous resource allocation decisions? (financial and human)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Does the organization have a desire to influence those holding power?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Does a peak association exist? Is it representative?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.5 Settlement Services Associational Systems

Societal interests may be very well developed or very under developed, as they fall within an associational system. An associational system is comprised of the collection of interest organizations within a given domain. Product, territory, and/or functional interests can define domains. Each provincial jurisdiction had a unique settlement services associational system within it. Table 6.2 helps to distinguish between weakly and strongly developed associational systems.

In terms of policy development, strongly developed associational systems are much more attractive to state actors than weakly developed systems. Attempting to
Table 6.2

DEVELOPMENTAL STAGE OF ASSOCIATIONAL SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY DEVELOPED ASSOCIATIONAL SYSTEMS</th>
<th>WEAKLY DEVELOPED ASSOCIATIONAL SYSTEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous in their actions</td>
<td>Overlapping domains of groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced and secure supply of resources</td>
<td>Competition between groups for resources and members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized and coordinated internally</td>
<td>Groups are weakly linked or not linked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited number of organizations</td>
<td>Unlimited number of organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity to plan for long term</td>
<td>Mainly short term planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linked such that the system is</td>
<td>No one encompassing coordinating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encompassing in scope and purpose</td>
<td>association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

consult and seek accommodations from societal actors, the state will find it much easier to find who speaks for whom, and which societal actors are representative, within strong associational systems. Fragmentation within and among groups weakens the state’s ability to mobilize them toward the resolution from societal problems.” Strong systems readily become policy participants, but weak systems are much more problematic and time consuming. By the nature of the three-step process involved in the Settlement Renewal Consultations, the federal government was able to strengthen the associational systems within each province.

Some provinces were already quite strong; Manitoba and Saskatchewan were the weakest. British Columbia and Ontario had the strongest pre-settlement renewal association systems. Nonetheless, all associational systems were intensified by the nature of the consultation process itself in addition to what was at stake because of the federal withdraw from policy administration. Many groups became policy participants rather than just policy advocacy players. Provincial policy environments became much
more conducive for an increased provincial administrative role. The transition in administration could now occur with greater ease and less chaos.

Groups engaging in policy advocacy approach the state as lobbyists, acting externally to policy-making circles. Successful advocacy depends largely on the groups’ capacity to develop a working knowledge of the policy making process and the ability to generate information regarding specific policies. Policy advocacy is strengthened by the mobilization of support for advocated policy proposals through the maintenance of internal membership cohesion as well the generation of broader societal support.  

Policy participation roles, often built from an associational system’s beginnings in policy advocacy, require the formalization of internal structures, resulting in a distinct identity for the system. In order for this advanced role to develop, the interest association must be able to order and coordinate a range of complex information and activity so as to generate relatively sophisticated policy positions. Further, organized interests must be sufficiently autonomous from their members to be able to transcend short-term interests in favor of a longer-term perspective, without jeopardizing membership compliance.

The more differentiated an associational system is, the more likely it will be successful in policy participation roles. Differentiated systems have subunits that represent each of the structural subsectors, territorial divisions, or functional tasks within that system. Thus, specific interests of members can be transmitted through the system and addressed. Specialized knowledge is readily accessible but does not dominate the policy agenda. Well-developed systems can rise above specialized interests and
integrate diverse interests. Essentially, the regional system envisioned by the federal government was a highly differentiated, well-developed associational system.

The extent of organizational development among organized interests depends largely on an associational system's logic of influence and the system's logic of membership. These two characteristics, taken together, will contribute significantly to an understanding of an organization's degree of development. This focus on context enables analysts to rationalize why some societal interests play policy advocacy roles and others become well-developed, serving policy participation roles. It can also serve as a guide for governments wishing to help a policy sector reach a more developed state. As defined by Coleman and Skogstad, the concepts are outlined in Table 6.3.

Table 6.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOGIC OF INFLUENCE:</th>
<th>LOGIC OF MEMBERSHIP:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structures of significant institutions within the systems environment</td>
<td>Interests and motivations of individuals and organizations that bring them to join the association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Structure of the state at the sectoral level (state capacity &amp; autonomy)</td>
<td>1. values of members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do state policies and goals promote the mobilization of organized interests?</td>
<td>2. sense of collective identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. degree of state funding of interests</td>
<td>3. size of potential membership domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. role of political parties</td>
<td>geographic distribution of members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. federalism (distribution of powers)</td>
<td>5. resource base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. changes in communications technology</td>
<td>5. nature of informal social relations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.6 Logic of Influence

6.6.1 Logic Of Influence: State Capacity

The state is the most prominent component of an organization's logic of influence. "Systems of interest intermediation are not simply given and completely divorced from the state; the state influences to structure these systems in many ways that attempt to advance its own interests." 87 One mechanism most often in the control of the state is the policy formation process, including consultation processes. How this mechanism is animated will have a tremendous impact on whether an associational system plays a policy advocacy or a policy participation role.

Settlement Renewal consultations are an excellent example of the state engaging societal interests in an attempt to advance its own interest: regionalization of settlement services. Chapter five of this thesis discussed state autonomy and capacity and has shown that state actors in the settlement services policy community held tremendous strength.

6.6.2 Logic of Influence: State Funding

State funding is another powerful mechanism, serving as an institutional resource for organized interests; but, this resource carries a big price. "State sponsorship of interest associations appears to be as much a method of controlling dissent as it is for assisting the disadvantaged." 88 Risks of losing funding can serve as a real constraint to otherwise assertive organizations. On the contrary, ensuring that funding remains secure can serve as a very real incentive to participation in policy change. Policy consultation will be substantially different, both in terms of the degree of participation and the nature
of that participation, when there is a financial relationship between state and societal interests.

Settlement Renewal had this fiscal factor at its forefront. In fact many groups reacted negatively to the federal proposal to withdraw precisely because they equated federal withdrawal with reduced funding. Examples of this preoccupation can be found in all consultation reports. The Toronto Refugee Affairs Council forwarded that “Settlement Renewal should not lead to funding cuts.” Metro Community Services for the Municipality of Metro Toronto, in their presentation to the Standing Committee on September 20, 1995 stated that, “Allocation decisions should be made at arm’s length from funded agencies.” The Diocese of London, Office of Refugees, stated in their submission to the Standing Committee on September 15, 1995 that the federal government should “avoid the diversion of funds” and that they should not cut services to cut costs.” The Diocese of London further argued that “Local Advisory Councils should not handle funding, it should be a separate body.”

The Teachers of ESL (English as a Second Language) Association of Ontario had two cautionary statements for the Standing Committee: “ensure no diversion of funds and funding decisions and processes should be open.” A joint submission by Brampton Multicultural Centre, Inter-Cultural Neighbourhood Social Services, Multicultural Interagency Group of Peel, and Peel Multicultural Council stated, “Peel region should receive its fair share of funding, contrary to the present situation” and that “funding decisions should be handled by public servants, not by the Local Advisory Council.” The Windsor-Essex County Newcomers Network purported in their
September 25, 1995 submission that “funding should go only to the non-profit sector and that Local Advisory Councils should not distribute funds”. 97

The funding concerns raised by these organizations echoed those of many others across the country. Sustainability of many organizations and the services they provide depended greatly on continued, reliable funding. Those who allocate funds hold tremendous power, power to decide who gets how much. Having input into those decisions distributes some of that power amongst the inputting organizations. Where there is competition for funds or limited funds, the power is magnified. This is the case with immigrant settlement services. A redistribution of policy power will necessarily be accompanied by a redistribution of funding power. In fact, funding served as a major impetus for participation in the policy renewal process. Furthermore, service providing organizations were connected to the federal government through their funding relationship and thus may have felt obligated to participate when called to do so.

6.6.3 Logic of Influence: Mobilization of Interests

States may use the creation of well-developed associational systems as a means of creating consensus within a policy domain and secondarily, as a means of transferring responsibility for integrating diversity of interests to the societal level of the sector. 98 In essence, this occurred during Settlement Renewal. Several provinces held communications between groups outside of the federally facilitated workshops. Several groups submitted joint position papers. The consultation process definitely was a catalyst for groups to interact and search for consensus on important issues. The ability of the group to fulfill its organizational mission was in jeopardy so concessions were
made and agreements were reached. Thus, federal objectives could be achieved without having to be federally imposed.

6.7 Logic of Membership

Logic of membership is equally important. An investigation into what brings members of a group together and how they stay united will be extremely revealing in policy terms. Economic, cultural, and ideological diversity of an organization's membership impedes development. Geographic dispersion makes communication and policy consensus within an associational system constrained. Groups, which have an ideology of individualism and independence, will be less likely to form into a well-developed associational system. Rather than having a strict hierarchical order, well-developed systems enjoy vertically integrated structures.  

Round I of the Settlement Renewal Consultation process asked groups to respond to numerous principles and standards. Below is a listing of the six principles as they were outlined in the discussion documents:

1. Integration is a two way process, which involves commitment on the part of newcomers to adapt to life in Canada and on the part of Canadians to adapt to new people and cultures.

2. The ability of newcomers to communicate in one of Canada's official languages is key to integration.

3. Newcomer's contributions to the economic and social fabric of Canada are valued: it is important for newcomers to become economically and socially self-sufficient; and it is important for members of communities in Canada to help to ensure that newcomers have opportunities to participate in and contribute to the economic and social life of Canada.

4. It is important to share with newcomers the principles, traditions and values that are inherent in Canadian society such as freedom, equality, and participatory democracy.
5. Settlement and integration services will be aimed at helping newcomers become self-sufficient as soon as possible. Priority will be given to those facing significant barriers to integration, and who are deemed most in need within the community.

6. Settlement and integration services across the country will be flexible, responsive and reasonably comparable. Gaining consensus on principles had the reciprocal effect of helping groups to recognize shared values. Although they may be offering different settlement services to unique clientele, they could agree on common principles and standards. This held true regardless of an organization’s geographic location within Canada.

Logic of membership refers mainly to internal characteristics of organizations, but state actors were able to manipulate some of these characteristics through the consultation process as it was designed. The state was successful in enhancing the policy roles of societal interests by strengthening provincial associational systems. This will prove helpful during the second phase of Settlement Renewal where the federal government will negotiate new administrative relationships with provincial governments. Once the details of these relationships are secured, provincial governments will benefit from a strong associational system as they fulfill new administrative roles. Additional beneficiaries are the societal groups themselves as they will be more aware of the policy that effects them and their clients. They will be in a much better position to affect it.

6.8 Conclusion

To reiterate, this chapter analyzed the role that organized societal interests played in the Settlement Renewal Consultation process. In particular, the analysis reveals that
societal interests gained policy strength through their involvement in the process. The nature of their involvement was an integral part of the process as it was planned by national state entities; societal interests effectively contributed to the process while simultaneously building their policy capabilities within the settlement services sector. Ideally the clients of the service providing organizations will benefit from increased awareness and policy participation of the organizations created to serve them.
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CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION

7.1 Introduction

The objective of this chapter is to summarize the significant findings regarding the effect of the federal government initiated 1994 Settlement Renewal Consultation process on the nature of the settlement services policy environment during the course of the consultations that were conducted between 1994 and 1996. The study examined settlement services policy environment changes, with special attention dedicated to changes in the social and policy paradigms of the federal government, the provincial governments (save Quebec), and organized societal interests as related to Settlement Renewal. Secondarily, this chapter reflects on the significance of the findings with respect to the usefulness of Hall’s Paradigmatic Change Model in the consideration of strategies for policy change.

7.2 The Application of the Paradigmatic Change Model to the Case of the 1994-1996 Settlement Renewal Consultation Process

The evidence presented in this study demonstrates that the Paradigmatic Change Model can be meaningfully applied to the multi-phased settlement services policy renewal process that was attempted by the federal government. The historical context for policy change was presented in chapter two of this thesis and demonstrated that settlement
services policy experienced a period of policy stability; followed by a period when that
stability was challenged; that was then followed by a period filled with experimental
policy changes and reciprocal challenges to policy authority. The historical analysis
reveals that by the 1990s, authority for settlement services policy was fragmented and the
social paradigms that underlay it were in conflict with one another.

The main source of conflict within the social paradigms of the federal government,
provincial governments, and societal groups centred on perceptions and attitudes
regarding appropriate policy roles for both the federal and provincial levels of
government. Intimately associated with policy roles were financial resources dedicated to
the fulfilment of those policy roles. This study finds that this paradigm conflict was at the
root of numerous unsuccessful bilateral negotiations between the federal government and
provincial governments beginning as early as 1978. Only Quebec was able to resolve the
conflict between paradigms and arrive at a settlement services policy agreement in 1991.
All of the other provinces were unable to resolve the conflict and, thus, still did not have
satisfactory federal-provincial agreements on settlement services in 1994. But the
pressures to reach such agreements were a part of the political reality in the early 1990s
and served as the impetus for the 1994 Settlement Renewal Initiative.

Of relevance to this study, was the first phase of the 1994 Settlement Renewal
Initiative: a comprehensive, national consultation process. The consultation process was
directed at the entire National Settlement Services Policy Community (NSSPC), with the
exception of policy actors in Quebec. For the purposes of the consultation process, the
NSSPC was divided on provincial boundaries and independent, neutral facilitators
managed the consultation processes within each provincial jurisdiction. However, these
facilitators did work closely with federal officials. The findings of this study show that the 1994 consultation process was highly participatory and engaged hundreds of societal groups, many of which were service providing organizations. The debate focused on the federal proposal to change the prevailing policy paradigm which had the federal government as the dominant settlement services policy actor. The relative strength of organized societal interests grew through their involvement in the consultation process. The consultation process was implemented with provincial governments on the periphery of the NSSPC. Later in the process, provincial governments added their social paradigms to the debate and became involved in the discussions.

This study finds that the federal strategy of employing the consultation process as it was designed and delivered was an effective strategy for changing the social paradigms of societal interests with regard to the valued level of policy authority and responsibility held by the federal government in settlement services policy. At the beginning of the consultation process in 1994, the majority of presentations in both the Standing Committee Hearings and the series of provincial workshops emphasized a preference for the maintenance of a strong federal policy role in immigration settlement services policy. However, by the end of the consultation process in 1996, the majority of presentations in Round II of the provincial consultation processes conceded that the provincial governments may be a suitable policy partner for the federal government; this policy position is in great contrast to the policy positions of societal interests in early 1994. The transformation in policy positions demonstrates that the consultation process undertaken successfully fostered social learning and, as a result, generated changed social paradigms with respect to the governance of settlement services policy.
The settlement renewal consultation process successfully fostered social learning and changed social paradigms largely because of the nature of participation of both state and societal actors, in the consultation process. The analysis in this study reveals that the federal government was the crucial state actor within the consultation process and was able to guide the consultation process toward social learning objectives because of the federal government’s high levels of capacity and autonomy within the NSSPC. Moreover, the policy roles served by societal actors, as participants in the consultation process, both communicated and legitimated the very federal proposal to which they were initially adamantly opposed; namely, the reduction of the federal government’s role in settlement services policy.

A review of the findings of this study reinforce the value of consultation processes as integral aspects of paradigmatic policy change. However, this conclusion merits further review as social and policy paradigms are complex and the factors influencing them are multiple.

7.3 Significance of the Findings

To ascertain the significance of the findings of this study, it is important to seriously question why an extensive consultation process was chosen by the federal government. It was a strategy to foster social paradigms that would support the federal government’s desire to reduce their settlement services policy role without having to increase public expenditures related to settlement policy. The strategy may have been chosen because bilateral negotiations with the provincial governments between the 1970s
and 1994 had not resulted in settlement services policy agreements. Rather, they resulted in frustration, delays, and paradigmatic conflicts.

The 1991 settlement services agreement between Quebec and the federal government, namely the Canada-Quebec Agreement, served as the model sought by other provincial governments because of the large financial sum transferred to the province of Quebec for the provision of settlement services policy. The reality of the federal government policy and social paradigm in the early 1990s left little hope for the other provinces to achieve an agreement with comparable monetary considerations. But because such an agreement did exist between Quebec and the federal government, the motivation of provincial governments to reach a settlement services bilateral agreement strengthened.

Until January 1991, the Ontario government was not actively pursuing a federal-provincial agreement on settlement services policy. However, in January 1991 the Ontario government announced that it would be pursuing such a bilateral agreement. This new interest in negotiating such an agreement was based on the Ontario government’s desire to,

Secure additional financial compensation for the integration and settlement of immigrants. The Ontario government felt that Ottawa’s financial compensation to Quebec for supplanting the federal government in planning and delivering immigrant reception and settlement services gave Quebec a disproportionate share of such resources. 101

Western provinces had similar concerns that were solidified by the Canada-Quebec Agreement. Following the Western Premiers Conference in 1991 in Nipawin, Saskatchewan, the Western Premiers “unanimously endorsed a call for more efficacious provincial role in planning and managing information.” 102 The western provincial
governments believed in “...equitable treatment of all provinces by the federal government...”. Thus when the western premiers called for a larger provincial role in immigration, the call was motivated more by monetary considerations than by a sincere desire to assume more responsibility in immigration and settlement services.

Following the signing of the Canada-Quebec Agreement, the benefits to a substantive federal-provincial agreement on immigration and settlement services policy began to surpass the costs. Social paradigms that valued the universality of settlement services that only the federal government could provide, were compromised based on the reality of fiscal inequality together with rising costs and reduced revenues for provincial governments. These financial concerns were so great that provincial governments were not prepared to enter into any federal-provincial agreement that did not compensate adequately financially.

Within these specific circumstances, the federal government decided to enhance the policy involvement of societal organizational members of the National Settlement Services Policy Community. Other strategies to reach a federal-provincial settlement services agreements during the 1970s and 1980s did not succeed. As the life of settlement policy progressed through the 1970s and 1980s, the social and policy paradigms of the federal government and the provincial governments grew further and further apart. The findings of this study indicate that when social paradigms within a single national policy community diverge tremendously and cause the policy-making process to stagnate, dominant policy actors should consider strategies that would foster social learning around the policy paradigm. Extensive, well designed consultation processes can be effective
mechanisms to change social paradigms and, in turn, contributed to paradigmatic policy change.
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