

**Immigration Discourse in Cities: Examining the Effects of Local Immigration  
Partnerships in Richmond and Surrey**

**By**

**Nicholas Phin**

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements  
for the degree of Master of Arts

at

Dalhousie University  
Halifax, Nova Scotia  
August 2018

© Copyright by Nicholas Phin, 2018

## Table of Contents

ABSTRACT.....	iii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS USED.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION .....	1
CHAPTER 2: THE AUTONOMY OF CANADIAN CITIES, AND THE ROLE..... THEY PLAY IN STEERING THE URBAN REGIME	15
CHAPTER 3: INTERCULTURALISM, RIAC, AND THE COMMUNITY..... COLLABORATION ROUNDTABLE IN RICHMOND	43
CHAPTER 4: MULTICULTURALISM, DIVERSITY, AND THE..... LEADERSHIP OF SURREY’S MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT	65
CHAPTER 5: CONVERGENCE OR AUTONOMY: A COMPARTIVE..... ANALYSIS OF SURREY AND RICHMOND	88
CHAPTER 6: CONCLSION.....	112
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	123
APPENDIX 1.....	131
APPENDIX 2.....	140

**Abstract:**

As government services have been downloaded to the local level, cities have become increasingly important to our understanding of immigration policy, with cooperation between municipal governments, civil society groups, and the business community developing to address the challenges associated with immigrant settlement and integration. Despite this, upper levels of government still play a role in the immigration process, and are viewed as being able to shape narratives and discourse around immigration. With the federal government expanding the Local Immigration Partnership program, which provides funding to cities to develop and expand immigration governance networks, this raises the question as to what extent the federal government is able to influence local discourse. By comparing two cities, Richmond and Surrey, this thesis will explore the relationships that exist between local governance networks and upper levels of government, highlighting the privileged role of cities in the development of local immigration discourse.

## **List of Abbreviations Used**

ACIR = Advisory Committee on Intercultural Relations  
CCT = Community Collaboration Table  
DAC = Diversity Advisory Committee  
FCM = Federation of Canadian Municipalities  
GAR = Government Assisted Refugees  
LIP = Local Immigration Partnership  
MSSD = Most Similar Systems Design  
RCSAC = Richmond Community Services Advisory Committee  
RIAC = Richmond Intercultural Advisory Committee  
RMCS = Richmond Multicultural Community Services  
SPAC = Social Policy Advisory Committee  
SPARC BC = Social Planning and Research Council of British Columbia  
WCP = Welcoming Communities Project

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the many wonderful people, with whom this thesis, and the completion of my graduate studies, would not be possible.

First and foremost are to my wonderful parents, without whose love and support I would not have been able to reach this stage of my academic career, let alone thrived in it.

My friends in Dalhousie's 2016 cohort of graduate students, Callee Robinson, Gerhard Soyka, Susan Manning, Liam Hunt, and Erik Fertsman, who helped me to push me farther in my understanding of the material, enriching my studies.

My friends in both Halifax and Vancouver, whether they provided me with much needed levity or moral support, as I completed this program. A particular debt is owed to Dylan Hill for providing me with a home while I studied in Halifax, and to Krystal Karnik, who took me in while I was conducting research in Richmond and Surrey.

I would also like to thank Professor Kristin Good for her incredible academic support during this program, and for introducing me to the field of local immigration policy.

Thank you as well to Dr. Ruben Zaiotti, Dr. Robert Finbow, and Dr. Lori Turnbull, for providing me with superb feedback during the course of my writing and defence. Your feedback enriched my thesis.

## **Chapter 1: Introduction**

The role of cities has become increasingly important in our understanding of public policy and immigration in Canada. With Canada receiving over 250,000 immigrants and refugees a year, how municipalities develop immigration policy contributes to how well immigrants can integrate into the community (Keung 2016). As immigration levels are determined at the federal level, but immigrants are integrated at the local level, understanding the relationship between the federal government and municipal governance is crucial to understanding how immigration policy is developed (Poirier 2006, 206-207). At the same time, services have increasingly been downloaded from the provinces to the cities. Faced with increasing responsibility for immigrants' integration and multiculturalism policies, cities have increasingly developed relationships with business and civil society organizations in order to achieve their policy goals (Good 2009, 234; Fourot 2015, 416). This raises questions, however, about how exactly these governance networks are arranged, how much authority the municipal governments have to steer the governance network against potential pressure from business and civil society, and how the federal government impacts these networks in areas of multilevel governance. In examining how these factors influence the development of local governance, my thesis will focus on the development of local immigration discourse, using two cities in order to develop a comparative framework. In order to better understand how municipal governments, local government networks, and the federal government, impact the development of local immigration discourse, my thesis will consider the development of the Local Immigration Partnership (LIP) program. Built off

of multi-sectoral arrangements in Ontario, the LIP is a federal program that aims to bring local government, civil society groups, and the business community together in order to promote social and economic integration by expanding local governance networks through the use of federal funding. Ultimately, this thesis raises the question of whether *Local Immigration Partnerships affect the local discourse about immigration, and how they affect both the urban governance network, and the role of the municipal government in the immigration process*. As will be explored in chapter two, the weakness of municipalities within Canada's intergovernmental framework suggests that the involvement of the federal government should produce a convergence effect in discourse, with each city adopting a similar discursive approach to immigration following the development of the LIP.

As it pertains to the immigration field, discourse, broadly speaking, refers to how issues around immigrants and immigration are discussed, both in terms of support or opposition to immigration, and in terms of normative approaches towards immigrant integration. As we will see in chapter two, normative models of immigration are important in establishing how cities see their role in the immigrant settlement and integration process, and what the role that they believe immigrants should play in the integration process, and in public life more broadly. While pluralist models of immigration advocate that there is a role for ethnocultural diversity in public life, civic universalist models argue that displays of cultural distinctiveness should not enter the public sphere, with more extreme variants arguing for assimilation in the private sphere as well. Discourse is important to the policy process, as it informs how governments and

members of the governance network perceive issues related towards immigration, which serves to frame policy debates and identify feasible and desirable policy goals (Fourot 2015, 420; 424; Steinmo 2001, 1). In order to make discourse empirically measurable in each city, this thesis will employ NVIVO software in order to scan key policy documents, identifying which words are used most frequently in municipal and LIP documents. This will serve to identify how language changes over time, and which words, including words that can help to identify underlying normative views on immigration, gain prominence following the introduction of the LIP. At the same time, documents will be manually read in order to identify which words and phrases are used in the most prominent section of documents, including mission statements and statements made by an organization's leadership.

While the hypothesis put forward is built on the academic literature supporting the view that national discourse influences urban political behaviour, this thesis will ultimately demonstrate that the LIP program has neither produced a convergence between the two cities nor has it had a significant impact on each city's normative framework for understanding immigration. By looking at the evolution of policy and discourse through time, this thesis demonstrates that changes to each city's normative understanding of immigration have created a path-dependency, which has maintained local discourse around immigration even after the introduction of the LIP. While Richmond's discourse of interculturalism has been dominant since 2002 and has been unaffected by programs initiated by upper levels of government, Surrey demonstrated a noticeable shift away from a discourse centred on multiculturalism towards a discourse centred on diversity. It



is unlikely, however that this change came as a result of the LIP program, but, rather was due to the strengthened relationship between the City of Surrey and the Surrey Board of Trade following the development of the Province of British Columbia's Welcoming Communities Project in 2011. Both of these critical junctures, Richmond's adoption of interculturalism and Surrey's shift towards diversity, have likewise proven to be critical events in defining the role of the municipality within the regime. In Richmond, this has centred the Richmond Intercultural Advisory Committee as the municipality's driving force in the governance of immigration, while at the same time solidifying the municipality's view that their role in the immigration process is to provide support and assistance. In Surrey, the shift towards diversity and the development of the Welcoming Communities Project saw the city take on a leadership role within the regime, both through the city's advisory committees and through City Council itself. While funding and initiatives from upper levels of government appear to be capable of creating the conditions for change in regime relationships, it is not sufficient, and requires increased partnership and participation with the business community.

By analyzing discourse, my thesis will attempt to gain a broader understanding of how urban governance impacts discourse around immigration, and what this means for local immigration policy. By understanding how immigration is discussed at the local level, I believe that we can gain a broader understanding of how immigration policy is developed. By examining discourse, including how immigration is discussed, and the language that it used to describe immigration into each city, my thesis will attempt to uncover how the relationships that exist between members of the governance network

and upper levels of government influence normative perspectives on immigration. As my thesis views governance not simply as the formal institutions of government, but as the coalition of actors in business and civil society, this understanding will highlight the role that ideas and language play in the development of public policy, and how they are changed by municipal-federal partnerships. While I do not intend to recommend immigration policies, by shining a light on how changes to discourse affect policy development, it can be used to predict the outcomes of future municipal-federal multilevel relationships on local governance.

This chapter will serve as the outline for my thesis, and will highlight not only why the topic of local discourse is being pursued, but why it is important to look at municipal governments as autonomous entities. To do so, I will begin by briefly exploring the role of cities in the immigration process, including the assumption made that they are creatures of the province and incapable of developing and implementing policies related to the immigration field. From there, this chapter will discuss the development of the LIP program, and the normative model that underpins it. Finally, this chapter will provide a brief framework for how the thesis will progress, including an overview of each chapter. This chapter will end by highlighting the key findings from this research project; that the LIP program has not served to create a convergence effect between the two cities, and that both Richmond and Surrey have demonstrated a degree of autonomy in the development of their discourse, policies, and governance networks.

### **Canadians Cities in the Immigration Process**

As Aude-Claire Fourot highlights, it was once assumed that municipalities were either incapable of implementing immigration policies, or if they did that municipal policies would mirror those implemented by the federal government (Fourot 2015, 414). As municipalities lack constitutional authority, they have often been assumed to be “creatures of the province,” as they are required to seek approval from their province in order to either gain new prescribed powers, or make changes to existing powers (Levi and Valverdi 2006, 41). Despite this, evidence suggests that not only have municipalities begun to develop policies related to immigration, but that the process of downloading has actually served to give them greater autonomy due to the provinces and federal government withdrawing from the immigration field (Fourot 2015, 416). As Kristin Good notes in her study of local immigration policy in the Greater Vancouver and Toronto regions, not only do relationships between municipalities and provincial governments influence the degree of autonomy that municipalities have, but there are variations between cities within the same province as well (Good 2009). Fourot notes this in her survey of the field of local immigration policy as well, highlighting how cities within both the Greater Toronto and Montreal regions have shown degrees of variation in their approach to immigration policy (Fourot 2015, 416). A further rationale for cities entering the immigration fields has been the structural force of globalization, which has resulted in cities competing for skilled immigrants as a source of economic growth (Poirier 2006, 207). As Katharyne Mitchell highlights, Vancouver’s early initiatives to promote multiculturalism were in large part due to the city’s desire to integrate into the structures of global capitalism, and promote trade and growth with the Asia Pacific region (Mitchell

1993). The globalization of capitalism has resulted in cities pursuing strategies to attract and retain immigrants as a source of economic growth, often in competition with one another (Fourot 2015, 427).

The strategies that municipalities pursue in response to the pressures of downloading and immigration have demonstrated the degree of local autonomy that they have in this field. Kristin Good identified the relationship between municipal responsiveness to immigration and racial composition, classifying cities that had bifurcated populations as either being biracial, with one immigrant group representing over fifty percent of the immigrant population, or multiracial cities, which are composed of a majority white population and an immigrant population with no one dominant group (Good 2009, 43). Good's study demonstrated that biracial cities were more responsive in developing policies and initiatives to address immigration as a result of greater mobilization amongst the dominant immigrant population, with multi-racial cities demonstrating an increased likelihood of being unresponsive to immigration (Ibid, 42-43). In a comparison between the municipalities of Ottawa and Montreal, Christine Poirier identified that differences in discourse helped to offer an explanation for why Ottawa lagged Montreal in entering the immigration field (Poirier 2006, 217). While Montreal's discourse around interculturalism produced policies and initiatives that were designed to create common reference points between members of various ethnocultural groups, Ottawa's civic universalist discourse focused on the equality of all citizens (Poirier 2006, 209-210). As Poirier notes however, these discourses have changed, with Montreal beginning to include more universalist discourses, and Ottawa introducing

elements of discourse based on multiculturalism (Ibid). Municipal strategies within the immigration field are flexible over time, and can change as a result of changing circumstances.

Despite the growing innovation that we have seen in the development of municipal immigration initiatives and strategies, the provincial context remains key to understanding the limitations of municipalities in the immigration process. As the amalgamation of Toronto in the 1990s and the reduction of Toronto City Council's seats by Premier Ford's government in 2018 (Pagliaro 2018) highlights, the provinces ultimately have the power to limit municipal power and authority at their discretion. While cities have taken on greater responsibility in the field of immigrant settlement and integration, the extent to which they are able to enter this field largely depends on their province's willingness to grant them the resources and authority necessary to participate outside of a purely symbolic manner. Ultimately however, whether cities are able to enter the immigration field is subject to provincial interference. As we will see shortly, the power of the province to unilaterally alter municipal authority means that research into federal municipal relations needs to take this into consideration during the process of case selection, as municipalities in different provinces may face fundamentally different legal limitations on their authority.

### **The LIP Program**

Building off of multi-sectoral arrangements in Ontario, the Local Immigration Partnership (LIP) was developed with the aim of increasing social and economic integration in Canadian cities by expanding urban governance networks (Stasiulis, Hughes, and Amery 2011, 113-114). Beginning with the development of the Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement (COIA), which recognized the importance of municipalities in the integration process, the federal government started to highlight the need to develop new structures and strategies to address complex social issues in the field of immigration (Burr 2011, 3). As Martin Horak notes, the involvement of the business community in the immigrant settlement and integration process is rare, as they prefer to advocate for immigration at the provincial and federal levels of government (Horak 2012, 357). It is notable in this vein that one of the objectives of the LIP program has been to incorporate the business community into the governance network (Stasiulis, Hughes, and Amery 2011, 113-114).

Based on the new public governance model of service delivery that highlights the importance of engagement and participation by government and community actors in solving complex policy problems, the objectives of the LIP are to support local partnerships and community based planning (Bradford and Andrew 2011, 3). Built off of Citizenship and Immigration Canada's (now Immigration, Refugees, and Citizenship Canada) increasing recognition of the importance of community level planning, the LIP program was intended to support collaboration amongst local stakeholders (Burr 2011, 1). One of the LIP's core goals is to incorporate immigrant settlement and integration into the broader community planning process, and to develop self-sustaining multi-sectoral

partnerships (Ibid, 2). Key objectives include establishing a partnership council, conducting research and establishing a local settlement strategy to be implemented over a three year period, develop annual action plans that address local priorities, and report on implementation (Ibid, 5). While laying a groundwork for the development and implementation of immigration initiatives, the LIP program leaves room for flexibility in the development of partnership programs.

In its normative approach, Neil Bradford and Caroline Andrew note in a paper for Citizenship and Immigration Canada that the LIP's approach is built on the ideal of establishing a two way street between newcomers and the host community (Bradford and Andrew 2011, 13). While noting the importance of diversity and immigration in the development of Canadian society and the Canadian economy, Bradford and Andrew highlight that the "diversity advantage" does not happen automatically, and that it requires coordination and action on the behalf of government and stakeholders (Ibid, 2). In addressing the needs of immigrants to access services and gain social inclusion, while recognizing the importance of the long standing community and establishing cultural cohesion, Bradford and Andrew highlight the virtues of interculturalism in the development of integration and settlement policy (Ibid, 3). In particular, they note how multiculturalism tends "to emerge in rather top-down ways and encourage somewhat formalistic expressions of cultural difference" that interculturalism takes into account local contexts, and builds solutions from the ground up (Ibid, 3-4). In discussing the evolution of the LIP program, Bradford and Andrew note that one of the broader dynamics that has occurred on the Ontario LIPs has been the building of two-way streets

between the host community and immigrant groups, which they describe as providing a “value-adds” to the immigrant settlement and integration process (Ibid, 12-13). Given this focus on interculturalism, and the broader trend of cultural bridging in Ontario LIPs, should a convergence occur between the Surrey and Richmond LIP, it is likely that we should anticipate that it would focus around a discourse of interculturalism.

### **The Thesis Outline**

In developing the argument that my thesis puts forward, chapter two will focus on the theoretical frameworks that will be utilized to explore the development of Local Immigration Partnerships in Richmond and Surrey. This will situate my thesis into the literature on municipal governance, examining the theories of urban governance, multilevel governance, and urban regime theory, in order to understand how together they are useful tools in order to examine the evolution of discourse in Canadian cities. While each theory provides a useful foundation for exploring the impact that LIP’s have on local discourse, each theory likewise has drawbacks. By synthesizing these three theories, my thesis will be able to develop a holistic understanding of how upper levels of government, municipal governments, and the governance network influence discourse. This will include a brief discussion of normative approaches to immigration, including multiculturalism, interculturalism, and civic universalism, and will lay the foundation for the normative views explored through each city’s discourse. The methodological approach that this thesis will take, including the importance of document analysis and triangulation, will be highlighted in this chapter.



From there, chapters three and four will focus on the city of Richmond and Surrey respectively. This will situate Richmond and Surrey's history as immigrant receiving cities, and the evolution of local policy making from the years 2000 to 2017. Doing so will allow me to examine the evolution of their policies through time, comparing municipal responses to changes in upper level policy making, and understanding how the broader governance structure has changed. By maintaining the provincial context, my thesis will be able to examine two municipalities that operate within the same provincial context, and are subject to the same provincial regulations and statutes. Applying the data that will be gathered through document analysis, interviews, and scholarly analysis, these two chapters will also divide each city's recent history into pre LIP and post LIP. In doing this, these chapters will be able to demonstrate broad trends in each city's discourse, including whether variations have occurred following the introduction of the LIP. By doing this, these chapters will serve as the empirical foundation for answering my research question.

The fifth chapter of my thesis will perform a comparative analysis between the two cities. This will examine the changes in local discourse and policy development, and whether there has been a convergence between the two cities. This will address one of the key hypotheses that my thesis puts forward, whether federal intervention into the field local immigration policy will create a national convergence in discourse, or whether urban autonomy will ultimate prove to be the deciding factor. This chapter will also analyze the impacts that LIPs have on urban governance, including whether they expand

the governance network in noticeable ways, and whether this impacts the ability of municipal governments to steer their urban governance networks. This will include analyzing broad trends between the two cities, including how business leadership and civil society responds to LIPs within the urban governance arrangements.

The final chapter will consider the implication that chapter 5 has on the theoretical approaches, and particularly what implications this has for our understanding of multilevel governance in the field of local immigration policy-making. This will include a brief examination of future avenues for research into the development of LIPs, noting avenues that, while connected to this research project, were not able to be considered due to the scope and length of this thesis. In particular, this section will raise questions about the importance of local autonomy, and particularly the importance of the business community in the development of discourse and the broader governance network. This chapter will also serve to reflect on the research process itself, including ways in which data collection could have been expanded, and the importance of elite interviews in providing context to data collected through document analysis.

## **Conclusion**

By looking at how LIPs have influenced discourse over time, not only will we be better able to understand how upper levels of government influence discourse at the municipal level, but also how the relationships between municipal governments and civil society organizations are influenced by federal funding. Though the hypothesis that my

thesis initially put forward, that the development of LIPs would produce a convergence in discourse between Richmond and Surrey, will be demonstrated to be false, what we instead find is that there is a high degree of autonomy in each city. Not only has each city pursued a different normative model in their immigration policy-making efforts, but each city has pursued different governance arrangements with civil society actors, choosing to take different roles in steering the governance network. While Surrey has taken on a leadership position within the regime, Richmond has chosen to adopt a position of facilitating and supporting immigrant settlement and integration. As we will see, the decision to pursue these normative approaches, and these positions within the regime, both came at critical junctures in the development of each city's history. At the same time however, the partnerships that exist in each regime, and in particular the role that the business community has played in each city's governance network, has served to inform how these networks have developed, and the significance of each critical juncture.

## **Chapter 2: The Autonomy of Canadian Cities, and the Role They Play in Steering the Urban Regime**

The question that my thesis asks is *do Local Immigration Partnerships affect the local discourse about immigration, and what implications does this have for urban governance?* In order to answer this question, my thesis will examine two cities which have introduced Local Immigration Partnerships (LIPs), controlling for cities that have similarly proportioned immigrant populations. My thesis hypothesizes that we should expect to see a convergence towards a national discourse between the two cases, with similar discourse trends following the introduction of the LIP. This is partially informed by Irene Bloemraad's observation that Canada's national discourse of multiculturalism has influenced the development of political incorporation of immigrants in Toronto, indicating that federal policy, and federal discourse, matters in the development of how immigration is discussed and understood at the local level (Bloemraad 2006, 118; 125-126). By looking at policy through the lens of discourse, my thesis intends to contribute to the broader understanding of urban governance, and to what extent municipal governments and governance networks are able to act autonomously when faced with pressures from the federal government. Built primarily upon urban regime theory, urban governance theory, and multilevel governance, my thesis seeks to develop a broader understanding of how federal-municipal relationships affect immigration discourse, how they influence the municipality's role within the regime network, and the extent that the federal government can influence the autonomy of cities and municipalities to their own discourse within Canada's federalist framework.

This chapter will begin by exploring this thesis' research question, the role of discourse in the development of local immigration policy, as well as the role of municipal governments in Canada's constitutional framework, and why we would expect to see convergence. From there, urban regime theory, urban governance theory, and multilevel governance theory will be looked at in order to see what they can contribute to understanding the research question. This chapter will then elaborate on the methodology that will be used to construct this thesis' argument, including the rationale behind the selection of Surrey and Richmond as case studies, and the use of a most similar systems design comparative model to compare the two cities. This will also consider how my thesis will approach the task of gathering empirical data, including how academic sources, document analysis, and elite interviews will be utilized in order to triangulate data to strengthen my findings.

This chapter will ultimately find that while each theoretical approach contributes to this thesis' understanding of how LIP's impact local discourse, separately they provide an incomplete perspective on how the municipal government, the governance network, and the federal government influence the development of local discourse within cities. By synthesizing these theories, this thesis will develop a more holistic approach to understanding the multiple facets that influence governance. Should there be a convergence in discourse between Richmond and Surrey, this will demonstrate that the federal government is able to exert its influence on the municipal government and local governance network, highlighting their privileged position within Canada's multilevel governance system.

## **Municipalities as Creatures of the Province**

In Canada's federalist structure, municipalities are often considered to be "creatures of the province" as they lack a formal legal and constitutional standing, with the provinces having nearly unlimited power to determine the jurisdictional authority of their municipalities (Sancton and Young 2009, 10; Sancton and Young 2009, 6-8). Under section 92 of the BNA Act of 1867, provinces possess sole legal autonomy over municipalities, with municipalities requiring the approval of their province in order to gain any new powers or methods of taxation (Cameron 1980, 22; Levi and Valverdi 2006, 411). From this perspective, municipal governments are not capable of developing independent policies to respond to immigration, relying instead on replicating policies developed by upper levels of government (Forout 2015, 414). While several Canadian cities, including the City of Toronto, have attempted in the recent past to gain new statutory powers through city charters and provincial legislation, municipal governments have remained without constitutional standing (Levi and Valverdi 2006, 414-415). The literature on governance in Canadian municipalities stresses the importance of this structure, attempting to determine the capacity for municipalities to act autonomously, purposefully, and collaboratively, within Canada's constitutional framework (Sancton and Young 2009, 3).

Though political science has traditionally excluded the study of municipal policies and politics, since the 90s the field has begun to re-consider the role of municipalities as

political actors, and the extent to which cities vary in their response to immigration (Fourot 2015, 414-415). By examining discourse between Richmond and Surrey, this thesis can help to explore the extent to which municipalities are able to act autonomously in developing discourse around immigration, or whether they replicate policies and discourses when provided with funding from upper levels of government to pursue immigration objectives. As Aude-Claire Fourot highlights, municipalities have often been considered to either be incapable of entering the immigration field, or when they do enter this policy field they are assumed to replicate the normative model adopted by the federal government (Fourot 2015, 414). This assumption is tacitly echoed by Irene Bloemraad, whose study of local immigration policy in Toronto viewed Canada's federal policy of multiculturalism as replicating at the local level and offering explanatory power for the variation in structured mobilization that exists between Toronto and Boston's immigrant communities (Bloemraad, 2006: 125-126). If cities are simply creatures of the province, then we should anticipate that adjustments to immigration discourse will not centre on local conditions, but on changes to discourse at the federal level. At the same time however, Fourot has highlighted that cities have been given more autonomy in the development of local policies due to the withdrawal of the federal and provincial level from providing services, with subsequent downloading to the municipal level (Fourot 2015, 416). Given the development of LIPs and the introduction of funds by the federal government, this raises the question as to whether cities will begin to reproduce federal discourses in response to increased funding and direction, effectively producing a convergence effect, or whether local autonomy will be maintained with each city continuing their own unique discourse. By utilizing academic literature, document

analysis, and interviews, my thesis will be able to properly examine discourse changes in Richmond and Surrey, and what this says about the position of municipalities and cities within Canada's federalist system. If the view of municipalities as simply creatures of the province holds true, then we should expect that funding from the federal level will shape local discourse, as municipalities respond to changing federal conditions.

### **The Role of Discourse in Local Immigration Policy**

As Aude-Claire Forout notes, discourse around immigration and diversity can help to explain divergent policy trajectories between cities (Forout 2015, 420). How immigration is perceived, and what role immigrants are expected to play in the immigration process, influences how policies are developed. Citing Poirier, Livianna Tossutti notes that there is a significant amount of variation that occurs between purely assimilationist and purely pluralist normative models (Tossutti 2012, 611). Though assimilationist discourses posit that expressions of cultural distinctness should not enter the public sphere and should remain in the private life of immigrants and new Canadians, pluralist discourses argue that cultural distinctness has a role in public life (Ibid). While there are variants within assimilationist discourse, including radical variants which go as far as to argue that immigrants must assimilate into their host culture even in their private lives, the more common form of assimilationist approach is civic-universalism, which posits that while cultural distinctiveness is acceptable in the private sphere, that it is unacceptable in the public sphere or in public institutions (Ibid). Likewise there are also variants within the pluralist discourses, with multiculturalism and interculturalism acting



as two of the key variants (Ibid). Though both multiculturalism and interculturalism share a similar approach in that they promote cultural diversity in the public sphere, multiculturalism promotes diversity in the public sphere and the granting of rights to minority groups, while interculturalism puts a greater emphasis on identifying and maintaining common reference points for both immigrants and the host society (Ibid). While similar, the distinguishing characteristic of interculturalism is the focus that it puts in the development a shared identity in opposition to the perception that multiculturalism produces cultural enclaves (Tossutti 2012, 612).

Differences in discursive typologies between cities will help to demonstrate the freedom that cities may have in developing local immigration policy, suggesting, as Good notes, that it is debatable whether changes in discourse are the result of conscious decision making (Good forthcoming, 7). By utilizing academic literature, document analysis, and interviews, my thesis will be able to properly examine discourse changes in Richmond and Surrey, and how these differences manifest through differences in the normative approaches that these two cities take in the immigrant settlement and integration process. Through the comparative method, these changes will help to determine if there is movement towards a national discourse, and how the presence of a LIP program influences pre-existing trends. Ultimately, this will offer the greatest explanatory power to understand the influence of LIPs on local discourse, and how this affects local governance.

## **Literature Review**

As my thesis is attempting to understand whether federal involvement in the local immigration field can produce a convergence in discourse, the theories used to explore this concept will highlight different factors which influence the development of discourse at the local level. My thesis will be built on three specific concepts of governance; multilevel governance, urban governance theory, and urban regime theory. These concepts represent the aspects of governance that will be needed in order to understand my thesis question; the impact of provincial and federal governments on local discourse, the capacity of the municipal government to steer the urban coalition, and the influence of the local regime, including the important role of the business community, in developing the urban governance network in each city. While each theoretical approach provides a foundation for understanding the impact that the LIP has in each city, each theory lacks components necessary to develop a broader understanding of how LIP's affect discourse. By bringing these theories together, my thesis will develop a more holistic understanding of how discourse is developed at the local level. We will briefly explore each of these theories, before looking at how they will be synthesized to tackle of the study of local immigration discourse.

### **Multilevel Governance**

Hooghe and Marks argue that multilevel governance can be classified into two frameworks, general-purpose jurisdiction governance, and task-specific jurisdiction governance (Hooghe and Marks 2003, 236-237). The former, which is consistent with

Sancton and Young's analysis of Canada's legal framework, views multilevel governance as centred around human territorial communities, with the latter being flexible, with intersecting membership, existing through many overlapping legal jurisdictions, and designed around policy problems (Hooghe and Marks 2003, 237-238; 241). Local Immigration Partnership's, which my thesis will address directly, are administered in the model of general purpose jurisdictions, as they encourage cooperation between municipal, provincial, and federal governments to achieve tasks, while maintaining the integrity of strict territorial delineations (Burr 2011, 1).

In considering the role of the LIP in the context of multilevel governance, the literature demonstrates that the downloading of services has simultaneously increased the role of municipal governance in immigration, while increasing the need for cities to work with provincial and federal governments to administer immigration programs. The scholarship on multilevel governance acknowledges the importance of discourse in intergovernmental relationships, as has been highlighted by Montreal's resistance to the federal government's discourse on multiculturalism, historically addressing immigration issues through intercultural, and later universal, discourses (Poirier 2006, 210). Despite the degree of autonomy that has come from downloading, municipalities are weak governments within Canada's federal and constitutional framework, and rely on their province both in terms of what areas they are allowed to govern, and in terms of their financial resources. By utilizing a multilevel governance approach, my thesis will be able to demonstrate whether federal and provincial influence results in a convergence towards a standard discourse, as the privileged role of the upper level of government has the

jurisdiction and fiscal capability to lead in this field. In conjunction with Pierre and Stoker's conception of the local government as having a steering function, looking at whether there has been convergence in discourse will help to determine how the federal government is able to exert its influence within the multilevel governance process due to the privileged role of the federal government in Canada's legal and fiscal framework.

We can see how the LIP program fits into the existing literature on local immigration policy. As a cooperative arrangement between municipal, provincial, and federal levels of government, the LIP program can serve as a case study to explore the influence that the federal government has on local discourse, and the extent that they are able to lead the municipal level in the immigration field. As we will see in both the urban governance and urban regime theory literatures, local governance is not simply a prerogative of the municipal government, but is increasingly shared in conjunction with business and civil society. By exploring the relationship between the different levels of government in conjunction with these frameworks, my thesis will be better situated to examine how upper levels of government not only affects local governments, but the broader governance network.

### **Urban Governance Theory**

Urban governance, according to Jon Pierre, can be defined as an analytical framework for determining what is worth studying at the municipal level (Pierre 2005, 452). Specifically, Pierre argues that "a governance perspective on urban politics directs

the observer to look beyond the institutions of the local state and to search for processes and mechanisms through which significant and resource-full actors coordinate their actions and resources in the pursuit of collectively defined objectives” (Ibid). Although the urban governance model and the urban regime model share the concept that governance arrangements include nongovernmental actors, urban governance differs from the urban regime model by making fewer assumptions about who these extra-governmental actors are (Mossberger 2009, 48). This distinction is important, as urban governance puts a larger emphasis on the role of local government in the governance network to explain variation in local governance between cities (Pierre 1999, 375).

While the literature on urban governance focuses on the governance network, unlike urban regime theory which looks at governance through a social production model of power, urban governance focuses on the ability of municipal government to control their environment, and in particular their ability to co-ordinate societal actors within the municipality (Pierre 2000, 3). In this aspect of the literature, governance refers to how municipalities coordinate corporate interests and civil society, and how they steer these two groups towards the interests of governing institutions (Pierre 2000, 4). Although the literature acknowledges that governments no longer have the monopoly on the control of governance, as they have been forced to unload governmental responsibilities onto the private sector as a result of downloading services in the 80s and 90s, it acknowledges that municipal governments have a growing degree of autonomy from the provincial and federal governments (Pierre 1999, 372). While acknowledging that urban governments work within a network, Gerry Stoker highlights how the role of government inside of this

network is to steer the network towards desired objectives, although he adds that this action is often imperfect and imprecise (Stoker 1998, 24). Pierre and Stoker's conception of government as the steering force within the governance network is particularly useful in understanding the relationship between municipal governments and the LIP in each city. By considering the municipality's role in steering the governance network, my thesis will not only be able to consider how the municipality itself influences the development of local discourse within the governance network, but will be able to look at the extent that municipalities are able to act autonomously from intrusion into the field by the federal government.

### **Urban Regime Theory**

Urban regime theory will be utilized to examine the roll of the governance network in the development of local discourse, and how this is influenced by the involvement of the federal government in the immigration field through the LIP program. By utilizing urban regime theory as a framework, my thesis will not only be able to look at how discourse has changed in each city after the introduction of LIP, but will help to elaborate the extent to which the federal government can influence discourse at the regime level. As Good highlights, a common discourse acts as a cohesive factor in the urban regime by providing a shared understanding of the nature of the policy problems (Good 2009, 25) raising questions as to how the introduction of the LIP influences this understanding of shared policy problems. Should the introduction of the LIP program produce a convergence effect, this would suggest that the federal

government is able to exert its influence on both municipal governments and the broader governance network in which municipalities find themselves. One of the key aspects of urban regime theory that will be utilized is its political-economy focus, which highlights the importance of the business community in the urban governance process. This will allow my thesis to look at how the business community, along with other members of the governance network, influence the development of local immigration discourse through a social production model of power. As we will see, regimes have a path-dependent component, where the options available for the governance network are constrained by previous decisions.

Regime theory looks at the structure of local governance and begins from perspective that “view(s) power as fragmented and regimes as the collaborative arrangements through which local governments and private actors assemble the capacity to govern” in pursuit of a common agenda (Mossberger and Stoker 2001, 812). It is important to note that the relationships between government and members of the private sector can take the form of both formal and informal forms of cooperation (Mossberger 2009, 40). Unlike previous theories of urban governance, urban regime theory takes a social production model of power, viewing of power as being “power to” rather than “power over” (Stone 1989, 229). In this context, power is not defined by the ability of political actors to exert their policy preferences, but the ability of local actors to build capacity in order to collectively achieve common objectives by pooling resources in order to increase capacity (Stone 1989, 227). Regime theory emerged as a

contrast to the “growth machine” model of urban governance which assumed that the local governance networks were limited in their ability to develop and implement social policies and programs, instead focusing solely on economic growth (Good 2009, 20-21). By focusing on how the capacity to govern is developed as opposed to what the capacity to govern is used to achieve, urban regime theory was better able to demonstrate why there are variations between regimes in different cities, as the conditions for capacity building are different between cities (Ibid). In this sense, urban regime theory is more of a concept, or a model, than a theory (Mossberger and Stoker 2001, 811).

While urban regime theory is a popular tool for understanding urban governance, there have been debates about its applicability outside of the US. Jon Pierre has posited that urban regime theory is “an abstraction of US urban political economy” and that due to this intrinsic characteristic cannot travel outside of the US (Pierre 2005, 447). Others have specifically looked at cases within Canada, and suggested that urban regimes would not be expected to develop due to Canadian cities only existing as ‘creatures of the province’ that are subject to pervasive provincial interference (Good 2009, 37). In the context of its US origins, urban regime theory is considered to be ethnocentric, as the theory is considered unique to American political, cultural, and economic traditions (Pierre 2005, 448). Due in part to the level of authority that US municipalities have in the public sphere, which differs from municipal authority in other countries including Canadian municipalities, and the fact that the urban regime emerged in Atlanta as a coalition between the white business community and the black



middle class in order to create biracial cooperation, the perception has developed that regime theory is specific to the US context (Pierre 2005, 448; Stone 1989, 11). For theorists like Pierre, urban governance is a more applicable theory to cities outside of the United States (Ibid). Despite this criticism, urban regime theory remains a valuable application for understanding urban governance in Canadian cities. In an analysis of the application of urban regime theory across the US, Germany, and France, it was discovered that not only could this method be applied internationally, but that doing so produced a strong analysis for a variety of regimes, highlighting the importance of local political and economic constants in the development of regime politics (Mossberger 2009, 46). In the context of this thesis, this will allow us to consider how variations between urban regimes may have contributed to discourse in each city prior to the LIP, creating a baseline with which to test the possibility of convergence following the introduction of LIP program.

In applying urban regime theory to my thesis I will use Mossberger's criteria for what constitutes an urban regime. These standards for classification as a regime include; partnership between government and non-government sources, including business in some capacity; collaboration based on social production; identifiable policy agendas shared between members of the coalition; and a long standing pattern of cooperation that demonstrates the durability of the coalition (Ibid). While this may be criticized for attempting to expand the concept of the regime too far, it is notable that while the social production criterion has moved away from its strict government-business

application in the US, that it is still being used to describe the same interdependence between public and non-public actors that was being described in the US model (Mossberger and Stoker 2001, 823). By keeping the description of urban regime theory constrained to key criteria for classification that is consistent with its US origins, urban regimes in Canada would fall under the “family resemblance” category of concept expanding, allowing for minor variation as long as the primary criteria are analytically important (Collier and Mahon 1993, 847). This is particularly important in Canada, as the federal and provincial governments have downloaded services, and the costs associated with them, onto the cities (Fourot 2015, 416) an effect which has further privileged the role of the business community within the urban governance network due to the resources that they are capable of mobilizing. As Mossberger highlights, while the participation of the business community is necessary for regime analysis, regimes can have motives that extend beyond economic growth and business interests, and can include issues related to broader civic collaboration (Mossberger 2009, 49). This argument has been echoed by Kristin Good, who highlights how the ethnic configurations of cities not only affect the policy preferences of government and the business community, but contribute to the influence of civic leadership within the urban regime, as well as the regime’s overall goal of economic growth (Good 2009, 35).

### **Synthesizing the Theories**

While each of the above theoretical approaches contribute valuable insights towards understanding local discourse, including how upper levels of government, municipalities, and the broader governance network each influence discourse development, each theory is, on its own, inadequate for understanding how LIP's affect local discourse. While urban regime theory rightly notes the importance of local political conditions and the privileged role of the business community, studies utilizing regime theory have often not taken the multilevel context into account, failing to address the importance of upper levels of government in the development of the urban regime and local policy. In conjunction with multilevel governance however, urban regime theory can serve to highlight how upper levels of government can influence the development of local discourse, and what effect the federal government has on the development of the regime level. If a convergence effect is observed between Richmond and Surrey, this would suggest that while the business community may have a privileged role within the governance network, that the influence of the federal government and the funding that is provided through the LIP program has the potential to provide a greater influence on the development of local discourse. In a similar vein, while urban governance considers the role of the municipality in the governance process while acknowledging the importance of upper levels of government, it fails to acknowledge the privileged role of the business community in the governance network, and the importance of capitalism as a structural factor that influences the development of policy. Where an approach to studying LIPs that acknowledges the importance of the business community benefits from an urban governance perspective, however, is in urban governance's focus on the

role on the municipality in steering the governance network. While urban regime theory does acknowledge the importance of municipal governments at the regime level, the social production model of power does not consider the extent that municipal governments are able to guide the regime towards preferred outcomes. By incorporating the two, this thesis will be able to look at how the municipality steers the governance network in the development of local discourse within the structural context of capitalism, acknowledging the governance networks reliance on the business community for much needed capital.

While urban governance is capable of understanding the role of the municipality in developing and propagating local discourse, it has a theoretical downside relative to urban regime theory. While governance is a broader concept than urban regime theory, using it sacrifices precision, and would reduce the ability of my thesis to explain local governance in terms of political economy, disadvantaging my theories ability to utilize the privileged role of business in determining policy (Good 2009, 27). As downloading has increasingly caused local governments to take over responsibility for immigration programs away from the upper levels of government, including the costs associated with running these programs, a political economy approach will be useful for examining the dynamics of the local governance network within this context (Fourot 2015, 416). Despite this disadvantage relative to urban regime theory, while it does not utilize a political economy approach in studying the governance network, the urban governance approach incorporates analysis of how national policies and institutions act as “external infrastructure” which influence the development of values, interests, and identities at the

local level, connecting the urban governance approach to theories of multi-level governance (Sellers 2005, 426). This highlights the role that national level policies play in creating the conditions that local actors find themselves operating within, shaping the development of local politics (Ibid, 427). By acknowledging the importance of national level policy, and viewing the development of the LIPs in Richmond and Surrey as external infrastructure in shaping local politics and municipal policy, urban governance will provide a useful theoretical approach to understanding how LIP's influence the development of discourse at the local level, contrasting the importance of national level policies against the local agency of municipal governments.

Though a multilevel governance approach to examining immigration discourse acknowledges the importance of upper levels of government in Canada's constitutional framework in developing governance relationships with municipalities, this theoretical approach does not adequately consider the extent to which local autonomy plays a role in the development of discourse, including the importance of business participation in the governance network. As Sancton and Young highlight, the common refrain regarding municipalities in Canada is that they are 'creatures of the province' as they lack legal recognition in Canada's constitution, with their powers and authority being defined by their province (Sancton and Young 2009, 3). Because of this legal arrangement, in theory the provinces have nearly unlimited statutory power over the cities within their jurisdiction (Ibid). This, however, belies the fact that municipalities often work in conjunction with the provincial and federal government to solve policy problems. Indeed, in the area of immigration, not only is the trend towards solving policy problems through

multilevel governance increasing, but so is the expansion of municipalities into the field of immigrant settlement and integration (Fourot 2015, 421). As Aude-Claire Fourot highlights, cities have a degree of autonomy in handling immigration policy, arguing that cities within the same province display policy variations in their response to issues related to immigration and diversity, with Kristin Good supporting this and noting the importance of local agency within multilevel governance structures (Fourot 2015, 416; Good 2017, 12). At the same time, Fourot, Poirier, and Good have all highlighted how the downloading of services from federal to provincial, and from provincial to municipal governments, has resulted in municipal innovation in responding to policy problems (Poirier 2006, 205; Fourot 2015, 416; Good 2009, 232-233). Downloading has strengthened the imperative for cities to launch their own programs, with the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) advocating for the launch of diversity and immigration programs at the municipal level, and encouraging the intergovernmental recognition of the role of cities in the immigration policy field (Poirier 2006, 206). These pressures have resulted in cities developing their own immigrant integration and multiculturalism policies and initiatives, such as Toronto's Multilingual Services Policy, and Vancouver's Community Services Grants Program (Good 2009, 58; 68). We can see how increasing pressure on municipalities to address immigration and multiculturalism policies has resulted in increased autonomy, though as the proliferation of intergovernmental arrangements between municipal and provincial governments has demonstrated, there is still a considerable role for upper levels governments in the administration of immigration services (Fourot 2015, 420). With the development of the LIP program, this raises important questions about whether greater funding and

involvement from the federal government will reverse this trend, creating greater convergence between cities around models determined by upper levels of government.

In order to better understand how the federal government influences the development of local discourse, incorporating regime theory and urban governance into a multilevel analysis will be useful in looking at whether the role of local autonomy in the development of discourse is maintained following the introduction of the LIP. While urban governance theory acknowledges the federal government as creating external infrastructure in which municipalities find themselves within, it also considers the role of the municipality in steering the governance network as an autonomous actor. Unlike multilevel governance approaches, urban governance takes the role of local and municipal autonomy seriously in understanding the development of policy at the local level, while still acknowledging the role that upper levels of government play in shaping the opportunities and constraints that are available to local actors (Sellers 2005, 426). This is particularly important because, as previously noted, one of the ways in which municipal governments attempt to steer the governance network is through values and ideas (Pierre 1999, 375). In this capacity, urban governance theorists like Jeffrey Seller's help to connect urban governance with multi-level governance networks. By acknowledging that both federal and municipal governments are capable of influencing the development of local discourse, this thesis will be better able to explore how federal involvement in the immigration process impacts local autonomy, and what this means for the development of local immigration discourse.

By utilizing these three theories together, my thesis can develop a more holistic approach to examining the factors that influence discourse at the local level. While multilevel governance considers the privileged role of upper levels of government, utilizing urban governance and regime theory will allow this thesis to consider how this privileged position interacts with local autonomy, both in terms of municipal governments, and the structural forces that privilege the business community in the governance network. While the hypothesis that this thesis puts forward, that we should anticipate a convergence effect between the two cities, is built on the privileged position of upper levels of government in the development of discourse, urban governance and regime theory provide valuable counterpoints that serve to acknowledge the scope of influences that contribute to the development of discourse at the local level. As a competing hypothesis for this thesis would be that local conditions create the conditions that are responsible for discourse change, urban regime and urban governance theories will allow this project to fully test the empirical evidence, exploring how and why discourse changes. By utilizing these together with multilevel governance, my thesis can better explore the nuanced relationship that exists between upper and local levels of government, and how this impacts the development of governance networks.

### **Case Selection**

The cases that I will be utilizing for my thesis are Richmond and Surrey. Both cases are immigrant-receiving cities that have large minority populations. In the case of Richmond, immigrants represent 60 percent of the population, with visible minorities



comprising 70 percent of the population (Statistics Canada, Richmond 2013). Surrey has a smaller immigrant population at 41 percent, with a visible minority population of 53 percent (Statistics Canada, Surrey 2013). While both cities have a predominant immigrant population, they are also biracial cities which, as Kristin Good notes, is important to understanding how cities respond to immigration. While multiracial cities, which are composed of a dominant white population but contain no dominant immigrant population, are more likely to be unresponsive to issues around immigration, biracial cities, which have a population which is divided between a dominant white population and one dominant immigrant population, are more likely to be responsive to the needs of immigrant populations within the city (Good 2009, 207). Therefore, we would expect a multiracial and biracial city to not only exhibit significantly difference discourses prior to the introduction of the LIP, but we would expect them to have substantially different governance arrangements, limiting their applicability under a MSSD comparison. While a case can be made that Vancouver would also make for a good comparison, particularly with Surrey as both cities have similar populations in terms of size and ethnic configuration, Vancouver has a longer history of engaging in the immigration field, and working with settlement organizations and the business community to achieve policy objectives, as well as serving as the primary business and economic hub of the Vancouver Metro Region (Good 2009). While a convergence effect may still be seen between Vancouver and Surrey, due to its status as a resource rich city we would anticipate that there would be less incentive for Vancouver to adopt the federal government's normative perspectives as a response to the need for financial resources then we would expect in Surrey. Creating a comparison between Surrey and Vancouver

would then introduce additional exogenous variables that would take away from an MSSD analysis. As Richmond and Surrey are the fourth and second largest municipalities respectively, with similar histories of being suburban cities in the Metro region, this reduces potential exogenous variables. Likewise, while Burnaby is the third largest city in the region, it is not as heavily bifurcated as Richmond and Surrey, with a population that is one-third European-Canadian, one-third Chinese-Canadian, with the remaining third being comprised of a multitude of ethnic minority groups.

In addition to this, selecting two cities within the metropolitan region is ideal for creating a comparative analysis that considers the impact of the federal government on local autonomy through both an urban governance and urban regime lens. While LIPs have been developed in cities outside of the metro region, the academic literature (Good 2009) indicates that both Surrey and Richmond had taken steps to enter the immigration field prior to the development of the LIP, allowing this study to examine how municipal involvement in the immigration field has evolved in cities, rather than looking at cities with nascent immigration governance networks at the time of introducing the LIP. As the urban governance literature indicates that municipalities steer governance networks toward desired outcomes, had this study instead examined two cities in which the municipality previously had little to no involvement in the immigration field, then the results would provide for a stronger analysis of how the LIP can produce governance networks, rather than how it shapes existing governance networks. Likewise, as Richmond and Surrey have not only entered the immigration field, but have developed identifiable and enduring governance relationships that include the business community,

studying these two cities will serve to provide greater insight into how the federal government influences politics from a regime perspective. Ultimately, selecting Surrey and Richmond as case studies will allow me to explore the central question of the extent that municipalities are able to express their autonomy against interference from the federal government.

The selection of these cases is also desirable due to their close proximity to one another, and due to the fact that they are in the same province. As the literature on multilevel governance indicates, both provinces and the federal government develop relationships with municipal governments (Poirier 2006, 206-207). By selecting municipalities that are within the same province, my thesis will enhance its ability to focus on the federal government's influence on municipal discourse by holding the provincial influence set. As provinces have nearly unlimited constitutional authority to grant or revoke statutory powers to municipalities, keeping the provincial context constant will ensure that if a variation in discourse is identified between cities that it does not occur as a result of lopsided pervasive interference by one provincial government. As they are within the same province, they have been subject to similar provincial interventions in municipal affairs, including participation in the same provincial immigration programs such as the Welcoming Communities Project in 2011. They have also both experienced the withdrawal of the provincial role in immigrant settlement through the repatriation of settlement funding to the federal government in 2014. As a result, both cities implemented their LIP at the same time (2014) and have followed a similar timeline of development. This will be important in determining the influence of

the federal government, allowing future research to explore how provincial variation effects national discourse convergence.

### **Comparative Framework**

As I develop my thesis, I will be utilizing the comparative method, with a focus on using Most Similar Systems Design (MSSD) to explain variation between the cities that have introduced a LIP. The MSSD model is ideal for comparative analysis into cases that have a high degree of similarity in exogenous variables, while explaining systems level differences between cases (Anckar 2008, 392). In the context of the comparative method, I will be utilizing LIPs as my independent variable, determining changes to discourse as my dependent variable. While a case study approach could be utilized to examine each city, by utilizing MSSD, my thesis will be able to better understand the role of the independent variable in immigration discourse through directly accounting for controlled variables (Lijphart 1975, 163-164). As well, the comparative method will be used not only as a form of hypothesis testing, but as a way to draw out the variables that inform immigration policy between the two cities as a “heuristic device” (Lijphart 1975, 159).

Despite the similarities in my cases, previous literature has indicated that cities within the same province are capable of developing different policy approaches to address immigration issues, making them useful for comparative analysis (Fourot 2015, 416). As the cities that I have chosen are controlled for demographics and immigration,

they qualify for MSSD analysis by having similar exogenous variables (Anckar 2008, 399). However, there are sufficient differences in discourse in the selected cities, allowing for comparison. In Richmond, the discourse around immigration and multiculturalism policies have intentionally developed around the concept of ‘interculturalism’ as opposed to multiculturalism, which has been associated with division within the city (Good 2009, 71-72). Comparatively, while previous scholarship on Surrey has indicated that there has been a backlash towards immigration, the city has primarily used multiculturalism as the dominant normative framework, though with some hints of interculturalism (Good 2009, 78-79;212). While it is unclear the extent to which this is representative of broader discourse trends, it creates a baseline against which the effects of the LIP can be measured.

### **Data Analysis**

The primary method that will be employed to collect data will be document analysis. As a method, document analysis is a useful tool for tracking change and development across time (Bowen 2009, 30). Utilizing this method will allow my thesis to determine how words and language change, and specifically how they have changed following the introduction of the LIP. In particular, this method will be used to determine if the words and phrases most associated with immigration converge in Richmond and Surrey, in part by determining the degree of variation that occurred in the time period before the introduction of the LIP. By accessing government documents for a substantial degree of time before the introduction of a LIP, my thesis will be able to determine long

standing patterns. If there is a deviation from this pattern in Richmond and Surrey, then this will demonstrate that LIPs have had an effect on discourse, which can be examined for convergence. Conversely, this could also demonstrate that LIP's have had a trenching effect, causing each city to use their particular variations in discourse more frequently. By conducting a discourse analysis before and after the LIP, and comparing historical changes in discourse to historical events in the municipality, my thesis will be able to exclude any changes in discourse that were caused by exogenous events.

Document analysis will be supported by academic sources and, where possible, elite interviews. By doing this, my thesis will be able to triangulate the information provided in document analysis, while simultaneously incorporating the information learnt through document analysis into interview questions (Bowen 2009, 30). Academic sources will primarily be used to orient my thesis into existing literature to understand the role of immigration policy in cities, and to identify potential sources for document analysis. For conducting interviews, my thesis will use this method both to confirm discourse changes that have been discovered through document analysis, and to make broader inferences about how changes in discourse are affecting policy makers and community leaders, and how LIPs have affected informal relationships within the regime (Bowen 2009, 30; Tansey 2007, 766).

## **Conclusion**

Through the analysis of Surrey and Richmond, my thesis will be able to better illustrate how immigration discourse in cities responds to initiatives from the federal government, and how this impacts the local discourse around immigration. Through this analysis, I intend to better understand not only the role of federalism in immigration policy, but what the limits of municipal autonomy are in the development of discourse. This will help to determine the role the municipal government plays in steering the governance coalition, and what limitations they have to influence desired outcomes by business and civil leadership. Governance relationships are not only a byproduct of collective action, but are dependent on the context in which organizations are brought together (Stoker 1998, 22). Through the triangulation of data through document analysis, elite interviews, and immigration scholarship, I will be able to develop a deeper understanding of how cities respond the introduction of federal programs in the field of immigration, and what this means for the development of local discourse.

### **Chapter 3: Interculturalism, RIAC, and the Community Collaboration Roundtable in Richmond**

Lying on the South side of the Fraser River, the City of Richmond has grown from a farming town into a city of over 200,000 people. Beginning with a wave of immigration from Hong Kong in 1990s, subsequent Chinese immigration into Richmond has since changed the face of the city, with the 2016 Canadian Census revealing that over half of Richmond residents are ethnically Chinese (Statistics Canada 2017). Launching a multiculturalism policy in 1991, the City of Richmond committed itself to “pursuing diversity and multiculturalism through bylaws, programs and policies” (City of Richmond Policy Manual, 1991). In considering how the municipality steers the city’s governance network, and how the development of the LIP has influenced this network, this chapter will start by looking at the city’s policies and initiatives related to immigration and diversity from 2000 until 2013 in order to establish how the city was involved in this field prior to the introduction of the LIP. From there, the policies and initiatives that have been implemented from 2014 until 2017 will be considered, followed by the initiatives of the Richmond LIP following the repatriation of settlement funding to the federal government in 2014. In order to contrast discourses on the LIP with local discourses, NVIVO will be utilized to scan documents in order to identify frequently used words and themes during each period. This chapter will end by analyzing the composition of Richmond’s regime, as well as the extent that the introduction of the LIP has influenced discourse in the city. This will likewise consider the extent that the municipality has steered the regime, and how the development of the LIP in 2014 has impacted the urban regime.



Ultimately, this chapter will demonstrate that while Richmond has developed a regime in conjunction with business and civil society actors, that the steering function of the municipality has largely been limited to propagating interculturalism as a normative framework in the city. While the LIP does maintain interculturalism as a dominant normative value, the language used on the LIP is largely oriented towards the issues that have been identified as being crucial to newcomers during the LIPs community research. Likewise, the LIP does not appear to have had a significant impact on the city's immigration discourse, though it has raised policy issues at the municipal level. Establishing these parameters will serve to create a comparative framework to be used in conjunction with an analysis of Surrey's regime and governance network in Chapter 5

### **Municipal Policies and Initiatives Between 2000 and 2014**

Though engaged in issues related towards diversity and multiculturalism, Kristin Good notes in her 2009 book that the City of Richmond primarily viewed its role in the immigration process as that of a facilitator, partially due to the financial constraints faced by municipal governments (Good 2009, 183). The two committees that dealt with diversity in Richmond are the Richmond Intercultural Advisory Committee (RIAC) and the Richmond Community Services Advisory Committee (RCSAC). While the RCSAC serves as a collection of societies and not-for profit agencies that administer social services in general, RIAC serves as the primary vehicle for issues related to immigration and diversity at the city level (Carlile, Penner, and Sherlock Interview 2017). RIAC's

mandate is to “enhance intercultural harmony and strengthen intercultural co-operation in Richmond” and has a scope that includes advising City Council, performing research for council, and promoting intercultural awareness in the city, as well as bringing an annual report and a strategic plan to council for approval. While the city has a councillor serving as a liaison on RIAC, the primary role of City Council in regard to RIAC is to approve the committee’s annual report and yearly work plan (Ibid). Likewise, issues related to multiculturalism outside of RIAC’s annual report that are brought before Council may be referred to RIAC for their advice and perspective (Ibid). RIAC’s membership consists of one councillor, six citizens who are interested in enhancing intercultural harmony, four members of the RCSAC, as well as one member from School District 38, the RCMP, Richmond Health Services, and the Ministry of Children and Family Development (City of Richmond Report to Council 2002, 100). Membership was later expanded to include representation from the Richmond Seniors Advisory Committee and the Richmond Committee on Disability, as well as two youth representatives (Richmond Intercultural Advisory Committee 2009, 2).

Following its inception, RIAC developed the 2004-2010 Intercultural Strategic Plan, highlighting the committee’s objectives. In developing the plan, the committee conducted both public and stakeholder consultations between 2002 and 2003, highlighting key strategic directions to be followed by the committee over the six year period (RIAC 2004, 10). These strategic directions included addressing language barriers in the city; addressing the perception and reality of racism in the community; addressing participation gaps in municipal, provincial, federal, and stakeholder events; ensuring that

the city and local stakeholders' systems policies and planning processes are in line with the city's intercultural vision; and identifying programs and partnerships that support the integration of Richmond's youth population (Ibid, 15). During this period, RIAC was responsible for showcasing best practices amongst community agencies, exploring barriers to voting and civic engagement, and providing input on the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, the Official Community Plan update, and the Richmond Social Planning Strategy (RIAC 2012, 5). In addition, RIAC was responsible for developing the Newcomers Guide for all new Richmond Residents. Translated into eleven languages, the guide is composed of a checklist of resources that new immigrants need upon moving to Richmond, as well as community services and employment resources (City of Richmond 2015, 3; 22-23; 34-35).

The 2004-2010 Intercultural Strategic Plan also noted the increasing diversity of newcomers coming to Richmond, as well as the development of a more confident and organized aboriginal community (RIAC 2004, 4). The strategic plan noted that since 2004 there had been an increase in partnerships that developed between the city and local organizations, increasing the number of potential organizations to participate in RIAC's work. This has included an increase in immigrant serving agencies, with organizations providing complex services that RIAC views as going "beyond usual definitions of settlement" (Ibid). In 2013 RIAC provided input into the development of the Richmond's Social Development Strategy, which was developed in order to direct the city's social development agenda, including how the city works with stakeholder organizations in the field of social service provision (Richmond Intercultural Advisory Committee 2017, 6).

Notable RIAC initiatives have included developing a community dialogue to discuss and receive feedback from members of the community who normally do not participate in discussions around interculturalism, participation in an audit on the use of language on signage in the city, and providing input into training modules for city staff (City of Richmond Report to Committee 2013).

The Richmond Public Library, as Good notes, has been responsive to immigration needs, and plays an important role in settlement services (Good 2009, 73). The library provides books in ten languages, as well as weekly new immigrant orientation seminars, with information provide in English with Mandarin interpretation. In addition, they host multilingual programs and events in languages including English, Mandarin, Cantonese, Punjabi, and Tagalog. The library also serves as a point of contact for other settlement services through a web portal, connecting newcomers to the Richmond Newcomers Guide, information on ESL programs, and information on skill development and job searching (Richmond Public Library 2017). The section on job searching is quite developed, offering newcomers information on how to search for jobs and how to write resumes, with the library also offering courses designed for those that are searching for work (Ibid). The website also serves to connect newcomers with immigrant settlement organizations such as ISSofBC, MOSAIC, SUCCESS, and RMCS.

### **Municipal Policies and Initiatives Between 2014 and 2017**

In the 2017-2022 Strategic Plan, RIAC notes that the primary objectives of the committee are to continue exploring ways to align the committee's values with local stakeholders, address language and cultural barriers that interfere with building a welcoming community, and working to address the perception and reality of racism in Richmond (RIAC 2017, 7). In addition, key commitments made by RIAC are to improve resource sharing between the city and local stakeholder groups, as well as to support the training of city employees (Ibid). The strategic plan identifies that during the period during which the previous iteration of the strategic plan had been endorsed that there were changes to Richmond's ethnocultural diversity, including an increase in the Filipino population living in Richmond, the increasing prominence of the aboriginal community, and an increase in mandarin speaking Chinese, with Mandarin speakers now overtaking Cantonese speaking Chinese residents (RIAC 2017, 3)

Highlighting the city's role as providing advocacy and support for local groups and organizations, it was noted during interviews that the repatriation of settlement funding from the province to the federal level had resulted in immigrant categories, including Temporary Foreign Workers, Study Permit Holders, and Refugee Claimants, no longer being able to access English language training courses (Carlile, Penner, and Sherlock Interview, 2017). Brought to the attention of City Council by the RCSAC and RIAC, these organizations requested that the city advocate to upper levels of government that they continue funding these programs (Carlile, Penner, and Sherlock Interview, 2017; City of Richmond Report to Committee 2014, 21-22).

## LIP Initiatives

Initial membership in the Richmond LIP was based on the relationships that had been built through the Welcoming Communities Project (WCP). Launched in 2008 by the Province of British Columbia, the Welcoming Communities project targeted 51 communities in order to build local capacity for immigrant integration (Jobs Trade and Technology 2013). Following the repatriation of settlement funding to the federal government, the LIP project in Richmond was introduced as the Community Collaboration Table (CCT) with Richmond Multicultural Community Services (RMCS), an immigrant settlement organization that has existed in Richmond since 1985, acting as the contract holder and as the Secretariat, providing a project coordinator and assistant (Richmond Community Collaboration Table 2016, 8). Membership on the CCT consists of public services including the Richmond Public Library, labour and employer organizations, members representing the education field, and civil society organizations. As interviewees noted however, the bulk of CCT membership comes from the settlement service sector (Habib Interview, 2017; Carlile, Penner, and Sherlock Interview, 2017). While there is a business presence on the CCT, it is relatively minor, with Avia Employment Services, which is funded by the Province of British Columbia's WorkBC program to help job seekers find employment, serving as the key business presences on the CCT (Carlile, Penner, and Sherlock Interview, 2017). While the city does have representation on the CCT, Paul Penner, the Project Manager for Richmond's Community Social Development department, noted that the City primarily views its role on the CCT as being that of a stakeholder and a supporter (Carlile, Penner, and Sherlock

Interview, 2017). One of the fundamental differences between the two programs has been the level of funding that they have received. While the WCP provided funding for both planning and projects, under the LIP funding has been limited to planning and research, with participants providing the relevant resources necessary for the project based on the concept of shared responsibility (Richmond Community Collaboration Table 2016, 8;36). Though indirect, this can be seen as a form of downloading, with the community and civil society organizations becoming responsible for a greater portion of the CCT's funding.

The CCT has identified four primary strategy areas, focusing on immigrant employment, settlement service, community experiences, and daily living, with the mandate of the CCT being to “make Richmond an inclusive city where the needs of all are understood, valued and met through coordinated settlement services, welcoming spaces, and intercultural harmony” (Richmond Community Collaboration Table 2016, 5; 8). The structure of the CTT is divided into four subcommittees based on the four primary strategy areas in order to identify the specific needs that are required to execute CTT projects (Richmond Community Collaboration Table 2016, 8). One of the initiatives that has been undertaken by the CCT has been in the area of service mapping. Contracted by RMCS, the Social Planning and Research Council of British Columbia (SPARC BC) conducted a survey of service providers in Richmond that work with immigrants and refugees. The results of this project highlighted the needs of immigrants, as well as what aspects of city life are considered important to daily immigrant life, and identifying the existing services and immigrant serving organizations in Richmond (Richmond

Community Collaboration Table 2016, 15). This has included mapping out the physical locations of service providers to better serve newcomer communities, examining whether immigrant services were being duplicated across the city, and considering the extent to which immigrant serving agencies have the organizational capacity to deliver services (SPARC 2016, 7). This also served to identify gaps, highlighting aspects of service delivery that were considered adequate or inadequate. An example of this is in the survey's response towards English language services, which found that while ESL programs were considered to be more than adequate in meeting the needs of immigrants and newcomers, basic literacy programs were considered inadequate (SPARC 2016, 5).

In considering the CCT's focus area on settlement, it was identified that a key action area is the coordination of settlement service delivery within Richmond amongst service providers and within the newcomer community, as well as increasing opportunities for English language learning opportunities in Richmond. In the area of employment, the objectives of the CTT include working to streamline the job search process and make it more accessible for immigrants, create awareness around labour market demands as they relate to immigrants and convey them to both immigrants and employers, support newcomers in their professional development by creating opportunities to connect newcomers to employers, and expand CTT membership to include a greater number of businesses and employers. In the field of building a diverse and inclusive community life, the objective of the CCT is to build on existing municipal plans in order to address community integration, work so that newcomers and immigrants can connect with the community and have greater access to community life, and



strengthen the relationship between the newcomer community and public institutions. In the priority area of providing support for key aspects daily living, CTT objectives include ensuring that newcomers and immigrants are supported in their search for adequate housing, supporting them in their transport needs, and ensuring that immigrants have support in accessing the BC health care system.

### **Urban Discourse Between 2000 and 2013**

As Kristin Good notes in her 2009 book, Richmond developed the first iteration of its intercultural advisory committee, the Advisory Committee on Intercultural Relations (ACIR) and Co-ordinating Committee on Ethnic Relations, with the city recognizing the need to balance integration with respect for diversity (Ibid, 70-72). Following the disbanding of the ACIR in 2000, RIAC was established to complete the projects that had been left incomplete by ACIR (City of Richmond Report to Council 2002, 4). The intercultural model was built into RIAC's mandate, with RIAC's terms of reference noting that the purpose of the committee is to "enhance intercultural harmony and strengthen intercultural co-operation in Richmond" (RIAC 2008, 1).

In conducting a document scan with NVIVO, the prominence of intercultural dialogue between 2000 and 2013 is supported. Scanning RIAC's annual reports from the initial proposal for RIAC in 2002 until 2013, along with the City of Richmond's 2004-2010 Intercultural Strategic Plan, 2012-2015 Intercultural Strategic Plan, and 2013-2022 Social Development Strategy, "Intercultural" was the third most commonly used word

with 91 instances, shortly behind “RIAC” and “City” (Appendix 1). Comparatively, “Diversity” placed 28th with 19 instances, with “Integration” placing 35th with 17 instances. However, “Multicultural” and “Inclusion” did not appear to be in the top 50 words most frequently used in these documents (Ibid). In terms of the context of its usage, the words intercultural, diversity, and multicultural, where it does appear, are all used in a positive manner. There does not appear to be a negative connotation associated with any particular word in the documents scanned.

### **Urban Discourse Between 2014 and 2017**

Following the introduction of the LIP, there was only a minor change in the words used in city documents. While “Intercultural” was still prominent with 393 usages, it had fallen to the 8th most commonly used word, with RIAC as the 6th most common word with 459 instances. However, while “city” and “community” were the most common and second most common words used respectively, neither “multicultural” nor “inclusion” were listed among the 50 most frequently used words. While “diversity” appeared with relative frequency, with 130 instances the word, it ultimately placed 46th overall.

In discussing the role of discourse with senior civil servants in Richmond, it is noticeable, given the word’s prominence in City of Richmond documents, that when asked about what words are used most frequently to discuss the city’s ethnocultural diversity, that interculturalism was not cited as one of the dominant words (Carlile, Penner, and Sherlock Interview, 2017). It was explained to me that interculturalism is the

preferred term with RIAC, noting that this stems from the view that immigration and integration should encourage interaction between members of different groups, and not settle for separate enclaves or isolated cultures (Ibid). While diversity and access and inclusion were identified as being used colloquially, interculturalism appears to remain the preferred nomenclature in the City's formal documents and policies. Like in the 2000-2013 section of the discourse analysis, all of the words that are used to describe immigration in a normative fashion are used in a positive context, with no indication in the text itself that particular phrases are negatively.

### **Discourse on the LIP**

The CCT documents deviate from the discourse found in city materials, scarcely using languages that defines immigration in normative terms. Unlike previously examined periods of discourse “interculturalism” does not appear in the CCT's top 50 most used words. While “Integration” appeared 45 times, “diversity” “multiculturalism” and “inclusion” were rarely used. The dominant words used were oriented towards the four keys areas identified as priorities of the LIP's, including employment, settlement, community experience, and daily living supports, which include access to health care and transportation. In the LIP documents “settlement” was the third most frequently used word with 147 uses, “health” appeared 65 times, “employment” appeared 53 times, and “community” was the second most used word with 559 instances. In her interview, Sanzida Habib noted that language training programs were one of the areas that the CCT

has identified as significant (Habib Interview, 2017). This is supported by the document scan, which identified the word “language” as appearing 60 times.

What this suggests is that the language used on the CCT has been driven largely by the community research project rather than by the dominant narratives that appeared during the examination of municipal documents. This is again consistent with Sanzida Habib’s interview, in which she identified the priorities of LIP as being fairly based on the grassroots research performed by the LIP (Habib Interview, 2017). In addition to being formed through community based research, Habib noted that the CCT consulted newcomers in the development of the LIPs strategic plan (Ibid). Likewise, long-standing residents of Richmond were consulted to ensure that their perspectives were included in the development of the strategic plan, reflecting an intercultural approach to immigrant integration.

### **Richmond’s Regime and the Role of the Municipality**

What is evident from looking at the documents and the interviews is the extent that an urban regime has developed, and been maintained, in Richmond. Although Good’s 2009 book identified the presence of a regime, the documents and interviews highlight how this has been propagated and maintained by demonstrating how the relationships that were developed between RIAC, civil society groups, and the business community, have continued into the present, with the role municipality remaining consistent as well. While Good’s interviews with municipal leaders identified that the

city viewed itself as a facilitator and an enabler in the field of immigration, this does not appear to have significantly changed, with the city identifying its role in the immigration process as providing support and assistance (Good 2009, 183; Carlile, Penner, and Sherlock Interview, 2017). Likewise, interculturalism appears to have remained the dominant normative approach in the city during this time period.

Keeping in mind Mossberger's four criteria, we can see how Richmond's governance structure meets the criteria for an urban regime. The first criteria, that partnerships exist between government and non-government groups including the business community, is demonstrable due to the ongoing relationships that exist between government and civil society organizations in Richmond. These relationships exist through both formal and informal relationships, with groups like RIAC and the CCT developing out of existing relationships between the city and RMCS. While interviewees did note the difficulty in developing partnerships with the business community on the CCT, these interviews suggest that the municipality does work with the business community and the Chamber of Commerce in a supportive capacity on issues related towards immigration and diversity. This can be seen in the 2012-2015 Intercultural Strategic Plan, in which RIAC identified local business stakeholders as being active in addressing language and cultural barriers through the encouragement of ESL classes across the community, and in the continued development, distribution, and funding of the Newcomers Guide (Richmond Intercultural Advisory Committee 2011, 12). This was reiterated in the 2017-2022 Intercultural Guide as well, where the business sector was identified as an active stakeholder on several initiatives, including work on an outreach

plan to engage Richmond's corporate business sector in the process of immigrant integration (Richmond Intercultural Advisory Committee 2017, 14). Likewise, while the Richmond Chamber of Commerce does not play a direct role on the CCT, they do have a program aimed at integrating Mandarin and English speaking businesses in Richmond (Carlile, Penner, and Sherlock 2017).

The second criteria, collaboration based on a social production model of power, is evident in the extent that objectives are achieved through governance arrangements as opposed to a strictly governmental approach. While the municipality has a presence on the CCT and RIAC, it does not explicitly direct them. A common theme amongst the documents analyzed is the extent that they praise cooperation between the government, civil society groups, and the community at large in the development of policy objectives. This is built into RIAC's principles, which identifies the committee as following a "community development approach by involving those affected in resolving issues and identifying opportunities" (City of Richmond Report to Council 2002, 99). This has been a consistent theme for RIAC, with the 2017-2022 work plan noting that in order for Richmond to achieve its intercultural vision that it will have to work in partnership with community groups, including "federal and provincial governments, institutions, agencies, educational organizations, the private sector, community, associations, the media, religious and cultural groups, and the general public" and highlights the need for cooperation rather than competition amongst stakeholders (Richmond Intercultural Advisory Committee 2017, 1; 4). Likewise, the CCT identifies increasing partnerships in order to leverage resources and community assets as being within the organization's

mandate (CCT Terms of Reference 2015, 1-2). This is in line with the main objective of the LIP as outlined by CIC (now Immigrant, Refugees and Citizenship Canada) to “Create collaborative strategies which align with broader goals of immigrant integration and address community needs” (Ibid). As the evidence from documents and interviews highlights however, this aim of creating collaborative strategies and relationships pre-dates the LIP in Richmond.

The third criteria of an urban regime is that identifiable policy agendas emerge between members of the governance network. While this is most noticeable in the case of the CCT, which has developed concrete policy agendas as a result of the development of the Strategic Plan, this has also been demonstrated through the advancement of private-public projects in Richmond. In an example that was provided to me during the interviews, RCSAC approached the city in order to pursue the common goal of supporting ESL services following the repatriation of funding to the federal level (Carlile, Penner, and Sherlock 2017). As Clarence Stone highlights, the ability of regimes to remain cohesive depends on selective incentives to promote regime cohesion (Stone 1989, 212-213). In the case of Richmond, this manifests in how each participant benefits from access to the immigration governance network, and the resources that are collectively pooled for the advancement of CTT initiatives. At the municipal level, the issue of immigration is noted as being too significant to Richmond for the city to ignore, with the city ensuring that existing services facilitate successful integration (Carlile, Penner, and Sherlock 2017). Though no member of the business community was available for comment, my interviews indicated that while the business community plays

a small role on the CCT, that businesses do participate in issues related towards immigrations more broadly.

The fourth criteria, that regimes exhibit a long standing pattern of cooperation, has been summarized in this chapter's demonstration that the early regime identified by Kristin Good has maintained itself following the repatriation of settlement funding to the federal level, and that this has been utilized as the basis for the CCT. The RMCS's relationships with both civil society groups and the municipality further demonstrates a long-standing pattern of cooperation that has developed in the city. Interview evidence notes that part of the justification for having the RMCS act as the LIP contractor was the longstanding relationships that were built with civil society groups inside the city, and the extent that they have been able to leverage these relationships on the CCT. These relationships exist both informally and formally, with groups like SUCCESS having ties to RMCS through their joint presence on both the CCT and the RCSAC, and through years of relationship building. As the CCT was formed by the RMCS, a significant portion of their members were ultimately recruited by RMCS themselves, with Habib's interview demonstrating how the role of civil society groups has been a consistent feature of Richmond's immigrant governance network (Habib Interview, 2017). Likewise, there is overlapping membership between RIAC and the RCSAC, including municipal representation on both committees. While the current membership of the CCT has been brought together through the use of federal funding, the informal networks that connect them have been around for a significantly longer period of time.



Looking at how the urban regime has influenced the development of its LIP, the role of RMCS, and the relationships that the RMCS has develop in the city, have been crucial to the development of the CCT. As Sanzida Habib highlighted in her interview, the RMCS has been active in Richmond for over 20 years, and has utilized the connection that it has made during this time in the development of CCT membership (Habib Interview, 2017). This has included a long term partnership with the City of Richmond, including Richmond's Access and Inclusion services, and groups such as the Richmond Public Library. Within the municipality, Habib identified Allan Hill, the city's diversity program coordinator, as the key point of contact for RMCS during this period, though he left the City shortly before interviews commenced for this research project (Habib Interview, 2017).

One of the key aspects of interculturalism that can be seen at the local level is in the 2004-2010 Intercultural Strategic Plan, which highlighted the promotion of English as the common language in Richmond, and praised the pride and acceptance of Canadian values and laws, and participation in public life (RIAC 2004, 4). These themes were repeated in the 2017-2022 Intercultural Strategic Plan, where the reduction of language and cultural barriers were viewed as being a key part of RIAC's strategic directions (Richmond Intercultural Advisory Committee 2017, 4). In considering the integration of immigrants in Richmond, the 2017-2022 Plan notes the need for the city to work with local stakeholders to build cultural bridges and reduce barriers, and engage with the business sector to build cultural capacity by informing and educating on interculturalism (Richmond Intercultural Advisory Committee 2017, 9). Unlike assimilationist discourse

models, the City is not taking a neutral approach towards immigration, and actively promotes diversity (Tossuti 2012, 611). At the same time however, while the discourse in Richmond promotes the recognition of cultural differences in the public sphere, it is not oriented towards the multicultural model of a mosaic of cultures, with the documents often rejecting multiculturalism as being static, in comparison with a dynamism of interculturalism. The focus on common reference points and establishing one integrated community is consistent with Christian Poirier's view on interculturalism, as he notes in his consideration of and the importance of Montreal's model of interculturalism, with Montreal's municipal government engaging in a publicity campaign to promote a shared identity between different ethnocultural groups within the city, using their shared identities as Montrealer's to establish a focal point for both long-standing residents and newcomers (Poirier 2004, 8; 16).

What is notable is that despite not producing documents that use the word "intercultural" it is evident from Sanzida Habib's interview, as well as the fact that both long standing residents and immigrants were consulted in the development of the CCT Strategic Plan, that the intercultural framework that has developed in Richmond has influenced the LIP, and has influenced how priorities were developed (Habib Interview 2017). Specifically, Habib commented that "we also did some survey with not just newcomers, but also with Richmond residents, so long timers as well, so that we understand both the newcomers' needs [and] also long-timers' perspectives on newcomer issues. Because it's not just a newcomer issue, right, we all need to be involved" (Ibid). Though not using the term intercultural directly, this is consistent with Tossutti's

conception of interculturalism as maintaining common reference points between immigrants and the host society (Tossutti 2012, 612). It is notable that the CCT's guiding principles have continued to include the "promotion of intercultural harmony" a phrase that has similarly been part of the RIAC's mandate (Richmond Community Collaboration Table 2016, 8; City of Richmond Report to Committee 2016, 121).

This distinction between the normative and policy dimensions of urban governance is critical in considering the role of the municipality in steering the urban regime. Though the CCT's priorities have been developed through grassroots research, the use of an intercultural focus in the development of the Strategic Plan indicates that the city has had an influence on how the CCT has developed their guiding principles. As Good notes, the use of interculturalism as a normative framework was a deliberate choice by RIAC, and quickly became the dominant framework in Richmond following the committee's creation in 2002 (Good 2009, 71-72). As Jon Pierre highlights, the urban governance model can be seen as a normative model of governance, reflecting, among other things, different sets of norms, beliefs, and practices (Pierre 1999, 375). Continuing with the idea that governance can be applied to normative perspectives, we can see the extent that interculturalism has become the dominant normative framework through the intentional efforts of the municipality (Pierre 2000, 3). Pierre rightly notes that the normative and organizational dimensions of urban governance are separate, supporting the idea that not only do municipalities develop unique normative structures, but that the institutions of government contribute to their development (Pierre 1999, 390).

Keeping this in mind, we can see how the intercultural normative framework, identified and supported by the municipal government, has been maintained on the CCT, even if the discourse is largely developed around community issues. Looking at how the municipality steers the CCT, it appears that there is little direct steering in terms of setting the CCT's policy agenda, with Paul Penner noting that the municipality maintains the role of stakeholder and supporter on the LIP that they take inside the city at large (Carlile, Penner, and Sherlock 2017). Likewise, while Habib noted that the City is just one of the partners on the CCT, it has been able to contribute on particular issues, highlighting specifically the role that the City played in providing training for service providers (Habib Interview 2017). However, outside of this, the city has primarily acted as a supporter. In discussing the interactions that take place between the city and the CCT, Paul Penner noted that as the CCT has conducted community consultations and community research, that the findings are shared with the city, making them aware of the issues and priorities of the CCT (Carlile, Penner, and Sherlock Interview 2017). At the same time, a significant portion of the CCT's membership is composed of members who sit on the RCSAC, ultimately meaning that, as Penner put it "you get the same people at different tables, but they're all thinking about similar issues, and different ways of approaching it" (Ibid). As Penner noted however, it is too early to determine the extent that the community research function of the CCT has influenced municipal policies (Ibid).

## **Conclusion**

Looking at the documents and interviews, it is evident that there is a regime in Richmond that has dominated the city's immigration and diversity initiatives. Through both formal and informal relationships, including membership in the RCSAC and RIAC, private-public partnerships have become the norm in Richmond. In developing the CCT, the dominant discourse has been geared towards the issues that have been identified through grassroots research and community consultation. While the CCT documents indicate that the city's dominant normative framework of interculturalism has been imbued in the development of the CCT, its focus has remained on the issues identified in the research. Likewise, while the maintenance of the intercultural framework indicates that the municipality has steered the urban regime, it has primarily done so through the maintenance of normative values (Carlile, Penner, and Sherlock Interview 2017)

## **Chapter 4: Multiculturalism, Diversity, and the Leadership of the Surrey's Municipal Government**

Lying between the Fraser Valley and the US border, Surrey is a city that has been transformed over the last thirty years from a quiet suburb into one of Metro Vancouver's largest cities. With a population of nearly 500,000, Surrey has not only become one of the region's most populous cities, but one of the largest destinations for new immigrants and refugees coming into the province (Surrey LIP 2017, 3). Though the largest immigrant group in Surrey is a prominent South Asian community, the city is also home to large Filipino and Chinese communities (Statistics Canada 2017). Likewise, the Syrian refugee crisis saw Surrey become the recipient of over five percent of all Government Assisted Refugees (GARs) coming into Canada, and more than forty percent of those coming to BC (Surrey LIP 2017, 10). In order to consider how the governance network in Surrey has evolved over time, and to ensure a comparative perspective with Richmond is maintained, this chapter will begin by looking at municipal policies and initiatives between 2000 and 2014, before looking at the period between 2014 and 2017 following the development of the LIP. From there, policies and initiatives undertaken by the Surrey LIP will be looked at, before beginning NVIVO scans of documents from each of these areas in order to identify commonly used words and themes during each period. Finally, this chapter will consider whether Surrey has a regime, the regime's composition, and how the introduction of the LIP has influenced its development. This will include an analysis of how the municipality has steered the regime, and the role that it has played on the LIP more broadly.

Ultimately, this chapter will demonstrate that the introduction of the Welcoming Communities Project in 2011 has influenced discourse at the local level by emphasizing discourse towards diversity rather than multiculturalism, and that this change has been maintained following the introduction of the LIP. Comparatively, the language used in the LIP documents focus on the issues that have been identified through the LIP's research as being important to immigrants and new Canadians, and as such tends to eschew normative language. In terms of influencing the urban regime's agenda, the municipality has been successful in using the LIP's research capacities to develop their own coordinated policies and initiatives, while also exerting influence on the interests of LIP members. By establishing the City of Surrey's role on the LIP, and in the urban regime more broadly, this chapter will ultimately allow for a comparative framework to be used alongside the City of Richmond's LIP and governance network in Chapter 5.

### **Municipal Policies and Initiatives Between 2000 and 2014**

In *Municipalities and Multiculturalism*, Kristin Good's survey of Surrey's municipal policies and initiatives related to immigration and diversity found that while the city was responsive to the concerns of immigrants and new Canadians that there was a sense amongst community leaders that the city had implemented their policies in a superficial way (Good 2009, 75). A survey of city documents shows that this began to change following 2006 with the development of the Multicultural Advisory Committee, now called the Diversity Advisory Committee (DAC), which was established with the

mandate to “enhance and celebrate diversity and inclusion” in Surrey (City of Surrey 2012, 1). The role of the Diversity Committee is primarily to identify and research the needs of Surrey’s diverse population, provide advice on city policies and programs, and review matters that are referred to them by Council, as well as making recommendations to the City (Ibid). Likewise, the committee is tasked with reviewing the programs, policies, and initiatives of other organizations in order to determine how the City can enhance them to better serve Surrey’s diverse population (City of Surrey 2017a, 17). Membership on the DAC includes two members of Council with one member serving as the chair, one school board trustee, and between twelve and fourteen volunteer members who are City of Surrey residents from diverse backgrounds (Ibid). Shortly after the creation of the DAC, the City reinstated the Social Planning Advisory Committee (Now the Social Policy Advisory Committee, the SPAC) with membership including one member from Simon Fraser University, one member from Kwantlen Polytechnic University, a member of city staff, and a member of city council appointed by the Mayor, as well as nine members from the community (City of Surrey 2007, 3). While the SPAC’s mandate and role do not explicitly reference immigration, diversity, or multiculturalism, themes of the committee have included issues related to new immigrants and refugees, and where programs and services are accessible to newcomers.

In considering the expansion of the city’s role in the field of immigration, the 2006-2007 Surrey Social Plan is notable in its effort provide strategic direction in five priority areas, including Community Development and Diversity (City of Surrey 2007, 2). This plan included a multi-year budget to enable the city to bring the departments of



Parks, Recreation, Culture, and Surrey Library together in order to better reach out to Surrey's diverse community (Ibid). This outreach included hiring diverse staff in Surrey Parks, Recreation, and Culture that can speak multiple languages including Punjabi, Hindi, Cantonese and Spanish, in response to the city's observation that there was a noticeable increase in participation from Surrey's ethnocultural communities (Ibid, 12). At the same time, Parks, Recreation and Culture hired a half-time Intercultural Outreach Coordinator in order to research and develop a list of local agencies and individuals that serve Surrey's diverse community, while creating partnerships in order to develop community events (Ibid, 13). The Social Plan also supported the idea of City Council acknowledging and celebrating five cultural events a year, including Vaisakhi, National Aboriginal Day, Christmas, and Diwali (Ibid, 14).

When the Province of British Columbia implemented the Welcoming Communities Project (WCP) in 2011, the City became the lead agency on Surrey's WCP, and co-chaired the program with Anita Huberman, the CEO of the Surrey Board of Trade. Key WCP projects have included a Refugee Myth-Busting Campaign, a Welcoming Spaces Project, hosting Service Provider Events, Youth Engagement Projects, Employer and Business Education and Awareness programs, as well as a program called Dialogues Inspired By Cooking and Food (Surrey Welcoming Communities Project 2014, 2). Key objectives for the WCP were laid out by the British Columbia Ministry of Jobs, Tourism and Skills Training, and were primarily geared towards developing community partnerships, improving access to community services and welcoming work spaces, as well as increasing awareness around issues related

towards immigrant integration (Surrey Welcoming Communities Action Plan 2013, 2-3). Membership on the WCP consisted of representatives from local government, including the Surrey School District and Surrey Libraries, as well as from immigrant serving agencies such as SUCCESS, PICS, and ISSofBC. Shortly before the WCP's program ended, Councillor Villeneuve took over the position of co-chair from Aileen Murphy, creating the leadership composition between the City and the Board of Trade that currently exists on the LIP. The leadership position that the city has taken on the WCP is notable given Good's observation in 2009 that the city had primarily developed relationships with "mainstream agencies" such as Options Community Services Society, as opposed to organizations that specifically serve immigrants and new Canadians (Good 2009, 77-78).

As Good notes, Surrey Libraries made changes in the early 2000s in order to increase access to library services among newcomer groups (Good 2009, 76). This included introducing a Multicultural Outreach Librarian, establishing multilingual collections, and placing advertisements in ethnic newspapers (Good 2009, 76-77). Currently, the Surrey Libraries website includes services for newcomers, information about settlement services, IELTS test practice, an ESL book club, and events for newcomers to practice their English language skills in a casual environment (Surrey Public Library 2017). Likewise, the library also offers translation services at all of its facilities. In addition to these initiatives, the library has maintained a presence on both the WCP and Surrey LIP.

## **Municipal Policies and Initiatives Between 2014 and 2017**

In considering the initiatives that followed the repatriation of settlement funding from the provincial to the federal level, key initiatives from the city have included renewed attempts to get the federal government to eliminate the Refugee Transportation Loan Repayment program, which requires refugees coming to Canada to repay the costs of medical exams, travel documents, and transportation to Canada. In 2015, the City of Surrey put forward a resolution to terminate the program to the Union of BC Municipalities, and later to the FCM (City of Surrey 2017b). As Councillor LeFranc noted, the initiative was brought forward by Councillor Judy Villeneuve and was supported by the city in an acknowledgement that the people who were affected by the loan repayment program were often the most impoverished and unable to repay these loans (LeFranc Interview 2017). Councillor Hayne likewise noted that City Council is united in their opposition the program, saying that “That sort of thing is just ridiculous. We’re going to invite refugees to come to Canada, then we’re going to pay for them to get here. It seems to me to be unconscionable that we’re going to then hold out our hand and demand that they pay that back.” (Hayne Interview 2017). While the city has been advocating for the elimination of loans since 2009, my interview with Patrick Donahoe highlighted how this initiative has gained momentum in recent years, with advocacy for removing the loans gaining support from civil society organizations (City of Surrey 2016a, 20-21; Donahoe Interview 2017). In particular, Donahoe noted that while it did not occur as a LIP initiative, that members of the LIP have individually advocated to

upper levels of government to eliminate the refugee travel loan repayment program (Ibid).

In 2016 the City of Surrey began work on the Sustainability Charter 2.0, which was designed to provide a 40 year vision of sustainability and build off of the original charter which was developed in 2008 to serve as the city's overarching policy document (City of Surrey 2016b, 10). Amongst the plan's eight themes includes a goal of greater inclusion, noting that Surrey is a City that acknowledges and celebrates diversity, supports new immigrants and refugees, and wants to support them in the settlement and integration process (Ibid, 19). The social plan notes the need to work with the LIP in the development of their immigrant and refugee integration strategic plans in order to promote the social and economic integration of newcomers (Ibid, 20). Councillor LeFranc particularly noted how the refresh from the original 2008 Sustainability Charter had included diversity, agreeing that the purpose was not to create a particular policy, but highlighting that diversity is embedded in the city (LeFranc Interview 2017). The charter was updated with the input of not only city staff, but from civil society groups, noting that the organizations that were involved in the consultation process would be necessary in the implementation of the charter. Ultimately, over 160 community stakeholders were consulted in the process (City of Surrey 2016b, 57).

### **LIP Initiatives**

The development of the LIP was based on the Welcoming Communities Project, including having the initial membership drawn from the WCP, with SPAC noting that wherever possible that the work of the LIP should be built on the work of the WCP (SPAC 2014a). As the LIP's 2014 Engaged and Inclusive newsletter notes, while the WCP was primarily project based, the LIP is strategy oriented, supporting a "coordinated, comprehensive and strategic approach to immigration, settlement and integration that works for Surrey" (Surrey LIP 2014). A common sentiment found amongst interviewees and amongst scanned documents is the extent to which the WCP set the foundation for the LIP, with Councillor LeFranc noting that the research conducted during the WCP was used as the base of the LIP's own research projects (LeFranc Interview 2017). In addition, the Surrey LIP established the Surrey Immigrant Advisory Roundtable, noting the need for representation and input from immigrants and refugees in the research and planning process (Surrey LIP 2016, 8). Unlike other LIPs, the Surrey LIP has noted that its work will be guided by not one but two strategic plans, the Surrey Immigrant Integration Strategy and the Surrey Refugee Integration Strategy.

One of the key tasks of the Surrey LIP has been to research the needs and services that are available to immigrants in Surrey, a process which ultimately produced a Service Mapping Project, an Immigrant Integration Research Project, and a Labour Market Research Project. The service mapping project was oriented towards identifying applicable services, as well as identifying areas where services overlap, or where gaps existed. This includes an analysis of where services are located, and how accessible they are for immigrants and refugees. The Immigrant Integration Research Project focused on

conducting community research in order to understand the attitudes and perceptions of newcomers and long standing residents towards immigration and diversity in Surrey, which included conducting seven focus groups, a random telephone survey of 301 Surrey residents, and a literature review of key documents (Surrey LIP 2015b, 1). The results of these surveys ultimately found that there is a perspective amongst Surrey residents and immigrants that the community is a welcoming place, in large part due to the multicultural character of the city (Ibid, 2). The Labour Market Research Project found that key barriers faced by immigrants include a lack of technical English language skills, and a lack of understanding of Canadian workplace culture (Surrey LIP 2015a, 57). The project found that while most employers in Surrey held workplace values that supported immigration that they did not actively recruit immigrants, with smaller employers lacking the resources necessary to recruit, train, and retain immigrants (Ibid). Likewise, employers were often unaware of programs that were offered by governments and immigrant serving organizations that would allow them to connect with resources to hire and train immigrants.

The key strategic directions that the LIP has identified are to increase access to services, increase participation amongst immigrants in city life, increase immigrant access to meaningful employment, support immigrant youths, and solidify and expand on the LIP's membership in order to develop sustainable leadership (Surrey LIP 2016). In the direction of increasing access to services, while the Service Mapping Project noted the existence of 235 no-cost immigrant services, a significant portion of these services were deemed inadequate by a survey of service leaders, including a lack of access to

English language training services (Surrey LIP 2016, 27). Likewise, the location of services and a lack of sufficient public transportation were identified as barriers to immigrant access. In the direction of establishing an Engaged Community, the LIP cited the objective of increasing awareness in the community of the effects of racial discrimination, as well as increase opportunities for newcomers to participate in leadership roles in volunteer positions (Ibid, 29). In considering the objective of increasing the employment rate amongst immigrants, the LIP set the goal of coordinating and promoting connections between ISOs, immigrants, and employers, as well as increasing mentorships, Co-ops, and work experience programs in order to increase economic integration among new immigrants (Ibid, 31). Noting the proportion of immigrant and refugee youths in the city, the LIP highlighted the need to support the city's education system in order to further integration, as well as increase opportunities for immigrant youths to access employment services and gain Canadian work experience (Ibid, 33). The final strategic direction, sustainable leadership, notes the need to coordinate and sustain the operations of the LIP, as well as secure and diversify LIP funding in order to ensure the sustainability of the LIP and its activities, with Surrey's status as significant receiver of immigrants and GARs being a significant rationale for maintaining the LIP's activities (Ibid, 35).

The Surrey LIP's structure is unique in British Columbia, as Surrey is one of the only municipalities in the province, along with Vancouver, that has taken a lead role on the LIP (City of Surrey 2015, 2). The LIP is not only co-chaired by Surrey Councillor Judy Villeneuve, but the city also provides the project staff, including a Coordinator and

a Senior Social Planner (Surrey LIP 2016, 9). Likewise, the strong presence of the business community is unique as well, with the CEO of the Surrey Board of Trade Anita Huberman acting as a Co-chair along with Councillor Villeneuve. As Olga Shcherbyna, the Surrey LIP coordinator, noted in this position Huberman has helped the LIP to conduct outreach to members of the business community, including conducting a survey of employers in Surrey (Shcherbyna Interview 2017). In a similar vein, Patrick Donahoe noted the role that Huberman has played in bringing people to the table, and in particular that she has gained the support of the business community for LIP initiatives (Donahoe Interview 2017). Having the business community play such a prominent role in the field of local immigration policy is rare, as while the business community is often active in immigration recruitment at the upper levels of government, they are normally less heavily involved in settlement at the local level (Horak 2012, 357). As the 2016-2017 Surrey LIP Year in Review highlights, the sector dialogues, which were designed to help close the gap between employers and immigrant job seekers, was not only a joint initiative between the LIP and the Surrey Board of Trade but was largely driven by Huberman (Surrey LIP 2017, 9). In addition to the city and business community, the Surrey LIP includes immigrant serving agencies such as MOSAIC, SUCCESS, and PICS, as well organizations such as Kwantlen University and the Fraser Health Authority.

#### **NVIVO Scan 2000 and 2014**

Though the document analysis included searching for documents as far back as 2000, as Kristin Good notes the city did not have a separate advisory committee related to



diversity until 2007, with the city's most important initiatives being developed by agencies that deliver services such as Surrey Parks and Recreation (Good 2009, 75-76). An examination of municipal documents from 2000 and 2014, including minutes from the DAC as well as the City of Surrey's Social Plan, identified "multicultural" to be the dominant word used to describe Surrey's normative approach to immigration and diversity, appearing 390 times (Appendix 2). Ultimately, this was the tenth most frequently used word, with "diversity" placing sixteenth with 297 instances.

Comparatively, the word "intercultural" did not appear more than six times per document scanned, with "inclusion" appearing only seventy times. The five most frequently used words are, respectively, Surrey, Community, City, Committee, and Cultural. It is noticeable that while the word multicultural was used frequently during this time period, its use declined rapidly beginning in 2011. While interviewees did not speak to an intentional shift away from multiculturalism, it is notable that at the same time there was a corresponding increase in the use of the word diversity in municipal documents.

### **NVIVO Scan 2014 and 2017**

Following the repatriation of settlement funds and the development of the LIP, there was a shift in the language used in the city. Though "diversity" was still used, it had increased in prominence, being the 7th most commonly used word. "Multicultural", however, was no longer one of the fifty most commonly used words with only twelve instances, appearing even less frequently than intercultural. While "Inclusion" was used and appeared in most documents, it was used scarcely, at most seven times in the same

document. The word “refugee” likewise appears 358 times as the sixth most frequently used word.

This shift away from multiculturalism and towards diversity is supported by interview evidence, with a common theme being the sense that multiculturalism has become an outdated term. The terms “inclusive” and “diversity” were likewise identified by City Councillors as being frequently used in the city. As Councillor Bruce Hayne elaborated

*“Multiculturalism seems to be used less and less, and so when we celebrate, we celebrate our diversity, we don’t necessarily celebrate our multiculturalism...and diversity can be more inclusive than other things, that when we celebrate diversity, we’re celebrating not only multi-ethnicity but we’ve, we’re celebrating different types of families, were supporting LGBTQ”* (Hayne Interview 2017).

In another interview, Councillor Vera LaFrank talked about the need for social and economic inclusion in the city, agreeing that multiculturalism has become an outdated term in Surrey (LaFrank Interview, 2017). By the time the LIP had been introduced, diversity had become the dominant word used to describe Surrey’s ethnocultural diversity.

### **NVIVO Scan of LIP Documents**

Unlike documents from the city, there did not appear to be any key words that relate to normative perspectives on immigration in LIP documents. While intercultural, multicultural, diversity, and inclusion did not appear amongst the top 50 words, “Integration” appeared 154 times as the eighth most commonly used word. In a similar vein as the 2014-2017 documents, “refugee” was a frequently used word, placing fifth at 260 instances. “Services” appeared 246 times as the sixth most frequently used word, and employment was the eighteenth most used word at 116 uses. While services has appeared during the 2000-2014 and 2014-2017 periods as the 14th and 4th most frequently used word respectively, its use in LIP documents is notable as it corresponds with one of the LIP's key strategic directions. Likewise, the prominence of the words employment, refugee, and integration, correspond with the LIP's key research areas as well.

## **Analysis**

Although Good demonstrated that a regime existed in Surrey in her 2009 book, the interview and document data collected for this project suggested that the introduction of the WCP in 2011 has had a significant impact on the development of the regime. In bringing together the municipality and civil society groups that specifically offer services to immigrants, as well as the business community, the WCP appears to have acted as a critical juncture for the Surrey regime, which has continued onto the LIP. Though none of the participants interviewed were able to speak to the development of the WCP, there is a correlation between the development of the WCP and the city's deepening involvement in the regime. In terms of the normative values that inform the regime, multiculturalism

has become less frequently used in the document analysis, with interviewees confirming that it is seen as an outdated concept in Surrey. The shift away from multiculturalism is notable in municipal documents, with the municipality's discourse shifting towards diversity, and the LIP documents indicating that their discourse has focused on key issues that have been uncovered through the LIP's community research. In keeping with the concept of the WCP acting as a critical juncture, we can likewise see how the normative framework in Surrey began to change from multiculturalism to diversity following the WCP's introduction.

In considering Mossberger and Stoker's four criteria for an urban regime, it is clear that Surrey's immigration governance structure qualifies as a regime. The first criteria, that partnerships be drawn from both government and nongovernmental sources, is demonstrated at both the level of the LIP and in the structure of Surrey's urban governance network more broadly. Though several of the organizations that are on the LIP do not sit on either the SPAC and the DAC, following the development of WCP the frequency with which these organizations have worked in conjunction with the city appears to have increased. Notable examples of this include a January 2015 meeting of the DAC in which the City of Surrey Diversity & Inclusion Coordinator noted the importance of working in partnership with OPTIONS, DIVERSEcity, SUCCESS and PICS in order to implement settlement services in city recreation centres, and a March 2014 meeting of SPAC in which the committee heard from a representative from PICS on the development of the Surrey Interfaith Community Inquiry Project, and the role that unease around religious diversity plays in promoting unease around cultural diversity

(DAC 2015c; SPAC 2014b). As Patrick Donahoe's commentary notes, the leadership that was demonstrated on the WCP was fundamental in developing the relationships that exist within the LIP to the point that they are at today. While the WCP began with only the Board of Trade representing the business community, LIP membership has expanded to include the Immigrant Employment Council of BC and VanCity Bank. Likewise, the collaboration between the municipal and community organizations in the update of the Sustainability Charter 2.0 services further highlights the relationships that exist between government and non-governmental actors in Surrey's governance network. In terms of establishing relationships on the LIP, Olga Shcherbyna notes that the municipality has been able to acquire the trust of the organizations on the LIP due to its perceived neutrality in addressing the needs of service providers, and in the municipality's ability to utilize previously established networks (Shcherbyna Interview 2017).

The second criteria, that collaboration is based on a social production model of power, is demonstrated through the constructive development of both the LIP and the municipality's policy priorities. Both Patrick Donahoe and Olga Shcherbyna note that the LIP is led through cooperation rather than through a directive approach from government. This extends beyond the LIP as well, with Donahoe noting that

*"To me it's like Surrey is not run by anything even resembling a white elite...And I just love that we have this Canadian dream type of community that's so multifaceted, that is running itself, and is running, I mean they're united by a crisis a number of times now around youth and gang violence and things like that...But there is no sense that*

*somebody else should be leading...to my mind. And we appreciate this, and we know we get heard.”* (Donahoe Interview 2017)

The collaborative nature of the LIP is further demonstrated by the development of common priorities through the Immigrant and Refugee Integration Strategies, with the Immigrant Integration Strategy in particular noting that the implementation of the strategy, while monitored by the LIP’s project team, will ultimately require the participation of key stakeholder groups in order to achieve key objectives (Surrey LIP 2016, 36). Given the importance of the business community in regime politics due to economic constraints that local governments and local organizations face (Mossberger 2009, 42) the prominent role of the Surrey Board of Trade as co-chair of both the WCP and the LIP is notable. As Councillor LeFranc highlighted, not only has the Board of Trade been active on the LIP, but they have been proactive in advocating for services for local immigrants, and advocating for policy changes at National Board of Trade events in areas related to immigrant settlement (LeFranc Interview 2017). One of the areas of the immigration field that the business community provides support for on the LIP is in terms of employment and economic integration, an area that has been identified as a key policy priority through the LIP’s research initiatives (Surrey LIP 2016).

The third criteria of an urban regime is that identifiable policy agendas emerge between members of the governance network. In considering how important immigration is to the municipal level, it is notable that City Councillors interviewed identified immigration as being both socially and economically important to Surrey’s future. While

Councillor Hayne spoke of the importance of economic integration in terms of realizing the net gains that come from immigration, Councillor LeFranc discussed the potential for innovation that comes with immigration, and the opportunity that this presents for Surrey. For the business community, the advancement of policies that support economic integration are seen as providing valuable employability opportunities (LeFranc Interview 2017). Likewise, in conducting a survey of over 160 community organizations during the update of the Sustainability Charter 2.0 in order to include a focus on diversity, serves to demonstrate the common policy goals that are shared by government, business, and civil society groups, and specifically how they worked in conjunction with one another to achieve these goals (City of Surrey 2016b, 57) .

While the fourth criteria, that regimes exhibit a long standing pattern of cooperation, is demonstrated by the endurance of the regime from the writing of Good's 2009 book until the present, what is most interesting about Surrey's regime is the extent that the municipality's role within the regime changed following the introduction of the WCP. Although none of the interviewees were able to speak to the development of the WCP, by looking at DAC documents we can see that while the WCP was implemented in 2011, that its development had been discussed in the committee as early as 2008 (DAC 2008). Following initial discussions about the WCP on the DAC, the City of Surrey paired with the Surrey Foundation in order to reach out to civil society groups and the business community in the WCP's development (DAC 2009a). This has continued following the implementation of the WCP and the transition to the LIP. The 2015 meeting of the DAC saw the committee hear from the South Asian Health Institute in the

area of improving health access for members of the South Asian community (DAC 2015a). This same meeting saw the DAC updated on the Connection program through the LIP, which established a partnership between the City of Surrey and the Immigrant Employment Council of BC (Ibid). Likewise, SPAC noted in a 2014 meeting that it has the capacity to serve in an advocacy role in addressing the barriers that refugees face in attending post-secondary education (SPAC 2014c). In the same meeting, the committee noted its ability to potentially develop partnerships with community service groups such as PICS (Ibid). This behaviour deviates from Good's observation that the city worked primarily with mainstream organizations as opposed to those that work directly with immigrants and newcomers (Good 2009, 77-78). It appears that the WCP served to deepen relationships between the city and civil society organizations in the immigration field. This arrangement appears to cross partisan lines as well, with interviewees noting that immigration is not a political issue at the local level in Surrey (Councillor Hayne Interview 2017; Councillor LeFranc Interview 2017).

Supporting the city's deepened role within the regime, it is notable that both the DAC and the SPAC have routinely heard updates from both the WCP and the LIP following their inception. Likewise, council appears to have become more increasingly engaged with issues related to immigration following the introduction of the WCP, and has regularly heard feedback on both the WCP and LIP initiatives as well. The engaged role of Council in this area is supported by both Councillor LeFranc and Councillor Hayne, who note that issues related to immigration and diversity appear often on Council, not only through reports on the WCP and LIP, but through proclamations and festivals,



key city plans, and the municipality's ongoing efforts to lobby the federal government on support for refugees (Councillor LeFranc Interview 2017; Councillor Hayne Interview 2017).

In considering the role that the municipality has played in steering the urban regime, while there has been a shift away from discourse centred around multiculturalism and towards diversity, the timing of this shift indicates that it has primarily been driven by the municipality's participation in the WCP. Likewise, the shift towards greater participation and partnership with immigrant serving agencies in the regime provides evidence that deeper participation in the regime has been influential in shifting the city's normative discourse away from multiculturalism. Had the change from multiculturalism to diversity been prompted by the municipality rather than members of the regime, we would expect this to appear in municipal documents before the launch of the WCP. This shift from multiculturalism to diversity has in turn been reinforced by the city, with the city actively promoting diversity, both at the municipal level and at the governance level. This is demonstrated in that while the LIP does not use discourse related to normative views on immigration that the "Message From the Chairs" component that starts the LIP's key strategies highlights the importance of diversity in Surrey, but make no reference to multiculturalism (Surrey LIP 2016, 3; Surrey LIP 2017, 3). This has further been demonstrated at the municipal level during a September 2015 DAC meeting, in which a presentation from the LIP coordinator was met with concern by committee members that the LIP was overly equating diversity with ethnicity (DAC 2015c).

What is clear however is the extent that the municipality has been able to steer the regime in terms of setting the agenda following the development of the WCP and the municipality's increased involvement in the regime. As Kristin Good notes, while a regime existed in Surrey prior to the development of the WCP, members of civil society groups who participated in of the regime observed the city as offering only superficial support for efforts in the immigration field (Good 2009, 78). Following the development of the WCP however, the City has adopted a leadership position in the local immigration field, with Patrick Donahoe noting that municipal leadership has been "superb" both on the LIP and more broadly, with the municipality providing support on the LIP through executive leadership and through a support team (Donahoe Interview 2017). In considering Good's observations that Surrey was largely fixated on business interests prior to 2009, it is notable how much of a focus economic and business interests have been addressed on the LIP (Good 2009, 78). While the Message from the Chairs section of the immigrant and refugee strategy guides highlight the importance of immigration to Surrey's businesses and institutions, the LIP has put a significant focus on issues related to employment and the business community, including the Immigrant Labour Market Research Project (Surrey LIP 2016, 3; Surrey LIP 2017, 3). While this focus could be attributed to the strong presence of the business community on the LIP, the city's previously observed focus on the business community, as well as interview evidence from councillors noting the importance of immigration to the city in terms of economic growth and innovation, demonstrates a connection between the city's and LIP's focus on business and employment. The significant change in this relationship has come with the

municipality now recognizing the economic and business rationale of actively supporting immigrant integration.

The municipality has likewise used the LIP's research faculties to strengthen their own policies, with Surrey's Senior Social Planner noting that while the city had implemented new programs and policies in the past, that they had often not been coordinated or strategic (Surrey LIP Newsletter 2014, 3). Work conducted between the city and the LIP appears to have been extensive, with the DAC noting how the Refugee Strategy was developed between the LIP and Surrey's Social Planning Committee (DAC 2015c). Though the update of the Sustainability Charter saw the incorporation of diversity into the city's institutional policies, one of the Sustainability Charter 2.0's key strategic directions includes supporting the social and economic integration of immigrants and newcomers through the LIP (City of Surrey 2016b, 59). The city's ability to influence the members of the regime to pressure the upper levels of government to eliminate the Refugee Loan Repayment Program further demonstrates the capacity of the municipality to exert influence on the regime to pursue long term objectives.

## **Conclusion**

While it can be confirmed that there is a regime in Surrey, the role that the municipality has played on the regime has changed dramatically over the past 17 years. While the support that the city provided to immigrant serving agencies was deemed superficial by service providers in the early 2000s, the city has now taken on a direct

leadership role. This role is not confined to advisory committees, with city council taking on a leadership role, both within the governance network and on the LIP. Evidence suggest that the Welcoming Communities Project has helped to reorganize the regime, with document evidence indicating that this change in governance relationships contributed to the shift away from a normative focus on multiculturalism to a discourse that centres more firmly on diversity. These changes continued onto the LIP, where the city has maintained its leadership position. While the regime appears to be steering the city in terms of normative discourse, the city has been able to influence the regime by influencing the LIP's agenda, and by bringing together civil society groups to put pressure on upper levels of government. Both city and regime are ultimately influencing one another.

## **Chapter 5: Convergence or Autonomy - A Comparative Analysis of Surrey and Richmond**

Having considered the ways in which immigration is governed at the local level, and the development of the LIPs in Richmond and Surrey, we will now turn to a comparative analysis of the two cities in order to better understand the effect that the LIP has had on the development of policy and local discourse. This chapter will start by comparing the policies and initiatives that have been pursued in each city following the introduction of the LIP, both at the municipal level and through the auspices of the LIP itself. This will focus on whether the LIP program has produced similar policies and initiatives in each city, and to what extent there has been local autonomy in the development of policy. From there, this chapter will compare changes to local discourse in Richmond and Surrey in order to better understand how the introduction of the LIP has influenced how immigration and diversity are discussed at the local level, and whether there has been a convergence effect. This chapter will end by analyzing the comparison between Richmond and Surrey in order to understand the changes that have occurred in the areas of local policy and discourse following the LIP, first through an analysis of changes to the urban regime and the way that the municipality steers the regime, and then through the lens of multilevel governance in order to better understand the role of the federal government in shaping local discourse. This will allow us to better understand not only how the LIP effects local discourse and governance, but the relationship between multilevel governance and local autonomy as well.

This chapter will ultimately argue that there has not been a convergence effect at the local level, either through discourse or policy initiatives. While discourse at the national level does influence local discourse, this chapter will demonstrate that cities ultimately have autonomy in their normative approach to immigration and diversity. This is due to the fact that urban politics not only creates local discourse independent of the national level, but produces a path dependency which locks in these normative models. By looking at urban regimes through a historical institutionalist lens, we can see how critical junctures in both cities resulted in their current normative perspective, and limit the ability of the LIP program to create convergence. Likewise, this historical institutionalist view of local politics will demonstrate that the role of the municipality in steering the regime is ultimately path dependent as well as highlight how institutional structures serve to produce self-reinforcing dynamics, with local governments only choosing to pursue new relationships with their systems of governance after a critical juncture.

### **Policies and Initiatives**

While there are areas of commonality between the Surrey and Richmond LIP in terms of key policy priorities, these priority areas have developed differently in each city. While each city's LIP focuses on employment, access to services, and participation in community life, the initiatives that they have pursued have taken on different forms. An example of this is in the field of access to settlement services where, while both LIPs have pursued research to identify what services exist and where gaps are in service

delivery, Richmond's LIP has put a greater emphasis on dispersing information to newcomers, while Surrey's LIP has focused on identifying the physical location of services in order for service planning to ensure that future services develop in places that are physically accessible to immigrants (Richmond Community Collaboration Table 2016, 26-28; Surrey LIP 2016, 38-39). As Patrick Donahoe's interview notes, public transportation in Surrey is limited, creating issues around the accessibility of services for immigrants and refugees. Therefore, Surrey's focus on access to settlement service has developed based on the particular needs of their community (Donahoe Interview 2017). In terms of participating in community life, while there are differences in terms of what problems each city identifies as important in the development of community life, it is notable that both LIPs address the need to connect immigrants with longstanding residents, as well as increase access to volunteer leadership opportunities. While each LIP has adopted the primary normative framework of their municipality, this suggests a slight learning toward an intercultural approach of building community life. It is worth noting at this point that interculturalism is not entirely alien to Surrey. As I noted in chapter 2, while Surrey's primary normative model prior to the WCP was multiculturalism, Kristin Good noted that Surrey's Parks and Recreation Department used the world interculturalism in their title (Good 2009, 212). The priority area of employment is the exception to this, as both LIPs have identified the need to increase partnerships with the business community, improve immigrants' knowledge of the Canadian labour market, and connect immigrants with mentorships and networking opportunities (Richmond Community Collaboration Table 2016, 23-25; Surrey LIP 2016, 31).

In addition to these overlapping areas, each LIP has identified priority areas that are unique to their city. Surrey's focus on immigrant youths, refugees, and expanding the LIP's membership and partnerships, differ from Richmond's priority area of supporting daily living through housing, transportation, and ensuring access to BC Health Care. This focus on housing can at least partially be attributed to the high cost of housing in Richmond, with several immigrants who work in Richmond being unable to live in the city, and having to commute from distant suburbs (Habib Interview 2017). While Richmond's CCT does acknowledge the need to expand membership in the business sector in order to develop partnerships to enhance immigrant access to employment, Surrey's focus on expanding the LIP is more encompassing, and looks at areas not only related to employment, but expanding funding to ensure that the LIP programs will be sustainable, as will the LIP partnership itself. Their focus on immigrant youths and refugees likewise reflects priorities that are unique to Surrey's immigrant population.

In considering how the initiatives developed by each LIP are comparable to the federal government's objectives with the LIP project, it is notable that while there are overlapping areas where discourse is indicative of the federal government's objectives that there are deviations as well. Kathleen Burr noted that the overall objectives of the LIPs are to support the coordination in the planning and delivery of integration services across multiple sectors, strengthen local integration into the labour market and social life, create a framework to increase collaboration, and improve outcomes in terms of social and economic participation (Burr 2011, 5). While both LIPs have policies that have focused on these areas, the evidence shows that this has served as a jumping off point for



each city, with each city's community research providing input into the development of LIP policies. This is not entirely unexpected, as the LIP was intended to complement existing activities in the cities where they are developed, and identify community specific priorities (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2013, 6).

In terms of each city's municipal policies and priorities following 2014, there has likewise been a lack of convergence. While both cities have been active in advocating towards upper levels of government, each city has advocated for a different cause. While Richmond has pressed upper levels of government to continue funding English language training courses, Surrey's advocacy has focused on eliminating the Refugee Loan Repayment Program. Richmond's focus on continuing English language training can be viewed in part as an attempt to promote bridging between long standing residents and newcomers. This is in keeping with the municipality's role of facilitator and supporter in the immigration process, and is also indicative of the city's normative model of interculturalism by promoting common reference points (Tossutti 2009, 612). In the same vein as policies and initiatives on the LIP, each municipal government has pursued policy initiatives that are designed to meet the specific needs of their community. Likewise, each municipality has used the community research function of the LIP to inform the development of corporate level policies. In Surrey, we can see how this has had the effect of incorporating diversity into the Sustainability Charter, where not only ethnocultural diversity was promoted as important to Surrey's growth, but diversity in terms of gender, age, and physical and mental ability (City of Surrey 2016b, 19). While the data collected from the LIP surveys indicates that initiatives have been drawn from the needs of local

residents, it is unclear whether the normative models in each city is aligned with the needs of each community, and falls outside of the scope of this thesis.

At the governance level, we can see that the City of Surrey has taken on a considerably more active role in steering the urban regime than the City of Richmond. Not only has Surrey's municipal government taken a leadership role on the LIP, but their involvement in the WCP served as a catalyst for engaging the regime more broadly. Surrey's strong leadership not only takes the form of the city's advisory committees, but through city council's leadership position on the WCP and LIP, and through council's attention to issues related to immigration and diversity. Comparatively, the City of Richmond has taken a relatively hands off approach to immigration and diversity, with RIAC serving as the city's primary vehicle for addressing immigration and ethnocultural diversity. While RIAC has been a fixture of Richmond's institutional framework for nearly two decades, it did not pursue a leadership position on the WCP or the LIP. The reason for this was not identified in the document analysis or in interviews, but it is notable that this would maintain the city's position of facilitation and support rather than direct leadership. In terms of normative approaches however, RIAC has been the dominant factor in shaping how Richmond addresses immigration and diversity, and has effectively instituted interculturalism as the dominant normative framework in the city.

### **Comparative Local Discourse**

What is most striking when looking at the discourse used on each city's LIP is the absence of language related to normative perspectives on immigration. Instead, the language on each LIP is geared towards the key areas that were identified in community research projects. In Surrey, this has resulted in employment, services, and integration, three of the LIP's key strategic directions, also being key words that appear in the discourse. Likewise, the word refugee is frequently used on the Surrey LIP, and is indicative of the extent that Surrey's refugee population has been centred in the LIP's agenda and research initiatives. In Richmond, the discourse used on the LIP focuses on settlement, health, employment, language, and community, reflecting key LIP initiatives. While there is overlap between the two cities in the use of the word employment, as well as both LIP's focus on employment as a key priority area, there appears to be little other convergence between the two.

Despite the absence of language in the NVIVO scans that frame immigration in normative terms, both the Richmond and Surrey LIPs are conspicuous in the fact that key documents from each LIP acknowledge their city's normative perspective in their introduction and framing of their documents. In Surrey, the Message from the Chairs acknowledges the city's *diversity* while abstaining from using the term *multiculturalism*. At the same time, the acknowledgement of Richmond's diversity in the CCT documents is framed around interculturalism. What is most notable about this, of course, is that the language used in each city corresponds to the discourse used in municipal documents prior to the development of the LIP, with diversity becoming dominant in Surrey's discourse in 2011, and interculturalism dating to the development of RIAC in the early

2000s. Both models of discourse pre-date the LIP project, indicating that there has not been a convergence in terms of normative perspectives as a result of the introduction of the LIP. Instead, each city's previously established normative perspective appears to be exerting itself onto the LIP.

Looking at discourse at the municipal level, not only does there not appear to be a convergence in how immigration is discussed, but the introduction of the LIP does not appear to have had any significant impact on local discourse. In the case of Richmond, interculturalism has remained the dominant method of discussing immigration and ethnocultural diversity consistently between 2000 and 2017. The language that has become prominent on the CCT is relatively absent from the municipal discourse following the LIP's introduction in 2014. The only significant area of overlap between CCT priority areas and urban discourse is centred on the use of the word "community" though this word was used frequently in Richmond's documents during the 2000 to 2014 period, indicating that the prominence of this word in Richmond's discourse is unrelated to the development of the LIP (Appendix 1). While "service" has been used in both the LIP and in municipal documents during the 2014 to 2017 period, it was also used frequently between 2000 and 2014, suggesting that the use of this word in the discourse is not the result of the LIP program. In Surrey, the use of the word "integration" has been prominent on both the LIP and in the discourse following 2014, however this word was also prominent between 2000 and 2014 (Appendix 2). When used in the context of interviews, the word "integration" was most frequently used in relation to settlement and

participation in the community, as opposed to cultural integration, with Councillor Hayne noting that

“It’s up to the community, it’s up to the city and so on to help to accommodate and help to support those folks as they integrate into society. Immigration, when done properly, is a net benefit to the community, certainly, and there shouldn’t be that social burden, or there isn’t typically a social burden on the community when you get economic integration or things like that.” (Bruce Hayne Interview, 2017).

This highlights one of my observations from the interview process, in which none of the interviewees I spoke to in Surrey appeared to view integration in universalist terms of limiting cultural distinction in the public sphere (Tossutti 2012, 616) but frequently supported public recognition of cultural differences. This overlap in the language used on the LIP and the language used in municipal documents is not surprising given the evidence provided in interviews, which suggests that the municipalities have learnt from the research and initiatives of their respective LIPs.

The most significant shift in discourse noted during the document analysis has been how Surrey’s municipality shifted away from multiculturalism and towards diversity, which, as has been noted, appears to be correlated with the development of the WCP, and has not been influenced by the LIP. While few documents from the WCP were available, the 2013-2014 final report cited Surrey’s diversity more frequently than multiculturalism, with the document making no reference to interculturalism (Surrey

Welcoming Communities Project 2014). In contrast with Surrey, Richmond has maintained its normative framework of interculturalism through the full time period of this study, and does not appear to have been influenced by either the WCP or the LIP. Given that Surrey's discourse changed, but Richmond's remained the same following the WCP, this indicates that the discourse change in Surrey has been a byproduct of changing relationships in the governance network, including the city's increased participation in the immigration regime. Why Surrey has changed its dominant normative discourse but Richmond has not raises questions not only about municipal autonomy, but about why particular events, in this case the WCP, have been critical to the discursive evolution of one urban polity and not the other.

### **The Link Between Urban Regime Theory and Historical Institutionalism**

Having established that the LIP has not created a convergence effect between the two cities, either in terms of discourse or in terms of policy initiatives, this raises the question of why each city has taken different approaches towards immigration and diversity. Both cities have similar characteristics, including "biracial" demographics, which Kristin Good identifies as populations that have bifurcated ethnocultural groups split between a majority or near majority white population, and a single visible minority population that constitutes close to or over half of the visible minority population (Good 2009, 200). As well, each city has a local political climate that is receptive toward immigration, with interviewees noting that immigration was not a political issue at the local level, or viewed as being politically negative. Likewise, both cities have

participated in the same provincial and federal programs during the time period examined. Despite this, each city has taken a different trajectory towards how they approach immigration at the local level, with different normative models of immigration. This raises the question as to why there is such a high degree of autonomy at the local level, and why the urban regimes have demonstrated such strong resiliency against convergence while participating in the same provincial and federal programs.

In order to understand why local autonomy has had such a considerable impact on the development of local discourse in Richmond and Surrey, it is important to look at the evolution of urban politics through time, and drawing the connections between regime theory and historical institutionalism. Institutions, in their broadest sense, not only refer to the institutions of the state, but the rules that shape political behaviour through both the formal and informal structures, and shape politics by defining who is able to participate in specific political areas, and what political actors view as being both possible and desirable policies (Steinmo 2001, 1). Clarence Stone's work on regime theory highlights this, noting the importance of social structures on the regime, and in particular how these structures create the cohesion that allows for regime stability (Stone 1989, 10). At the same time, there is a relationship that exists between structures and agents, where dominant political structures impact the decisions that are made by political actors, and the decisions of political actors likewise influence the development of political structures (Ibid). This relationship between structure and agent is necessary for regime change to occur, with the structure influencing the agent, and the agent simultaneously influencing the structure (Ibid). As Paul Pierson notes, policy decisions are reinforcing, and create

incentives for actors to maintain the status quo, in large part due to the self-reinforcing benefits that come from participation in the dominant structure, and the high costs associated with creating competing structures (Pierson 1993, 602-603). By increasing access to resources and decision makers, policies also serve to create cohesion between government and civil society groups who are part of the regime (Pierson 1993, 601; Stone 1989, 206). For this reason, political actors, once far enough down a particular policy path, find it difficult to change course and pursue opportunities that may have previously been available to them (Pierson and Skocpol 2002, 6). As Pierson and Theda Skocpol highlight, changes to the positive feedback process take the form of critical junctures, which are formative moments which create opportunities for institutional change, and to break from the established path dependence (Ibid). When these policies and programs produce success over the long term, they reinforce the existing regime by indicating to actors, both inside and outside of the regime, that there is a new status quo, to which these actors adjust, reinforcing the positive feedback loop (Pierson 2004, 85). The sequence of events in a regime is important, as path dependency limits the options available to local actors within the regime.

In the case of Richmond, the critical juncture in the development of their urban regime came with the inception of RIAC. As Good highlights, Richmond's normative approach to immigration was deliberate, and built from the fact that multiculturalism had become viewed as divisive in Richmond (Good 2009, 71-72). Through intentional deliberation on how to pursue interculturalism, RIAC not only brought clarity to the city's goals and objectives in the area of diversity and immigration, but actively



supported a philosophy of interculturalism at the corporate level (Ibid). As the discourse analysis suggests, this choice created a positive feedback loop, reinforcing interculturalism as the dominant ideational model in the city. Through RIAC and RMCS, partnerships were formed between city, civil society groups, and the business community, facilitating the development of Richmond's existing regime. In particular, this explains the discrepancy that was identified between Richmond's discourse analysis and interview evidence regarding the role of interculturalism. While the interview evidence suggests that there has been a movement away from interculturalism in terms of how immigration and diversity are discussed colloquially, interculturalism remains the dominant formal nomenclature due to RIAC's institutionalized status within the city and within the regime. In this context, the shift in colloquial language may be developing, but has failed to reach what Skocopl and Pearson identify as a threshold effect, as changes to social processes have little effect on dominant structures until they reach a critical mass and become a critical juncture (Pearson and Skocpol 2002, 9).

In terms of Surrey's regime, the critical juncture came with the city participating in the WCP. Prior to the WCP, Surrey had a normative discourse that centred around multiculturalism, before abruptly switching to a discourse centred on diversity. The discourse following the development of the WCP has reinforced this view, with diversity being the dominant language at the municipal level even after the WCP became the LIP. While the shift towards diversity is in part supported by the view expressed in interviews that multicultural has become an outdated term, as Yasmeeen Abu-Laban and Christina Gabriel highlight, there is a business rationale for utilizing the language of diversity as

well. While evoking Canada's tradition of official multiculturalism, the language of diversity is used to promote neoliberal ideals of global competition, focusing on the economic potential of immigration in a globalized economy (Abu-Laban and Gabriel 2002, 173). Given the prominent role of the Surrey Board of Trade on the WCP along with the municipality, it is unsurprising that the resulting change in discourse has been towards a normative framework that is associated with globalized economic opportunity. While Surrey's municipal government had traditionally held a focus on business and economic interests prior to the WCP (Good 2009, 78) it was not until they began to hold a leadership position on the WCP, working closely with the Surrey Board of Trade as co-chairs and redefining their relationship within the urban regime, that municipal discourse shifted from multiculturalism to diversity. This is particularly notable given that the word diversity, while not used as frequently as multiculturalism, did appear in the discourse between 2000 and 2014 (Appendix 2). However, Surrey's changing regime partnerships ultimately gave the discourse of diversity the unique prominence that it currently enjoys at the municipal level. Likewise, as Neil Bradford has demonstrated in his study of discursive localism in Toronto, by integrating the policy objectives and values of the governance network, cities are able to build networks to accomplish policy goals and establish civic purpose (Bradford 2016, 670). While the WCP may have served as the critical juncture by bringing the municipality together with the business community and immigrant serving agencies, switching normative models from multiculturalism to diversity may in fact have primarily served as a method creating civic cohesion amongst members of the governance network.

While it is feasible that the increase in refugees served as a critical juncture to mobilize the business community, the increase in refugees coming to Surrey came after the shift in discourse from multiculturalism to diversity. While Surrey was home to 25 percent of all Government Assisted Refugees (GAR) in British Columbia in 2011, since 2015 this number has increased to 44 percent of all GARs (City of Surrey n.d.). Likewise, interview evidence suggests that the influx of refugees from Syria provided a notable challenge for the regime, and for the municipal government, in terms of rallying to provide settlement services. The timeline of refugees coming to Surrey is inconsistent with the change seen in Surrey's municipal discourse and governance arrangements.

In terms of influencing the regime structure, the LIPs do not appear to have had a significant impact. Keeping in mind that regimes need to be viewed with an eye to the importance of sequencing, we can see how the inability of the LIPs to have a significant influence on the regime is due to the fact that they have not been able to overcome the historic relationships that existed in each city. In Richmond, the organic evolution of the regime was used to build both the WCP and the LIP based around the relationships that had been built by the RMCS over the previous 20 years. While the partnerships that formed Surrey's LIP are considerably newer than the partnerships that were formed through RMCS in Richmond, they ultimately developed in a way that have allowed them to endure past their inception with the WCP. As Hooghe and Marks note, the institutions responsible for governance are sticky, and often outlive the conditions that produce them (Hooghe and Marks 2003, 9). As Clarence Stone highlights, regime relationships endure in part due to the inability of organizations to form alternative regime (Stone 1989, 193).

Good points out that discourse plays a role in regime maintenance by providing a shared understanding of the nature of the policy problem, and the solutions that are considered to be “appropriate to such problems” (Good 2009, 25). While the LIP program has given each city funding to expand their governance arrangement, and indeed each LIP has taken it upon itself to expand these partnerships, their foundations are ultimately built on pre-existing relationships. This is not to say that the LIP has not had any impact on the cities’ regimes. As evidence in both Richmond and Surrey suggests, the LIP program has served to inform each city of policy issues and problems that immigrants face in their day to day lives. As Clarence Stones notes, changes and expansion to the regime are to be expected over time (Stone 1989, 10). However, what we have seen in Richmond and Surrey is an expansion on the existing regime, with new members joining as opposed to creating a parallel regime, an effect which Stone attributes to the gravitation like effect of the governing coalition, in which the larger the coalition gets, the greater capacity it has to draw more members in (Stone 1989, 193). While the LIP has had an expansive effect on each city’s regime, this effect has proven to be marginal, and has not served as a new critical juncture in either city.

The role of the municipality in steering the regime appears to be path dependent as well. In the case of Richmond, the role of the municipality to provide advocacy and support (as well as the genesis of RIAC) came from discussions about how best to handle pressures from Chinese newcomers who were unhappy that a group home was placed in a predominantly Chinese neighbourhood (Good 2009, 183). In responding to this critical juncture with the establishment of RIAC and an informal policy of facilitation rather than

direct leadership, Richmond solidified its role within the regime, producing path dependency. This choice, to facilitate intercultural relationships rather than through direct leadership, has persisted in the municipality, despite the creation of the WCP and the LIP. Comparatively, Surrey's critical juncture came with their choice to adopt a leadership role on the WCP upon the program's inception by the provincial government. From there, the role of the municipality as a leader within the city became cemented, both on the WCP and the LIP, and in the regime more broadly, creating a positive feedback loop similar to the one established in Richmond. What is noticeable here is the role of conscious decisions in the development of the municipalities' steering capacities within the regime, as these decisions do not appear to be strictly the byproduct of structural forces. As Jon Pierre notes, there are a variety of models of urban governance, which Pierre categorizes into ideal types (Pierre 1999, 377). While Pierre's concluding reflections on urban governance arrangements poses the question of whether different cities actively pursue different governance models (Ibid, 390) the evidence presented here indicates that though structural relationships within the regime create a path dependency once a governance model has been selected, critical junctures provide municipalities with the opportunity to develop new governance arrangements with members of the regime. While I am unable to speak to the four typologies that Pierre noted (managerial, corporatist, pro-growth, and welfare) as they relate to the cases of Richmond and Surrey, the evidence indicates that variation in governance arrangements is in part due to the historical relationships that exist between municipal government and civil society groups, with these relationships limiting the ability of municipalities to change their governance arrangement later on. While the structural constraints that municipalities find themselves

in limit the options that are available to them to re-arrange their governance network due to path-dependency, these structures are most open to change during critical junctures, allowing municipalities to make conscious decisions on their role within the governance network. While the ability of municipalities to alter their positioning within broader governance structures is not absolute, it does display a level of municipal autonomy that betrays the “creatures of the province” view of municipalities.

What becomes clear from looking at the evidence is that the active choices of municipalities have contributed to the development and expansion of their regimes, and the role that municipalities play at the governance level. While Neil Bradford and Caroline Andrew rightly note in their study of Southern Ontario LIPs that the pre-existing collaborations that exist in a city prior to the LIP influence the dialogue and relationships on the LIP, how these relationships develop is dependent on sequencing over the long term (Bradford and Andrew 2011, 13-14). Understanding the composition and discourse on the LIP is dependent on the relationships that have developed at the local level, and *how* these relationships have developed over the long term. While place matters in the development of LIPs (Bradford and Andrew 2011, 26) so does time.

### **Multilevel Governance and Local Autonomy**

Considering Hooghe and Marks’ conception of type one multilevel governance arrangements, which they note as being similar to the concept of the Russian nesting doll and fundamentally rooted in the concept of federalism (Hooghe and Marks 2003, 8-9; 16)

we can see how the LIPs have served to focus resources from multiple levels of government onto community centric partnerships. As Hooghe and Marks note, changes to jurisdictional authority tend to occur rarely, as when they do they incur a high cost (Ibid, 9). The chief benefit of type-one multilevel governance is the extent that these governance arrangements are based on the concept of community identity, making them ideal for addressing place based problems (Hooghe and Marks 2003, 13). We have seen this demonstrated with the LIP program, as the LIPs have developed community specific programs, and centred their language on issues effecting immigrants in each city while leaving local discourse relatively unaffected. Likewise, we can see how the LIP program has been a successful vehicle for community based policy making, while at the same time avoiding a redistribution of jurisdictional authority.

While type one models of multilevel governance serve to focus policy structures on community specific partnerships, they do so while failing to provide adequate program funding. As Neil Bradford notes, one of the biggest challenges facing Canadian cities is the imbalance between municipal responsibilities, and the lack of resources to address policy problems (Bradford 2004, 40). The introduction of the LIP, and in particular the pooling of local resources, can be viewed as attempting to restructure funding opportunities at the municipal level without the federal government providing direct project funding, or providing municipalities with new taxation authority. While the federal government has resumed responsibility for providing funding for settlement organizations, there has been no indication that the LIP has provided new funds for LIP projects. In contrast with the WCP which provided direct program funding, the LIP goes

further in the processing of downloading by requiring local community organizations and local governments to directly fund projects. The challenge that this has produced for municipalities is how to balance their responsibilities and commitments in the field of immigration with the lack of funding being provided by upper levels of government.

Though Hooghe and Marks rightfully point out the community centric aspect of type-one multilevel governance, this raises the question of how the federal government influences local politics through these arrangements. As Jeffrey Sellers notes, the national level not only provides institutional constraints for local actors, but influences the social and cultural dimension of cities, which exist within this larger framework (Sellers 2005, 426; 428). Likewise, Irene Bloemraad has demonstrated the importance of national discourse in the development of urban discourses around immigration and ethnocultural diversity (Bloemraad 2006, 12). This connection between national and local discourse is not unique to Canada, with national debates around immigration influencing the development of local policy making in both the United States and Europe (Leitner and Preston 2012, 16-17; Caponio 2010, 179). Despite the importance of discourse at the national level, degrees of variation exist between cities within the same country, with Tiziana Caponio noting the importance of local political actors in determining how immigration is framed at the local level (Caponio 2010, 179). While Canada's official multiculturalism has contributed to the development of local discourse in Canada, the empirical evidence presented in chapters 3 and 4 supports Caponio's observation that local actors play a prominent role in framing discussions around immigration, resulting in variations between cities within the same approximate geographical area, or within the



same sub-national unit. The evidence demonstrated by Richmond and Surrey, and the high degree of autonomy that has been demonstrated at the municipal and LIP level, indicates that while the national level influences local attitudes and views around immigration, national discourse ultimately does not replicate perfectly from the national to the local level.

In order to understand why national discourse does not replicate itself at the local level, we again need to look at the structural view of discourse expanded on in the previous section of this chapter. If we are to view politics through time and as a result of sequencing, then we need to consider that while the introduction of official multiculturalism may have been foundational in the development of modern immigration discourse in Canada, that subsequent events have influenced the development of how immigration is discussed, and provided subsequent critical junctures. In doing so, we can see that while the introduction of official multiculturalism may have served as a critical juncture at the time of its inception and played a significant role in the development of national and local discourses around immigration, that subsequent critical junctures have resulted in local polities deviating from the national model of official multiculturalism. By acknowledging the importance of local political autonomy, and the importance of local events in the shaping of local discourse, we can see how official multiculturalism has simultaneously influenced the development of local immigration discourse, while at the same time not constraining it. This is demonstrated in the cases of Richmond and Surrey, where both cities had previously used a normative model centred on multiculturalism, before critical junctures based on local political developments shifted

discourse towards interculturalism and diversity respectively. This shift is particularly noticeable given Poirier's observation that following the 1995 referendum that the federal government's discourse around immigration moved towards a universalist approach in order to combat Quebec nationalism by promoting a pan-Canadian nation and a common Canadian identity (Poirier 2006, 210). While official multiculturalism appears to have provided a critical juncture in the development of immigration discourse, this subsequent shift towards universalism does not appear to have had the same impact on local discourse, indicating that it did not serve as a critical juncture at the local level.

While federal funding for immigration programs through multilevel governance arrangements does appear to be capable of producing conditions which will change discourse, as Surrey's change in discourse through the WCP demonstrates, it is not a necessary condition. As Richmond demonstrates, change in local discourse can occur as a result of local events, and without upper levels of government pursuing greater multilevel arrangements. As such, while the development of LIPs in Canadian cities have the potential to change local discourse around immigration and ethnocultural diversity, this change is not guaranteed. In particular, the close relationship between the municipality and the Surrey Chamber of Commerce on the WCP, and the connections established between a discourse centred around diversity and a neoliberal view of public policy, suggests that the change in discourse in Surrey may not have been a byproduct of multilevel governance, but of the increased connections between government and the business community. Were this the case, funding for partnership programs such as the WCP or the LIP would only be expected to change discourse in the event that the

business community agreed to play a greater role in the immigration process. In the case of Surrey, this was demonstrated when the Surrey Board of Trade, a peak business organization, pursued a joint leadership role with the municipality on the WCP. As the case of Richmond demonstrates however, it is still difficult to persuade business organizations to play a greater role in immigration governance, and there is likewise no guarantee that developing a LIP program will increase business participation in the urban regime. Likewise, this raises the question as to whether it is also necessary for the municipality to pursue a dominant role within the regime in order to create a critical juncture. Were Surrey to choose to retain their position of superficial support following the WCP, it is unclear whether the prominence of the business community would have had a significant impact on the development of discourse at the local level. In considering the capacity of the municipal government to steer the urban regime, it then becomes evident that this may be limited by both the municipality and business community's willingness to assume a leadership role within the regime. In this sense, the failure of the WCP to serve as a critical juncture in Richmond may ultimately be due to Richmond's choice of retaining their role as facilitator rather than acting as a leader in the regime, however it is unclear if it would be possible, or even desirable, for the municipality to pursue a leadership role on the regime without the support of peak business organizations due to the financial capital that they are capable of contributing to the governance network. Ultimately, the nature and conditions of local politics, including the relationships that exist between government and the business community, serves as the dominant predictor as to whether there will be a shift in discourse.

## **Conclusion**

The evidence presented through both document analysis and interviews demonstrates that the introduction of the LIP has not served to create a convergence effect between the two cities, either in terms of discourse, or policies and initiatives. The reason for this is due to the structural nature of local politics, where Surrey and Richmond developed unique governance coalitions during critical junctures that have persisted through the development of the LIP. In Richmond, this governance coalition has centred around RIAC, which has cemented interculturalism as the dominant normative framework in the city. While Surrey's coalition formed more recently during the development of the WCP, the relationships that were formed here have proven to be durable following the LIP. While the WCP has changed Surrey's dominant normative framework from multicultural to one that is centred on diversity, it is unclear to what extent this has resulted from the creation of the WCP as a multilevel governance structure, and to what extent this has resulted from increased partnership with the business community. Though this suggests that multilevel governance structures such as the WCP and the LIP may produce change to local discourse, this is dependent on the business communities willingness to increase their engagement with these structures. Ultimately, the autonomy that is present at the local level, including in the municipality, civil society, and the business community, allows the city as a whole to steer the direction of their own LIP.

## **Chapter 6: Conclusion**

What we can see from the evidence and analysis in chapters three through five is that not only is there a regime in both Richmond and Surrey, but that the development of these regimes has not been significantly impacted by the introduction of the LIP. While the introduction of the WCP proved to be a critical juncture in Surrey, Richmond has maintained a path dependence based on a normative framework of interculturalism since the early 2000s. The endurance of Richmond's interculturalism, in comparison with Surrey's transformation under the WCP, raises important questions about the role of the business community within the regime, and the impact that the relationship between the business community and the municipality has on governance. This chapter will begin by providing a brief summary of this thesis's research findings, and how they fit into the theoretical frameworks outlined in chapter two. From there, this chapter will turn to reviewing the methodological process that informed this research study and comment on how effective the data sources were in establishing a causal link between the independent and dependent variables. This will include looking at the role of triangulation, and the importance of interview evidence in the development of the research data. This chapter will conclude by exploring some of the questions raised by the research findings, and will propose avenues for future research of the LIP program in Canada.

This chapter will conclude that future avenues of research into the development of LIPs in Canada should focus on the role of the business community on the LIP, and whether their increased involvement produces the conditions for a shift in local discourse.

This research focus should likewise consider the role of the business community in the governance network more broadly, including whether close relationships between the municipal government and the business community is likely to produce a discourse centred on diversity. In looking at the role of data collection in this research project, this chapter will highlight the value of elite interviews in triangulating data, and verifying evidence gathered through scholarship and document analysis.

### **Summary of Research Findings**

What this research project primarily indicates is that while funding from upper levels of government can help to produce the conditions that are necessary for change in discourse and local governance arrangements, this funding is not sufficient on its own. By shifting discourse away from multiculturalism and towards diversity while developing partnerships between peak business organizations and the municipal government, Surrey demonstrated how funding from upper levels of government can produce discursive change. As Richmond demonstrates however, the involvement of the business community may be a critical feature for change in discourse. As a result of the business communities lacking of a strong presence in the urban governance network, and the reluctance of peak organizations to participate on the LIP, Richmond's municipality chose to maintain their role as a facilitator and supporter in the field of immigration rather than adopt a leadership role. Participation of the business community may be a fundamental requirement, not only for programs like the LIP and the WCP to produce

discourse change, but to incentivize the municipal government to take on a leadership role on the LIP and within the urban regime more broadly.

What this highlights is the importance of local autonomy in the development of immigration policy, and in the development of a municipality's role within the urban governance network. While provincial funding for the WCP served as the catalyst for Surrey to adopt a leadership role in the governance network, the prominence of the business community in the immigration sector, as well as the leadership from the Surrey Board of Trade, may have been necessary to produce the conditions for the municipal government to change their position within the regime. Richmond, as interview evidence suggests, has had greater difficulty engaging the business community in the immigration field. While this does raise further questions, such as whether the support of the business community is necessary or simply sufficient to change how the municipality views its role in the regime, it does highlight the importance of urban autonomy in the development of policies, initiatives, and normative approaches in the field of immigration. The inability of the LIP program to produce convergence around the normative values of interculturalism identified in chapter one highlights the importance of politics of place, as composition of the regime influences the development of normative approaches to immigration at the municipal level. This is particularly noticeable in the case of Surrey, where the shift from multiculturalism to diversity was maintained following the introduction of the LIP. This likewise suggests that while the introduction of funding from upper levels of government may not induce changes to dominant normative structures on its own, that the support of the business community may serve as a critical

juncture in influencing municipal discourse, with the introduction of funding from upper levels of government providing the opportunity for these changes to occur.

In terms of the ability of these findings to travel outside of Richmond and Surrey, while this research suggests that local autonomy provides greater explanatory power than federal policies and initiatives for explaining change in discourse, this needs to be tempered by the provincial context. While the pervasiveness of local autonomy suggests that this can be applied broadly to cities across Canada, the provincial context in which this study situated itself matters. While the Province of British Columbia has developed positive relationships with the cities within the Greater Vancouver area, a fact that Fourot highlights as being historically important in explaining the Province's support for local immigration initiatives, these relationships are not universal between municipal and provincial governments in Canada (Fourot 2015, 420). In considering municipal-provincial relationships in Quebec, Fourot notes that the city of Laval had a tumultuous relationship with the Province to the extent that the municipality would have rather walked away from negotiating an immigration agreement than accept the province's preferred normative model of interculturalism (Ibid). While this demonstrates the ability of municipalities to reject discourses set by upper levels of government, it also highlights how provincial governments can threaten to withhold funding in order to achieve their desired objectives. These findings, therefore, can only travel so far as provincial-municipal relations are conducive to municipalities having the statutory power and fiscal capability necessary to enter and pursue policies and initiatives in the field of immigration. Likewise, this research has implications for cities where the municipality



has not engaged in the immigration field. While it may be possible that municipalities which have not entered the immigration field may be more inclined to adopt the normative perspective of upper levels of government, timing, sequencing, and local conditions have been identified as being critical to how discourse develops. As the research indicates, programs such as the WCP and the LIP have the capacity to act as critical junctures, and while these junctures may push municipalities that are otherwise unresponsive to immigration towards a federal discourse, the local conditions of the governance network, and each city's unique history, are more likely to determine the evolution of local discourse.

### **The Research Process**

The use of document analysis, particularly the use of document analysis over a long period of time, turned out to be one of the most vital aspects of the research. By examining how discourse changes over time, my thesis was able to better apply the study of discourse to the theoretical lens of historical institutionalism. After laying out the discourse over a 17 year period of time, I was able to extrapolate the relationship between historical institutionalism, discourse, and governance relationships to explore how multilevel governance relationships affect the development of the urban regime. Looking at the evolution of discourse through a linear perspective likewise allowed me to consider how structures change over time, and the role of critical junctures in the development of the municipalities' relationship within the urban regime. Using the MSSD model likewise allowed my thesis to remove the possibility that changes in discourse were a result of

exogenous factors, including the racial composition of each city, which served to strengthen the argument that change in discourse occurred as a result of local autonomy, and not due to case selection.

While document analysis and previous scholarship was used to establish long term trends in terms of Richmond and Surrey's immigration policies and discourse, interview evidence was able to not only support findings in the document analysis, but provided context for these findings. An example of this was the observation provided by Sanzida Habib, which highlighted how not only did the RMCS act as the contract holder of the CCT, but that membership had been drawn from RMCS's network. Likewise in Surrey, Patrick Donahoe's interview served to highlight the importance of Anita Huberman and Councillor Villeneuve in the progression of the WCP, and the development of the LIP. As Tansey notes, by collaborating and expanding on evidence acquired through other sources, interviews contribute to the process of triangulation (Tansey 2007, 766). This helped to uncover the relationship between Surrey's transformation from a municipality that superficially supported immigrant settlement and integration, to one that took a leadership role in the urban regime.

In this vein, I believe that the empirical evidence could have been stronger if I had been able to secure interviews with a greater variety of participants. While the participants in this project provided me with invaluable insight into immigration in their respective cities and regarding the development of the LIP project, it is unfortunate that I was unable to speak with a member of each city's business community. Doing so could

have provided the business perspective on immigration, and would have helped to understand how each city's business community saw their role in the immigrant settlement and integration process. Likewise, I was unable to speak with members of municipal government or civil society groups who had been members of the WCP. As a result, my thesis was unable to provide more context on the development of the WCP then on the development of the LIP. Given the WCP's importance in the evolution of Surrey's discourse, this insight could have proven fruitful in verifying the WCP as a critical juncture.

### **Avenues for Future Research**

The role of the business community in these two cases raises interesting questions about the importance of the business community on the LIP, and in the governance network more broadly. While evidence suggests that business organizations are reluctant to participate in the local immigration governance process (Horak 2012, 357) Surrey's transformation through partnership with the Surrey Board of Trade indicates that participation by this sector has the potential to not only change discourse in the urban governance network, but to contribute to changes in how municipalities see their role in the governance network more broadly. A particularly interesting avenue for research could be whether LIP programs elsewhere in Canada have produced discursive change without the involvement of peak business organizations. Analyzing LIPs from this perspective, and beginning by examining the particular governance relationships of LIPs and other multilevel funding programs that produced discursive change, would serve to

help understand the conditions that are necessary for a change of discourse. By using LIPs as a framing device, this would help to either verify the findings of this thesis, that the introduction of peak business organizations influences municipal discourse, or elaborate on the other conditions that produce discursive change. This method of studying urban autonomy, using the introduction of multilevel funding arrangements as a potential critical juncture, can also be used to uncover what conditions are likely to produce changes in how municipal governments view their role in the governance network. Are they, as the case of Surrey indicates, likely to take on leadership rolls on the condition of participation from peak business organizations addressing the absence of resources at the level of the municipal government, or are there conditions outside of this participation where the municipality will adopt a leadership role without support from the business community. While the case of Richmond demonstrates that critical junctures do exist outside of multilevel funding structures, studying this from the perspective of the LIP program will serve to highlight specifically how the federal government is capable of influencing the urban regime.

Another avenue for research, tied into the relationships that exist between the municipality and the governance network, is the extent to which individual agents are critical in changing how municipal governments see their role within the regime. Though many cities such as Richmond primarily manage immigration and diversity through municipal bureaucracy and advisory committees such as RIAC, Daiva Stasiulis, Christine Hughes, and Zainab Amery highlight how municipalities are capable of exercising political will in the development of immigration policies and initiatives (Stasiulis,

Hughes, and Amery 2011, 100-101). While both LIPs have demonstrated strong leadership from their contract holders and LIP chairs, interviewees in Surrey noted the importance of municipal leadership through the involvement of Councillor Villeneuve on the LIP, raising the question of whether partnership between the municipality and the business community would be possible without the personal involvement and advocacy of Councillor Villeneuve and Surrey City Council. While political leadership is influenced and constrained by local contexts (Greasley and Stoker 2009, 128) studying individual relationships between the municipality and the governance network on the LIP through the lens of individual agency can help to shed light on the impact that individual actors have on the development of governance relationships, and in particular what the role of agency implies for the choices that municipalities take during critical junctures. In the context of this study, this would serve to explore why the WCP served as a critical juncture in Surrey through the lens of political leadership, as well as how the advocacy of Councillor Villeneuve has contributed to the municipality's leadership position within the governance network, and their change in discourse more broadly. This could also serve to provide analysis for how municipal politicians such as Villeneuve have exerted their influence within the regime. Conversely, this could serve to address the role of agency in Richmond's choice to retain their position of supporter and facilitator rather than leader within the regime. While the absence of support by the business community has been identified as a significant factor in Richmond's choice to abstain from a leadership position within the governance network, by examining the choices of individual political leaders during the creation of the WCP and the LIP, this could highlight how local contexts have influenced political choices, and how municipal politicians in Richmond

viewed the prospect of changing their role within the governance network. Likewise, a study of LIPs from an agent driven perspective would serve to highlight the importance of individual actors within the business community, potentially serving to offer an explanation for why Surrey's WCP and LIP received the support of peak business organizations, but Richmond's organizations did not. This could further help to predict the likelihood of gaining business participation in LIPs elsewhere in Canada by looking at how individual leadership within the community translates to support for immigrant settlement and integration services.

## **Conclusion**

What this thesis has demonstrated is the extent to which local autonomy is ultimately able to overcome the influence of multilevel governance structures, and the importance of the politics of place in the development of the urban regime. While Richmond and Surrey have both participated in the same multilevel governance structures, they have pursued different paths, both in terms of their normative approaches to immigration, and the role of their municipalities within the urban regime. These changes have occurred as the result of critical junctures, with the case of Surrey indicating that the buy in of the business community may be a crucial condition for the municipal government to choose to adopt a leadership role within the regime. As this chapter has demonstrated however, these findings need to be studied further in order to verify the extent that the business community is necessary for discourse change. In both cities, the LIP has proven to be a valuable resource for the development of the immigration governance network. It has not only provided municipalities with valuable

research into the needs of their immigrant communities, but has brought together an increasing collection of stakeholders to develop and implement projects and initiatives. In doing so, it has proven that even after being provided federal funding, that municipalities are far from simply being creatures of the province.

## Bibliography

- Abu-Laban, Y., & Gabriel, C. (2002). *Selling diversity: Immigration, multiculturalism, employment equity, and globalization*. University of Toronto Press.
- Anckar, C. (2008). On the applicability of the most similar systems design and the most different systems design in comparative research. *International journal of social research methodology, 11*(5), 389-401.
- Bloemraad, I. (2006). *Becoming a citizen: Incorporating immigrants and refugees in the United States and Canada*. Univ of California Press.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative research journal, 9*(2), 27-40.
- Bradford, N. (2004). Place matters and multi-level governance: Perspectives on a new urban policy paradigm. *Policy options, 25*(2).
- Bradford, N. (2016). Ideas and collaborative governance: A discursive localism approach. *Urban affairs review, 52*(5), 659-684.
- Bradford, N., & Andrew, C. (2011). Local Immigration Partnerships Gathering Momentum: Early Successes, Emerging Challenges, and Recommendations for the Future. Citizenship and Immigration Canada.
- Burr, K. (2011). Local immigration partnerships: Building welcoming and inclusive communities through multi-level governance. *Horizons policy research initiative*. Retrieved October 29, 2016 <http://p2pcanada.ca/files/2011/10/Local-Immigration-Partnerships-Building-Welcoming-and-Inclusive-Communities.pdf>
- Caponio, T. (2010). Conclusion: Making sense of local migration policy arenas. In M. Borket & T. Caponio (Eds.), *The local dimension of migration policymaking* (pp. 161-195). Amsterdam University Press.
- Capoccia, G., & Kelemen, R. D. (2007). The study of critical junctures: Theory, narrative, and counterfactuals in historical institutionalism. *World politics, 59*(3), 341-369.
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada. (2013). Local Immigration Partnerships Handbook. Retrieved from Government of Canada. "Local Immigration Partnerships Handbook." Citizenship and Immigration Canada, Government of Canada, Aug. 2013, [p2pcanada.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/Local-Immigration-Partnerships-Handbook-2013.pdf](http://p2pcanada.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/Local-Immigration-Partnerships-Handbook-2013.pdf)



- City of Richmond. (2013). Building Our Social Future: A Social Development Strategy for Richmond 2013-2022. City of Richmond. Doi:  
[http://www.richmond.ca/\\_\\_shared/assets/socialdevstrategy34917.pdf](http://www.richmond.ca/__shared/assets/socialdevstrategy34917.pdf)
- City of Richmond. (2015). A Guide For Newcomers. City of Richmond. doi:  
[http://www.richmond.ca/\\_\\_shared/assets/Newcomer\\_s\\_Guide\\_2014\\_English\\_-\\_Updated33176.pdf](http://www.richmond.ca/__shared/assets/Newcomer_s_Guide_2014_English_-_Updated33176.pdf)
- City of Richmond. (2017, June 2). Diversity. Retrieved July 24, 2017, from  
<http://www.richmond.ca/careers/culture/diversity.htm>
- City of Richmond Policy Manual. (1991). Multiculturalism. City of Richmond.  
 doi:[http://www.richmond.ca/\\_\\_shared/assets/Multiculturalism\\_Policy22817.pdf](http://www.richmond.ca/__shared/assets/Multiculturalism_Policy22817.pdf)
- City of Richmond Policy Manual. (2015). Respectful Workplace Policy. City of Richmond.  
 doi:[http://www.richmond.ca/\\_\\_shared/assets/Respectful\\_Workplace\\_Policy22820.pdf](http://www.richmond.ca/__shared/assets/Respectful_Workplace_Policy22820.pdf)
- City of Richmond Report to Committee. (2013). *RIAC 2013 Annual Report and 2014 Work Program*. Richmond.  
 doi:[http://www.richmond.ca/\\_\\_shared/assets/RIAC\\_CNCL\\_01271437767.pdf](http://www.richmond.ca/__shared/assets/RIAC_CNCL_01271437767.pdf)
- City of Richmond Report to Committee. (2014). Richmond Community Services Advisory Committee and Richmond Intercultural Advisory Committee Report Regarding Settlement Services Funding Changes.
- City of Richmond Report to Committee. (2016). Richmond Intercultural Advisory Committee 2015 Annual Report and 2016 Work Program. Doi:  
[https://www.richmond.ca/\\_\\_shared/assets/\\_3\\_RSAC\\_Annual\\_Report43470.pdf](https://www.richmond.ca/__shared/assets/_3_RSAC_Annual_Report43470.pdf)
- City of Richmond Report to Council. (2002). Proposed Richmond Intercultural Advisory Committee. doi:[http://www.richmond.ca/\\_\\_shared/assets/022502\\_item122051.pdf](http://www.richmond.ca/__shared/assets/022502_item122051.pdf)
- City of Surrey. (n.d.). *Supporting Refugees in Surrey*. City of Surrey. Retrieved March 18, 2018, from <http://www.surrey.ca/community/18207.aspx>
- City of Surrey. (2006) 2006-2007 Surrey Social Plan Annual Report - Action Plan for the Social Well-Being of Surrey Residents. Doi:  
<http://www.surrey.ca/files/AnnualReport20062007.pdf>
- City of Surrey. (2012). Diversity Advisory Committee Terms of Reference. Dio:  
[http://www.surrey.ca/bylawsandcouncilibrary/DCT\\_DAC\\_TOR\\_2012\\_09\\_18.pdf](http://www.surrey.ca/bylawsandcouncilibrary/DCT_DAC_TOR_2012_09_18.pdf)

City of Surrey. (2015). Corporate Report: Update on the Surrey Local Immigration Partnership. Retrieved from:

[https://www.surrey.ca/bylawsandcouncilibraryCR\\_2015-R025.pdf](https://www.surrey.ca/bylawsandcouncilibraryCR_2015-R025.pdf)

City of Surrey. (2016a). Regular Council - Public Hearing Minutes. May 30 2016.

Retrieved from

[http://www.surrey.ca/bylawsandcouncilibrary/MIN\\_RCPH\\_2016\\_05\\_30.pdf](http://www.surrey.ca/bylawsandcouncilibrary/MIN_RCPH_2016_05_30.pdf)

City of Surrey. (2016b). Sustainability Charter 2.0. Doi:

[www.surrey.ca/files/SUSTAINABILITY%20CHARTER%20%5bFINAL%20SCREEN%5d.pdf](http://www.surrey.ca/files/SUSTAINABILITY%20CHARTER%20%5bFINAL%20SCREEN%5d.pdf)

City of Surrey. (2017a). Corporate Report: Select Committee Terms of Reference

Review. Doi: [http://www.surrey.ca/bylawsandcouncilibrary/CR\\_2017-R244.pdf](http://www.surrey.ca/bylawsandcouncilibrary/CR_2017-R244.pdf)

City of Surrey. (2017b). Refugee Transportation Loan Program. Retrieved from

<http://www.surrey.ca/community/13788.aspx>. Doi: December 13, 2017.

Collier, D., & Mahon, J. E. (1993). Conceptual “stretching” revisited: Adapting categories in comparative analysis. *American political science review*, 87(4), 845-855.

DAC. (2008). Diversity Advisory Committee Minutes, September 16, 2008. Doi:

<http://www.surrey.ca/bylawsandcouncilibrary/MIN-MAC-2008-09-16-D806.pdf>

DAC. (2009a). Diversity Advisory Committee Minutes, January 20, 2009. Doi: from

<http://www.surrey.ca/bylawsandcouncilibrary/MIN-MAC-2009-01-20-8B31.pdf>

DAC. (2009b). Diversity Advisory Committee Minutes, September 15, 2009. Doi:

<http://www.surrey.ca/bylawsandcouncilibrary/MIN-mac-2009-09-15-11B9.pdf>

DAC. (2015a). Diversity Advisory Committee Minutes, December 8, 2015. Doi:

[http://www.surrey.ca/bylawsandcouncilibrary/MIN\\_DAC\\_2015\\_12\\_08.pdf](http://www.surrey.ca/bylawsandcouncilibrary/MIN_DAC_2015_12_08.pdf)

DAC. (2015b). Diversity Advisory Committee Minutes, January 20, 2015. Doi:

[http://www.surrey.ca/bylawsandcouncilibrary/MIN\\_DAC\\_2015\\_01\\_20.pdf](http://www.surrey.ca/bylawsandcouncilibrary/MIN_DAC_2015_01_20.pdf)

DAC. (2015c). Diversity Advisory Committee Minutes, September 8, 2015. Doi:

[http://www.surrey.ca/bylawsandcouncilibrary/MIN\\_DAC\\_2015\\_09\\_08.pdf](http://www.surrey.ca/bylawsandcouncilibrary/MIN_DAC_2015_09_08.pdf)

Fourot, A. C. (2015). “Bringing cities back in” to Canadian political science: Municipal public policy and immigration. *Canadian journal of political science/revue canadienne de science politique*, 48(2), 413-433.

Good, K. R. (2009). *Municipalities and multiculturalism: The politics of immigration in Toronto and Vancouver*. Toronto [Ont.]: University of Toronto Press, Scholarly Publishing Division.

- Good, K. R. (forthcoming). "Municipal immigration policymaking in Canadian cities: The state of the art," in Tiziana Caponio, Peter Scholten and Ricard Zapata-Barrero (eds.). *The Routledge handbook to the governance of migration and diversity in cities* Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, p. 216-227.
- Greasley S., & Stoker, G. (2009). Urban political leadership. In J. Davies & D. Imbroscio (Eds.), *Theories of urban politics* (pp. 126-136). Thousand Oaks, California. SAGE Publications.
- Horak, M. (2012). Conclusion: Understanding multilevel governance in Canada's cities. In M. Horak & R. Young (Editors), *Sites of governance : Multilevel governance and policy making in Canada's big cities* (pp. 339-370). Montreal & Kingston. McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Jobs Trade and Technology. (2013). BC Gov News. Retrieved February 17, 2018, from <https://news.gov.bc.ca/stories/community-projects-help-welcome-newcomers-to-bc>
- Levi, R., & Valverde, M. (2006). Freedom of the city: Canadian cities and the quest for governmental status. *Osgoode hall LJ*, 44, 409.
- Keung, N. (2016, October 31) "Immigration Targets to Remain Unchanged Despite Calls for Significant Increase." Toronto Star. The Star.com, 31. Accessed 27 Nov. 2016.
- Leitner, H., & Preston, V. (2011). Going local: Canadian and American immigration policy in the new century. In C. Teixeira, W. Li, & A. Kobayashi (Eds.), *Immigrant geographies of North American cities* (pp. 2-21). Oxford University Press.
- Liesbet, H., & Gary, M. (2003). Unraveling the central state, but how? Types of multi-level governance. *American political science review*, 97(2), 233-243.
- Lijphart, A. (1975). II. The comparable-cases strategy in comparative research. *Comparative political studies*, 8(2), 158-177.
- Mitchell, K. (1993). Multiculturalism, or the united colors of capitalism? *Antipode*, 25(4), 263-294.
- Mossberger, K. (2009). Urban regime analysis. In J. Davies & D. Imbroscio (Eds.), *Theories of urban politics* (pp. 40-54). Thousand Oaks, California. SAGE Publications.
- Mossberger, K., & Stoker, G. (2001). The evolution of urban regime theory: The challenge of conceptualization. *Urban affairs review*, 36(6), 810-835.

- Pagliari, J. (2018, August 20). Toronto will take province to court over Ford's plan to slash size of city council. *Toronto Star*. Retrieved August 21, 2018, from [https://www.thestar.com/news/city\\_hall/2018/08/20/toronto-council-deciding-how-to-fight-premier-doug-ford-on-ward-cut.html](https://www.thestar.com/news/city_hall/2018/08/20/toronto-council-deciding-how-to-fight-premier-doug-ford-on-ward-cut.html)
- Pierre, J. (2005). Comparative urban governance: Uncovering complex causalities. *Urban affairs review*, 40(4), 446-462.
- Pierre, J. (Ed.). (2000). *Debating governance: Authority, steering, and democracy*. OUP Oxford.
- Pierre, J. (1999). Models of urban governance: The institutional dimension of urban politics. *Urban affairs review*, 34(3), 372-396.
- Pierson, P. (1993). When effect becomes cause: Policy feedback and political change. *World politics*, 45(4), 595-628.
- Pierson, P. (2011). *Politics in Time History, Institutions, and Social Analysis*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Pierson, P., & Skocpol, T. (2002). Historical institutionalism in contemporary political science. *Political science: The state of the discipline*, 3, 693-721.
- Poirier, C. (2006). Ethnocultural diversity, democracy, and intergovernmental relations in Canadian cities. In R. Young & C. Leuprecht (Eds.), *Canada: The State of the federation 2004, municipal-federal-provincial Relations in Canada*, 201-220. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press
- RIAC (2004). 2004-2010 Richmond Intercultural Strategic Plan and Work Program.  
doi:[https://www.richmond.ca/\\_shared/assets/RIAC\\_Strategic\\_Plan\\_and\\_Work\\_Program\\_2012-201532514.pdf](https://www.richmond.ca/_shared/assets/RIAC_Strategic_Plan_and_Work_Program_2012-201532514.pdf)
- Richmond Community Collaboration Table. (2016). A Community Response: Richmond Immigrant Settlement Strategy and Implementation Plan 2016-2019.  
doi:<https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B4eAjfzTNIUVQ2dhVFJTR1d4RnM/view>
- RIAC. (2011). 2012-2015 Richmond Intercultural Strategic Plan and Work Program. City of Richmond. Doi:  
[https://www.richmond.ca/\\_shared/assets/RIAC\\_Strategic\\_Plan\\_andWork\\_Program\\_2012-201532514.pdf](https://www.richmond.ca/_shared/assets/RIAC_Strategic_Plan_andWork_Program_2012-201532514.pdf)
- RIAC. (2009). Terms of Reference. City of Richmond.  
doi:[http://www.richmond.ca/\\_shared/assets/RIAC12980.pdf](http://www.richmond.ca/_shared/assets/RIAC12980.pdf)

- RIAC. (2017). *2017-2022 Intercultural Strategic Plan*. Richmond. doi:  
[https://www.richmond.ca/\\_\\_shared/assets/RIAC\\_Strategic\\_Plan\\_and\\_Work\\_Program\\_2017-202232514.pdf](https://www.richmond.ca/__shared/assets/RIAC_Strategic_Plan_and_Work_Program_2017-202232514.pdf)
- Richmond Public Library. (2017). ESL & Job Search. Accessed July 26, 2017.  
 Doi: [http://rpl.yourlibrary.ca/newcomers/esl\\_job\\_search](http://rpl.yourlibrary.ca/newcomers/esl_job_search)
- Sancton, A., & Young, R. A. (Eds.). (2009). *Foundations of governance: municipal government in Canada's provinces*. University of Toronto Press. Toronto.
- Sellers, J. M. (2005). Re-placing the nation: An agenda for comparative urban politics. *Urban Affairs Review*, 40(4), 419-445.
- Sellers, J. M. (2010). State-society relations. *The SAGE handbook of governance*, 124-141.
- Social Planning and Research Council of British Columbia. (2016). *Richmond Local Immigration Partnership Summary Report*. City of Richmond.
- SPAC. (2014a). Social Policy Advisory Committee Minutes, July 2, 2014.  
 Retrieved from  
[http://www.surrey.ca/bylawsandcouncillibrary/MIN\\_SPAC\\_2014\\_07\\_02.pdf](http://www.surrey.ca/bylawsandcouncillibrary/MIN_SPAC_2014_07_02.pdf)
- SPAC. (2014b). Social Policy Advisory Committee Minutes, March 5, 2014.  
 Retrieved from  
[http://www.surrey.ca/bylawsandcouncillibrary/MIN\\_SPAC\\_2014\\_03\\_05.pdf](http://www.surrey.ca/bylawsandcouncillibrary/MIN_SPAC_2014_03_05.pdf)
- SPAC. (2014c). Social Policy Advisory Committee Minutes, May 14 2014.  
 Retrieved from  
[http://www.surrey.ca/bylawsandcouncillibrary/MIN\\_SPAC\\_2014\\_05\\_14.pdf](http://www.surrey.ca/bylawsandcouncillibrary/MIN_SPAC_2014_05_14.pdf)
- Stasiulis, D., Hughes, C., & Amery, Z. (2011). From government to multilevel governance of immigrant of immigrant settlement in Ontario's city regions. In E. Tolley & R. Young (Eds.), *Immigrant settlement policy in Canadian cities* (pp. 73-147). McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Statistics Canada. (2017). Richmond, CY, British Columbia (Code 5915015) (table). National Household Survey (NHS) Profile. 2011 National House hold Survey. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 99-004-XWE. Ottawa.  
<http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/dp-pd/prof/index.cfm?Lang=E> (accessed November 7, 2016).
- Statistics Canada. (2013, September 11). Surrey, CY, British Columbia (Code 5915004) (table). National Household Survey (NHS) Profile. 2011 National Household Survey. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 99-004-XWE. Ottawa. Released

September 11, 2013. <http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/dp-pd/prof/index.cfm?Lang=E> (Accessed November 7, 2016).

Steinmo, S. (2001). The new institutionalism. *The encyclopedia of democratic thought*, 560-65

Stoker, G. (1998). Governance as theory: Five propositions. *International social science journal*, 50 (155), 17-28.

Stone, C. N. (1989). *Regime politics: governing Atlanta, 1946-1988*. Univ Pr of Kansas.

Stone, C. N. (1993). Urban regimes and the capacity to govern: A political economy approach. *Journal of urban affairs*, 15(1), 1-28.

Surrey LIP. (2014). Surrey LIP Newsletter: Engaged & Inclusive. Retrieved from <https://www.surrey.ca/files/SurreyLIPnewsletter01.pdf>

Surrey LIP. (2015a). Immigrant Labour Market Research Project: Final Report, November 2015. Retrieved from <http://www.surreylip.ca/sites/default/files/SLIP%20Final%20Report%20November%206%202015%20Low%20Res.pdf>

Surrey LIP. (2015b). Surrey is Home: Immigrant Integration Research Project: Final Report, March 2015. Retrieved from [http://www.surreylip.ca/sites/default/files/SurreyLIP\\_ImmigrantIntegrationResearch\\_ES-1.pdf](http://www.surreylip.ca/sites/default/files/SurreyLIP_ImmigrantIntegrationResearch_ES-1.pdf)

Surrey LIP. (2016). Surrey Immigrant Integration Strategy 2016-2019. Retrieved from [http://www.surreylip.ca/sites/default/files/1-52\\_SurreyLIP-StratPlan-Final-web.pdf](http://www.surreylip.ca/sites/default/files/1-52_SurreyLIP-StratPlan-Final-web.pdf)

Surrey LIP. (2017) Surrey Refugee Integration Strategy 2017-2020. Retrieved from [http://www.surreylip.ca/sites/default/files/2017\\_SurreyLIP-RefugeePlan-Web-FINAL.pdf](http://www.surreylip.ca/sites/default/files/2017_SurreyLIP-RefugeePlan-Web-FINAL.pdf)

Surrey Public Library. (2017). Newcomers Services. Retrieved November 30, 2017, from <https://surreylibraries.ca/services/newcomers>

Surrey Welcoming Communities Project. (2014). One Thousand Years of People: Surrey Welcoming Communities Project 2013-2014 Final Report. Doi: [http://surreylip.ca/sites/default/files/SWCC\\_Project\\_Summary\\_-\\_One\\_Year\\_Thousands\\_of\\_People.pdf](http://surreylip.ca/sites/default/files/SWCC_Project_Summary_-_One_Year_Thousands_of_People.pdf)

Tansey, O. (2007). Process tracing and elite interviewing: a case for non-probability sampling. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 40(4), 765-772.

Tossutti, L. S. (2012). Municipal roles in immigrant settlement, integration and cultural diversity. *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique*, 45(3), 607-633.

### **Interviews**

Carlile, Cathryn. General Manager, Community Services; Penner, Paul. Program Manager, Community Social Development; Sherlock, Leslie. Social Planner, Social Planning Department. Joint Interview. City of Richmond, August 23, 2017

Donahoe, Patrick. Dean, Faculty of Academic and Career Advancement, Kwantlen Polytechnic University. September 12

Habib, Sanzida. CCT Coordinator, City of Richmond, September 12, 2017

Hayne, Bruce. City Councillor, City of Surrey. August 24, 2017

LeFranc, Vera. City Councillor, City of Surrey. September 8, 2017

Shcherbyna, Olga. Coordinator, Surrey Local Immigration Partnership. August 24, 2017

### Appendix 1: Discourse in Richmond

<b>2000-2013 Discourse</b>			
<b>Word Number</b>	<b>Word</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Weighted Percentage</b>
1	city	819	2.12%
2	community	756	1.96%
3	riac	664	1.72%
4	social	483	1.25%
5	intercultural	392	1.01%
6	committee	367	0.95%
7	development	351	0.91%
8	work	341	0.88%
9	strategy	296	0.77%
10	services	263	0.68%
11	council	260	0.67%
12	program	252	0.65%
13	advisory	240	0.62%
14	youth	198	0.51%



15	planning	194	0.50%
16	plan	190	0.49%
17	strategic	187	0.48%
18	partners	179	0.46%
19	cultural	173	0.45%
20	policy	153	0.40%
21	staff	153	0.40%
22	support	153	0.40%
23	proposed	151	0.39%
24	members	147	0.38%
25	future	136	0.35%
26	groups	136	0.35%
27	issues	131	0.34%
28	programs	129	0.33%
29	building	126	0.33%
30	annual	125	0.32%
31	public	125	0.32%

32	vision	122	0.32%
33	housing	120	0.31%
34	information	120	0.31%
35	agencies	118	0.31%
36	guide	117	0.30%
37	ongoing	114	0.30%
38	civic	113	0.29%
39	years	106	0.27%
40	budget	104	0.27%
41	opportunities	104	0.27%
42	non	99	0.26%
43	term	97	0.25%
44	needs	96	0.25%
45	engagement	93	0.24%
46	action	90	0.23%
47	religious	89	0.23%
48	residents	89	0.23%

49	health	88	0.23%
50	initiatives	88	0.23%

<b>2014-2017 Discourse</b>			
<b>Word Number</b>	<b>Word</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Weighted Percentage</b>
1	city	1517	2.38%
2	community	1109	1.74%
3	services	540	0.85%
4	development	531	0.83%
5	social	529	0.83%
6	riac	458	0.72%
7	council	443	0.70%
8	intercultural	393	0.62%
9	plan	327	0.51%
10	program	324	0.51%
11	strategy	313	0.49%

12	work	307	0.48%
13	information	297	0.47%
14	programs	257	0.40%
15	committee	256	0.40%
16	strategic	242	0.38%
17	term	233	0.37%
18	guide	223	0.35%
19	public	221	0.35%
20	new	218	0.34%
21	housing	209	0.33%
22	support	209	0.33%
23	cultural	204	0.32%
24	building	196	0.31%
25	partners	195	0.31%
26	immigrant	89	0.36%
27	education	86	0.35%
28	experience	86	0.35%

29	family	86	0.35%
30	average	85	0.35%
31	opportunities	84	0.34%
32	collaboration	83	0.34%
33	number	81	0.33%
34	groups	79	0.32%
35	total	78	0.32%
36	integration	75	0.31%
37	participants	75	0.31%
38	job	72	0.29%
39	well	68	0.28%
40	organization	66	0.27%
41	living	65	0.26%
42	newcomer	64	0.26%
43	implementation	61	0.25%
44	refugees	61	0.25%
45	work	60	0.24%

46	year	60	0.24%
47	housing	59	0.24%
48	score	59	0.24%
49	skills	59	0.24%
50	years	58	0.24%

<b>CCT NVIVO Scan</b>			
<b>Word Number</b>	<b>Word</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Weighted Percentage</b>
1	services	821	3.34%
2	community	473	1.93%
3	settlement	300	1.22%
4	cct	296	1.21%
5	service	229	0.93%
6	newcomers	221	0.90%
7	respondents	206	0.84%
8	survey	206	0.84%
9	immigrants	187	0.76%
10	programs	178	0.72%

11	information	141	0.57%
12	english	130	0.53%
13	organizations	128	0.52%
14	research	127	0.52%
15	employment	126	0.51%
16	2016	124	0.51%
17	language	115	0.47%
18	support	115	0.47%
19	members	111	0.45%
20	strategy	106	0.43%
21	needs	102	0.42%
22	priority	99	0.40%
23	city	96	0.39%
24	health	94	0.38%
25	canada	91	0.37%
26	advisory	183	0.29%
27	centre	181	0.28%
28	planning	181	0.28%
29	future	176	0.28%
30	needs	170	0.27%

31	health	168	0.26%
32	opportunities	165	0.26%
33	newcomers	163	0.26%
34	service	160	0.25%
35	goal	156	0.24%
36	staff	156	0.24%
37	government	155	0.24%
38	well	152	0.24%
39	agencies	143	0.22%
40	goals	140	0.22%
41	residents	140	0.22%
42	youth	139	0.22%
43	engagement	133	0.21%
44	road	132	0.21%
45	care	130	0.20%
46	diversity	130	0.20%
47	vision	129	0.20%
48	2017	128	0.20%
49	people	128	0.20%
50	vancouver	128	0.20%



## Appendix 2: Discourse in Surrey

<b>2000-2014 Discourse</b>			
<b>Word Number</b>	<b>Word</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Weighted Percentage</b>
1	surrey	1345	1.95%
2	community	816	1.18%
3	city	805	1.16%
4	committee	778	1.13%
5	cultural	543	0.79%
6	advisory	520	0.75%
7	park	469	0.68%
8	plan	433	0.63%
9	program	396	0.57%
10	multicultural	390	0.56%
11	youth	372	0.54%
12	arts	368	0.53%
13	minutes	352	0.51%

14	services	341	0.49%
15	centre	323	0.47%
16	public	302	0.44%
17	diversity	297	0.43%
18	staff	293	0.42%
19	ave	281	0.41%
20	social	272	0.39%
21	new	267	0.39%
22	provided	253	0.37%
23	heritage	250	0.36%
24	project	244	0.35%
25	recreation	229	0.33%
26	communities	224	0.32%
27	development	222	0.32%
28	2007	215	0.31%
29	2008	214	0.31%
30	programs	211	0.31%

31	parks	202	0.29%
32	culture	200	0.29%
33	resources	195	0.28%
34	welcoming	190	0.27%
35	art	187	0.27%
36	meeting	186	0.27%
37	year	183	0.26%
38	information	182	0.26%
39	festival	181	0.26%
40	page	173	0.25%
41	planning	173	0.25%
42	mac	168	0.24%
43	2011	167	0.24%
44	housing	166	0.24%
45	people	166	0.24%
46	school	166	0.24%
47	councillor	164	0.24%

48	children	158	0.23%
49	events	158	0.23%
50	support	158	0.23%

<b>2014-2017 Discourse</b>			
<b>Word Number</b>	<b>Word</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Weighted Percentage</b>
1	surrey	1197	2.63%
2	community	466	1.02%
3	committee	409	0.90%
4	services	371	0.81%
5	city	358	0.79%
6	refugees	358	0.79%
7	diversity	278	0.61%
8	refugee	262	0.58%
9	advisory	260	0.57%
10	lip	247	0.54%

11	project	247	0.54%
12	program	217	0.48%
13	minutes	177	0.39%
14	new	175	0.38%
15	canada	170	0.37%
16	local	165	0.36%
17	newcomers	164	0.36%
18	people	164	0.36%
19	school	162	0.36%
20	welcoming	159	0.35%
21	immigration	158	0.35%
22	communities	155	0.34%
23	service	153	0.34%
24	immigrant	148	0.33%
25	settlement	148	0.33%
26	youth	148	0.33%
27	immigrants	147	0.32%

28	many	138	0.30%
29	information	134	0.29%
30	council	132	0.29%
31	staff	123	0.27%
32	support	120	0.26%
33	centre	119	0.26%
34	education	116	0.25%
35	partnership	116	0.25%
36	society	116	0.25%
37	resources	114	0.25%
38	public	108	0.24%
39	research	107	0.23%
40	year	106	0.23%
41	social	104	0.23%
42	integration	100	0.22%
43	government	98	0.22%
44	health	98	0.22%

45	work	97	0.21%
46	meeting	96	0.21%
47	business	95	0.21%
48	provide	95	0.21%
49	programs	94	0.21%
50	page	93	0.20%

LIP Discourse			
	Word	Count	Weighted Percentage
1	surrey	699	3.28%
2	community	265	1.24%
3	immigrant	245	1.15%
4	services	199	0.93%
5	lip	195	0.91%
6	integration	154	0.72%
7	refugees	134	0.63%
8	city	122	0.57%
9	immigrants	120	0.56%

10	project	120	0.56%
11	refugee	111	0.52%
12	youth	110	0.52%
13	resources	108	0.51%
14	strategy	106	0.50%
15	school	102	0.48%
16	society	99	0.46%
17	service	97	0.45%
18	newcomers	96	0.45%
19	employment	88	0.41%
20	research	86	0.40%
21	education	83	0.39%
22	local	82	0.38%
23	program	77	0.36%
24	immigration	74	0.35%
25	new	70	0.33%
26	language	67	0.31%
27	settlement	67	0.31%
28	support	67	0.31%
29	canada	66	0.31%
30	work	64	0.30%



31	access	62	0.29%
32	health	60	0.28%
33	information	60	0.28%
34	needs	60	0.28%
35	population	60	0.28%
36	april	59	0.28%
37	programs	59	0.28%
38	social	55	0.26%
39	organizations	54	0.25%
40	also	53	0.25%
41	many	53	0.25%
42	residents	53	0.25%
43	communities	52	0.24%
44	group	52	0.24%
45	university	52	0.24%
46	people	51	0.24%
47	focus	49	0.23%
48	students	48	0.23%
49	training	48	0.23%
50	advisory	46	0.22%