PCERII Working Paper Series

ETHNIC/RACIAL URBAN RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION IN EASTERN CANADA

Leo Driedger
University of Manitoba

Working Paper No. WP03-03

July 2003

PRAIRIE CENTRE OF EXCELLENCE
METROPOLIS
FOR RESEARCH ON IMMIGRATION AND INTEGRATION

The *PCERII Working Paper Series* is published by the
Prairie Centre of Excellence for Research on
Immigration and Integration.

For additional information contact:

PCERII Working Paper Series
Attention: Ms. Lenise Levesque, Editorial Assistant
1-17 Humanities Centre, University of Alberta
Edmonton, AB T6G 2E5 Canada
Tel: (780) 492-0635 Fax: (780) 492-259
Email: lenise@ualberta.ca
Web Site: http://pcerii.metropolis.net

Funders

We are pleased to acknowledge the following organizations that provide funding in support of the Prairie Centre: the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada; Citizenship and Immigration Canada; Canadian Heritage; Statistics Canada; Human Resources Development Canada; Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, Public Works and Government Services Canada, Status of Women Canada, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Public Service Commission, and the Solicitor General of Canada. The University of Alberta provides PCERII with a generous grant and the other participating universities offer supplementary support.

Ethnic/Racial Urban Residential Segregation

Leo Driedger
University of Manitoba

Driedger (1999) found that the largest metropolitan centres, Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver, represented three distinct residential segregation types in Canada. His examination of urban centres on the prairies showed that residential segregation in Winnipeg was more similar to Vancouver, and segregation in Calgary was more like Toronto. In this study, the Quebec and Atlantic Canada urban centres are examined for residential segregation type.

The author found that the largest eastern cities (Quebec City, Halifax, St. John's) tend to follow the pattern found in Montreal. None followed the Toronto residential segregation type, where race is a much more important factor. Metropolitan centres become depositories of immigrants over time, and these newcomers live in different areas of these cities. Eastern Canada, however, where people of British and French heritage dominate, received few immigrants in the twentieth century, and therefore follow the older Montreal pattern to a greater degree than the Toronto pattern, where recent immigrants have flocked recently. Size of city, social class, ethnicity and race, are all important influential factors examined here.

In this study we examine urban centres in Quebec and Atlantic Canada, to see whether they follow the residential segregation patterns of Montreal, the largest regional urban system in eastern Canada. Driedger (1999) found that the largest metropolitan centres, Montreal, Toronto, and Vancouver, represented three distinct residential segregation types. His examination of metropolitan areas on the prairies showed that residential segregation in Winnipeg was more similar to Vancouver, and segregation in Calgary was more like that of Toronto. We expect that Toronto, which was an early important centre in the region, will, because of historical, regional, political, economic, and social factors, be a model for many in the east. In this paper we shall compare some of those differences.

Metropolitan centres in Canada have become depositories of immigrants over time, and these newcomers live in different areas of these cities. The Big Three (Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver) urban centres, are expected to follow the Burgess concentric zone segregation pattern, as found by Balakrishnan and associates in 1976. Because the spatial social patterns vary considerably, these three will be used as

Keywords: Segregation; Quebec; Atlantic Canada; Montreal; Race; Ethnicity; Class.

ecological segregation types. Which patterns of residential segregation do the major urban centres in eastern Canada follow? This paper compares the major eastern urban centres with Montreal and Toronto, and seeks to find reasons for significant variations.

Theoretical and Conceptual Context

A Historical Sketch

The British and the French constituted a vast majority of the Canadian population, prior to the 1960s. John Porter's (1965) classic, *The Vertical Mosaic,* described the bilingual and bicultural demographic situation in the first century, with its controlled immigration policy which had heavily favoured North European immigrants. The French first settled in what is now Quebec, and the British came to Atlantic Canada and Ontario later. Porter (1965) designated these two as charter groups, and they dominated in their respective political regions, while other Europeans came as entrance immigrants into the federation founded in 1867.

A social revolution developed in Quebec which motivated the federal government to establish a Bilingual and Bicultural Commission (1965-1970) in the sixties, to see what changes were required. The title of the commission itself reflects how bipolar the mostly British and French heritage politicians in Ottawa saw Canada. When the commission arrived for hearings in the West, they found Germans, Ukrainians, Scandinavians, and a substantial number of other Europeans, who felt ignored. The commission soon responded by including *The Cultural Contributions of Other Ethnic Groups* (1970) as volume four in their multiple volume report. It was this commission report, and other factors, which influenced Trudeau to declare Canada a Bilingual and Multicultural nation in 1971 (Driedger, 2001).

A change in the restrictive immigration laws to include a point system where immigrants from all over the world had a better chance of admission into Canada also occurred in the sixties. This change has resulted in a much larger influx of immigrants from other non-European parts of the world, who settled heavily in Toronto and Ontario, which is much more multiethnic, multiracial and multicultural. In 1971 only about five percent of immigrants were considered non-European peoples of colour, but by 1996 this figure had doubled to ten percent, with large numbers of people entering Canada from Asia, the Caribbean and Africa. To help predict where all these new immigrants might live, we need to examine eastern urban residential segregation models, to see whether the earliest regions settled by French and British migrants have influenced urban residential patterns.

Zonal and Multiple Nuclei Models

Two early models have been developed, that examine urban residential segregation, one by the Duncans (1957) and the other by Shevky and Bell (1955). The Duncans' (1957) model is oriented to social class as the major factor determining where people live in the city, based on the Burgess concentric zone theory of urban growth developed in Chicago.

The Duncans assumed that lower class residents live close to the centre where usually the oldest, cheapest housing can be found. Because socio-economic status rises towards the newer outer zones, the Duncans predicted that the higher status families such as the British, and other northern Europeans, would live in the suburbs, and more recent immigrants from low status, non-white racial groups would live near the centre (Driedger, 1996). The Duncans (1957) used occupational mobility data as the basis for their study. More recently, Isajiw, Sev'er and Driedger (1993) have also examined occupational social mobility.

Shevky and Bell (1955) in their studies of Los Angeles and San Francisco, pursued the multiple nuclei theory proposed by Hoyt (1959). This conceptual framework offered many possibilities, which others have since employed with considerable success (Hou, Feng and Balakrishnan, 1996). By using factor analysis, Shevky and Bell could incorporate and control more variables. Out of their factor analysis emerged social rank, family status, and ethnicity factors, which Driedger (1991, 1996) used in his studies in Winnipeg. Shevky and Bell (1955) turned the focus of study from zones and sectors in the city to nuclei within the city, and the intensity of the interaction of members of groups within spatial enclaves (Driedger, 1991).

Shevky and Bell's formulae confirmed the salience of social class or socio-economic status as a strong variable (assumed to be the major variable in the work of the Duncans), but also provided a logical framework to study more variables, including ethnicity. Shevky and Bell's work is helpful because it shows that ethnicity has an independent influence on spatial location, and results in ethnic nuclei that do not necessarily conform to zonal or sector patterns.

Centralization and Concentration

Each metropolis can be examined as a social system by itself, to see how the population is ordered spatially, and which social factors are most influential. Balakrishnan (1976) studied the socio-economic differentiation in 23 metropolitan centres in Canada using 1961 census data. Following the Burgess concentric zone theory, he used a composite score of occupation, education, and income to indicate socio-economic status, and he measured the ecological distance from the centre of the city to the suburbs. He ranked 23 metropolitan areas in Canada by size into four distinct categories. There are very different patterns when the four are compared. They found that Montreal, Toronto, and Vancouver (the three largest centres) clearly follow the Burgess zonal pattern; socio-economic status is lowest in the city centres and rises steadily towards the suburbs. I plan to examine the residential segregation patterns in Quebec and Atlantic Canada and compare these especially with Montreal, the largest in the region.

In contrast to the pattern of the three largest Canadian cities, the seven smallest centres with populations under 100,000 (most of them now over 100,000) seemed to have no clearly defined residential pattern variation. In small cities, spatial arrangements seem relatively undifferentiated by socio-economic class, but as cities grow, they increasingly follow the Burgess zonal pattern, so urban size is a major factor. When an urban population approaches one million or more, the lower socio-economic residents tend to live in the older inner city and higher status residents are increasingly located in the newer outer rings in the

suburbs. When Balakrishnan (1976) analyzed spatial patterns using a quartile zone system (SES distributed in four equal groupings of 25 percent each) rather than geographically based physical distance, he found a similar pattern. This Canadian study shows that size of urban area seems to be an important factor affecting the way socio-economic status groups cluster.

Balakrishnan and associates also found that socio-economic status was predominantly sectoral (following the Ullman and Harris findings), where family status was zonal (Burgess pattern), and ethnic status followed multiple nuclei patterns (Shevky and Bell pattern) (Driedger, 1996). Balakrishnan and associates (1987, 1990, 1991, 1996) have now updated their work using a variety of diversity, concentration, dissimilarity and segregation indexes, which show that ethnic diversity between 1961 and 1991 has not increased in Atlantic Canada where (except for Halifax), the population is nearly homogeneously of British background. Similarly in Quebec, metropolitan centres east of Montreal, the population is homogeneously of French heritage. Driedger (1996) used a diversity index (0-1.0) to compare segregation diversity. Montreal, however, was much more ethnically diverse even in 1961 (.45), a diversity that increased somewhat by 1991 (.53) (Driedger, 1996). Urban centres west of Montreal were already ethnically diverse in 1961, ranging from .58 to .75 (exceptions Victoria and London), and by 1991 all of these centres in the west had become considerably more ethnically diverse, seven of them ranging in the seventies and seven in the eighties on the diversity index. Clearly in Atlantic Canada the population is mostly of British background, Quebec is largely of French heritage, and people in Ontario and the West are from multicultural backgrounds.

Visible minorities have increased from five to about ten percent of the Canadian population between 1971 and 1991 (Hou and Balakrishnan, 1996). Changes in the immigration act in the sixties enabled visible minorities to compete for entrance into Canada, and those who landed in turn sponsored immediate kin to join them (Driedger, 1999, 2001). Most of the visible minorities reside in Canada's cities, especially Toronto and Vancouver (Olsen and Kobayashi, 1993; Massey, 1986; Massey and Denton, 1987, 1993; Reitz, 1988).

By 1991 more than one fifth of the population of metropolitan Vancouver (22%), and metropolitan Toronto (21%) were visible minorities; Calgary (15%) and Edmonton (13%) ranked third and fourth, and Winnipeg (10%) approached the national average (Hou and Balakrishnan, 1996). These five metropolitan areas have the highest concentrations of visible minorities, and we expect that patterns of residential segregation will also be highest there.

In Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs) east of Montreal, except for Halifax (6%), only one or two percent of the populations are non-white. Other than Montreal (7%), CMAs in Quebec have almost no visible minorities. Except for Toronto, Ontario CMAs have less than the Canadian average of ten percent-close to five percent or less (Driedger, 1991).

Hou and Balakrishnan (1996) in 1991 found that outside Quebec, European Whites from British, German, French, and Italian backgrounds are among the least concentrated. British scores are very low. Italians who have arrived in Canada more recently are the most concentrated of the Whites, but their numbers are generally lower than visible minorities. Visible minorities like the Chinese, Blacks, Aboriginals, and South Asians score above

.50 in all of the centres, and are more concentrated than Whites. Clearly race at the time of immigration is an important factor which differentiates residential concentration.

Comparisons of the Big Three Urban Centres

In the search for differential patterns of ethnic and racial segregated types of urban centres, factor analysis of census tracts in the largest centres (Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver) was done by Driedger (1999). Montreal is part of the heart of French Quebec, and so it might be expected that the French, being a charter group, would be segregated in Montreal, in large French enclaves. In 1929, Dawson and Gettys used the Burgess concentric zonal model to plot ethnic residential areas in Montreal, and found that the French were located on the east side of Mount Royal, the British on the west side, and Blacks and visible minorities in zone two, in between the two solitudes. The two founding peoples were located on opposite sides of the mountain.

Running a factor analysis, using 1991 census tracts, Driedger (1999) found that the Quebec French middle class emerged as the first factor in Montreal. Included in factor one were the non-immigrant French population, Canadian citizens born in Quebec, the largely non-university educated, those in middle class occupations, and in the middle income range of $30,000-69,000. French Quebeckers were heavily concentrated in the east side of Montreal where Dawson and Gettys (1929) first found them in the 1920s, and they still resided there.

The second factor, Driedger (1999) found included recent immigrants of non-European heritage, many visible minorities, and those of low socio-economic status. These newcomers are residentially segregated from the majority French middle class in Montreal who have lived here permanently for centuries. The third factor includes North Europeans (heavily British) residents of high socio-economic status, residents of $70,000 plus income, the university educated, and those with higher status occupations. Here live those of the highest socio-economic class, and North European residents of British, German, Dutch and Swedish heritage. In 1991, similar to what Dawson and Gettys (1929) found in the 1920s, they still live separated on the other side of the mountain from the majority who are French and the newcomers.

Since the seventies, Toronto has surpassed Montreal as the largest metropolis in Canada, because it is in the centre of what has become the industrial southern Ontario heartland of Canada. Ontario has been the industrial magnet for years, and is increasingly also becoming the financial entrepreneurial engine which drives the country (Driedger, 1991). While residential segregation patterns were similar to Montreal and Vancouver before 1971, patterns have changed since, where recent immigrants of colour have been attracted to industrial Toronto. (After the rise of the Parti Quebecois and separatism, drove many Anglophones and English business out of Montreal into Toronto.)

Looking at residential segregation patterns in Toronto, the first factor includes recent non-caucasian immigrants who arrived since the 1970s, and includes many who are not yet "landed immigrants" (Driedger, 1999). Those born in South and Central America, the Caribbean, Asia, Africa and India, Blacks, East Indian and Filipino ethnic origins live in this area. The unemployed, and those in the lowest income levels live here as well as those who

have not finished high school. By 1996, 31.6 percent of Toronto's population were non-White in what used to be a mostly White population dominated by the British. This is a major reason why so many studies on race have come out of Toronto (James, 1990; Anderson, 1993; Henry, 1994; Henry et al., 2000; James, 1995; Richmond, 1994). Toronto is different from Montreal and Vancouver, in that recent immigrant visible minorities appear as the first factor in residential segregation. So it is not surprising that the non-immigrant North European factor, which appeared first in the other two, has become the second factor in Toronto. Residents who are white middle class, those who are non-immigrant North Europeans live in newer areas, residentially segregated from recent immigrant visible minorities who live in more affordable older areas. The third factor represents higher status residents, very similar to those in Montreal and Vancouver. They live where those with the most education, those who work in higher status occupations, and those who have the highest incomes also live. As in Vancouver, those born in the United States, as well as those of Jewish origin, are the most highly represented here.

Recently Driedger (2001) has suggested that:

> The study of ethnic and race relations in Canada evolved into three major visions and debates after World War II. In the pre-seventies the British and French charter peoples assured monolingual/ monocultural states, and expected that others would assimilate and amalgamate losing their separate identities. Beginning in the 1970s, this was expanded to official bilingual and multicultural visions. By the 1980s, ethnic and demographic diversity had expanded to include debates of equal rights for all, without prejudice or discrimination.

In this study, I examine, using residential segregation, whether Canadian eastern urban centres still follow patterns set earlier by European charter groups as in Montreal, or whether patterns of residence show that new visible immigrants have increasingly become a factor as they have in Toronto (Driedger, 1999).

The Problem and Methods Used

With this brief review of urban residential research, I am ready to introduce the general hypothesis that historic, demographic and social and political factors have affected residential segregation patterns in metropolitan centre in Canada quite differentially. To examine this hypothesis, the Montreal, Toronto, Quebec, and Atlantic metropolitan residential patterns will be compared.

To gain some sense of the diversity of the various urban forms, I did not resort to use of previously developed dissimilarity, concentration, and segregation statistics. Instead, I fed more than one hundred 1991 census variables into a principal component factor analysis, comparing census tracts. The two nearest and largest urban centres (Montreal and Toronto) were compared

with eastern Quebec (Quebec City, Sherbrooke), and Maritime (Halifax, St. John's, Saint John) metropolitan centres. The three factor solution explained roughly forty percent of the variance and the five factor solution about 50 percent of the variance. The first factor usually explained between 20-25 percent of the variance, the second 10-15 percent, and the third 7-10 percent, for a total of roughly 40 percent (using the three factor solution). The decision was made to use the three factor solution for analysis in this study, because it kept some of the immigrant, ethnic/social and socio-economic variables together, which proved helpful in refining multiple comparisons. Variables with factor scores of .40 were included. Based on the literature review, I expect the following:

1. The largest centres in eastern Canada (Quebec City), Halifax, St. John's will follow the residential patterns of Montreal most.
2. The largest urban centres where French Canadians are most dominant (Quebec City, Sherbrooke, Moncton) will follow the Montreal residential pattern most.
3. The largest urban centres where British Canadians are most dominant (Halifax, St. John's, Saint John) will also follow the Montreal residential pattern most.
4. Eastern urban residential patterns will resemble the Toronto residential pattern much less, where race is a much more dominant factor.

Findings

Montreal, Vancouver and Toronto have historically emerged as three quite different ethno-racial residential segregation types. Let us examine how the urban centres in eastern Canada correlated with Montreal and each other.

Montreal: Compared With the Largest Eastern Centres

In Table 1 I compare the factor structure of Montreal with the three other largest metropolitan areas (Quebec City, Halifax, and St. John's) in eastern Canada. The first factor, which represents French middle socio-economic status residents in Montreal, is also the dominant factor in Quebec City, Halifax, and St. John's. While in the first two Quebec centres this includes mostly French Canadians, in Halifax and St. John's where people of British heritage are dominant, it includes the British and other northern Europeans such as the Dutch as well as Jewish residents. The four metropolitan centres match quite well. Middle class people of North European background live in the same areas in all four centres.

The majority of items also cluster together in factor two, designated as Recent Low SES Immigrants in all four centres. In Montreal, residents with lower incomes, residents who immigrated recently, South Europeans and residents of colour such as Asians, people from the Caribbean, combine to make this a low income factor. They live in many of the same census tracts concentrated to the centres of the four metropolitan areas. Basically, the structures of Montreal, Quebec City, Halifax and St. John's match well, when we examine the first two factors.

Table 1
Residential Segregation Factor Structures of Montreal, Quebec City, Halifax and St. John's

	Montreal			Quebec City			Halifax			St. John's		
	French	Visible	High									
Variables	North	Immigrants	SES									
	Europe	Low										
	Middle	SES										
	SES											
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Non-immigrant population	0.97			0.67			0.71			0.72		
Canadian citizenship	0.95					0.64			0.73			0.68
Trades certificate or diploma	0.94			0.86			0.84			0.95		
$40,000-$49,999 family income	0.94			0.93			0.92			0.58		
French origins, ethnic origin	0.93			0.91			0.9			0.21		
Grades 9-13 - with secondary certificate	0.93			0.82			0.82			0.95		
Retail trade industries	0.91			0.28					0.69		0.75	
$50,000-$59,999 family income	0.91			0.62					0.68			0.88
Grades 9-13 - without secondary certificate	0.91			0.34			0.45			0.66		
Other non-university - with certificate	0.91			0.94			0.94			0.81		
Employed, both sexes 15+	0.9			0.37			0.49			0.4		
$30,000-$39,999 family income	0.9			0.78			0.7			0.79		
Construction industries	0.9			0.83			0.85			0.46		
Other non-university - without certificate	0.87			0.92			0.89					0.61
$60,000-$69,999 family income	0.85			0.79			0.73					0.28
Manufacturing industries	0.84			0.27			0.33			0.88		
Government service industries	0.82			0.95			0.71			0.44		
Communication and other utility industries	0.8			0.6			0.71			0.86		
Transportation and storage industries	0.79			0.93			0.93			0.9		
$20,000-$29,999 family income	0.76			0.83			0.9			0.96		
Wholesale trade industries	0.75			0.68				0.69		0.86		
Finance and insurance industries	0.74					0.71			0.62		0.88	
Health and social service industries	0.72			0.85			0.88			0.78		
Not in the labour force - both sexes 15+	0.71			0.35			0.37			0.79		
Unemployed, both sexes 15+	0.7			0.95			0.96			0.71		
Accommodation, food and beverage inds.	0.65					0.57	0.7			0.82		
Other service industries	0.64			0.9			0.96			0.87		
Highest level of schooling, less than grade 9	0.63			0.84			0.81			0.94		
Aboriginal origins, single ethnic origin	0.61			0.62			0.64			0.95		
Agricultural and related service industries	0.42			0.91			0.9			0.83		
Mining (incl. Milling), quarrying & oil well inds.	0.41			0.83			0.81			0.9		
Canadian, single ethnic origin	0.34			0.66			0.7			0.38		
$10,000-$19,999 family income		0.92				0.82			0.78			0.74
0-4 years, age at immigration		0.92			0.56			0.92			0.69	
1961-1970, period of immigration		0.92			0.76			0.9			0.76	
1971-1980, period of immigration		0.91			0.72			0.88			0.64	
1981-1991, period of immigration		0.88			0.64				0.72			0.83
20 years and over, age at immigration		0.83			0.93			0.83			0.95	
5-19 years, age at immigration		0.78			0.69			0.8			0.77	
Africa, place of birth		0.77			0.6			0.79			0.44	
Before 1961, period of immigration		0.77			0.7			0.77			0.61	
Black origins, single ethnic origin		0.75			0.39				0.68		0.31	
Caribbean and Bermuda, place of birth		0.73			0.42			0.73			0.34	
Central and South America, place of birth		0.72			0.38				0.63			0.59
Chinese, single ethnic origin		0.68			0.31			0.71			0.63	
Citizenship other than Canadian		0.66			0.75			0.71			0.88	

East Indian, n.i.e., single ethnic origin		0.65			0.32			0.71			0.63	
Greek, single ethnic origin		0.64			0.41			0.69			0.19	
Immigrant population		0.62			0.94			0.66			0.96	
India, place of birth		0.61			0.33			0.65			0.6	
Italian, single ethnic origin		0.59			0.5			0.64		0.13		
Non-permanent residents		0.57			0.66			0.61			0.56	
Other Asia, place of birth		0.53			0.47			0.58			0.76	
Other Europe, place of birth		0.53			0.83			0.55			0.64	
Polish, single ethnic origin		0.53			0.31				0.59			0.56
Portuguese, single ethnic origin		0.53		0.23			0.13			0.9		
Spanish, single ethnic origin		0.5			0.42				0.58	0.55		
Under $10,000 family income		0.46				0.72			0.46		0.42	
Under $10,000 household income		0.34				0.85			0.34		0.47	
Vietnamese, single ethnic origin		0.21			0.36				0.87			0.81
Irish, single ethnic origin			0.79		0.52			0.51			0.72	
Hungarian (Magyar), single ethnic origin			0.79		0.89			0.42			0.79	
German, single ethnic origin			0.77		0.68			0.37		0.68		
$70,000 and over family income			0.74		0.79			0.28		0.78		
British origins, ethnic origin			0.73		0.63			0.93		0.67		
Dutch (Netherlands), single ethnic origin			0.72	0.52			0.95			0.83		
Educational service industries			0.71		0.54		0.94					0.31
English, single ethnic origin			0.69	0.42			0.71			0.86		
Jewish, single ethnic origin			0.69	0.44			0.71			0.8		
Logging and forestry industries			0.67		0.62			0.48			0.44	
Real estate operator & insurance agent inds.			0.66		0.78			0.43		0.82		
Scottish, single ethnic origin			0.63		0.78			0.7			0.6	
Unemployment rate, both sexes 15+			0.58	0.28			0.54				0.63	
United Kingdom, place of birth			0.57		0.63			0.51		0.66		
United States of America, place of birth			0.52	0.58			0.59			0.95		
University - with certificate			0.43		0.4			0.68			0.41	

A look at factor three is quite different. The items which make up the third factor (high SES and other Europeans), for the most part, do not appear in factor three as they do in Montreal. In Quebec City and Halifax these items tend to line up in factor two, and in St. John's in factor one. Since a third factor hardly forms at all for the three smaller centres, we conclude that urban population size is operating, where those who are of higher socio-economic status have not yet differentiated themselves enough to move into exclusive areas, as they have in the much larger Montreal (3 million), which is six to 20 times as large as the three largest eastern centres.

Urban French Charter Dominance

Remembering that Balakrishnan (1991) and associates found that larger cities tend to follow the Burgess concentric zone pattern in Canada more, I decided to first compare the largest metropolitan areas in Quebec (Montreal, Quebec City, Sherbrooke), which include one of the Big Three. Table 2 presents the three factor segregation structure of Montreal, and compares the next largest urban centres in Quebec, with the Montreal pattern.

In Table 1 Montreal and Quebec City are compared; factor one (French, middle SES status) is very similar for both. In Table 2 factor one is very similar in Sherbrooke, but very different in Moncton, New Brunswick. The French Canadians dominate in all four cities, but Moncton is different because of size. Moncton is barely a metropolis of 100,000 or more, where the population has not yet become as differentiated as the other three, which are larger.

The majority of items in factor two (lower SES incomes, recent immigrants, people of colour), also cluster in Montreal and Quebec City, as well as Moncton, but they cluster as factor three in Sherbrooke. Race and low income are the major variables here, and they cluster together in all four centres, although in factor three in Sherbrooke.

Items which make up the third factor (high SES and other Europeans) in Montreal, also cluster in Quebec City and Sherbrooke, but under factor two. Again, there is no pattern in the smallest city, Moncton.

Urban size is a factor, but is European background type a factor which differentiates residents?

Urban British Charter Dominance

Having examined French dominance in the Quebec area, what about British dominance in Atlantic Canada, and residential segregation patterns? In Table 3 I compare Montreal with Halifax, St. John's and Saint John, the largest metropolitan centres in Atlantic Canada, which are also the capitals of Nova Scotia, Newfoundland and New Brunswick.

We see in Table 3, that the first North European middle SES status factor is very similar to Montreal in Halifax and St. John's, and the second lower SES status immigrants of colour factor is also quite similar in all three centres. Whether North Europeans are dominated by the French or British does not seem to matter. Saint John, however, in the southern half of a bilingual New Brunswick, does not follow the Montreal pattern.

Table 2
Residential Segregation Factor Structures of French cities, Montreal, Quebec City, Sherbrooke, and Moncton

		Montreal			Quebec City			Sherbrooke			Moncton	
	French	Visible	High									
Variables	North	Immigrants	SES									
	Europe	Low										
	Middle	SES										
	SES											
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Non-immigrant population	0.97			0.67			0.88					0.67
Canadian citizenship	0.95					0.66	0.71					0.48
Trades certificate or diploma	0.94			0.86			0.91					
$40,000-$49,999 family income	0.94			0.93			0.94				0.61	
French origins, ethnic origin	0.93			0.91			0.91				0.36	
Grades 9-13 - with secondary certificate	0.93			0.82			0.88					
Retail trade industries	0.91			0.28			0.61				0.5	
$50,000-$59,999 family income	0.91			0.62			0.83					0.89
Grades 9-13 - without secondary certificate	0.91			0.34			0.54					0.69
Other non-university - with certificate	0.91			0.94			0.98					
Employed, both sexes 15+	0.9			0.37			0.68			0.47		
$30,000-$39,999 family income	0.9			0.78			0.88					
Construction industries	0.9			0.83			0.87			0.51		
Other non-university - without certificate	0.87			0.92			0.96					0.73
$60,000-$69,999 family income	0.85			0.79			0.88					
Manufacturing industries	0.84			0.27								
Government service industries	0.82			0.95			0.99			0.47		
Communication and other utility industries	0.8			0.6			0.85					
Transportation and storage industries	0.79			0.93			0.96					
$20,000-$29,999 family income	0.76			0.83			0.94					
Wholesale trade industries	0.75			0.68			0.78					0.55
Finance and insurance industries	0.74					0.71	0.58				0.66	
Health and social service industries	0.72			0.85			0.93					
Not in the labour force - both sexes 15+	0.71			0.35			0.33					
Unemployed, both sexes 15+	0.7			0.95			0.98					0.68
Accommodation, food and beverage inds.	0.65					0.59	0.72					
Other service industries	0.64			0.9			0.95					
Highest level of schooling, less than grade 9	0.63			0.84			0.92					
Aboriginal origins, single ethnic origin	0.61			0.62			0.85					
Agricultural and related service industries	0.42			0.91			0.95					
Mining (incl. Milling), quarrying & oil well inds.	0.41			0.83			0.73					
Canadian, single ethnic origin	0.34			0.66			0.79			0.42		
$10,000-$19,999 family income		0.92				0.82			0.52			0.8

0-4 years, age at immigration		0.92			0.56				0.49		0.63	
1961-1970, period of immigration		0.92			0.76			0.8			0.74	
1971-1980, period of immigration		0.91			0.72			0.68				
1981-1987, period of immigration		0.91			0.53				0.61		0.48	
1981-1991, period of immigration		0.88			0.64				0.9			0.85
1988-1991, period of immigration		0.85			0.57				0.83			0.38
20 years and over, age at immigration		0.83			0.93			0.69			0.89	
5-19 years, age at immigration		0.78			0.69				0.88		0.61	
Africa, place of birth		0.77			0.6				0.65			0.4
Before 1961, period of immigration		0.77			0.7			0.84			0.55	
Black origins, single ethnic origin		0.75			0.39				0.45		0.48	
Caribbean and Bermuda, place of birth		0.73			0.42				0.44	0.51		
Central and South America, place of birth		0.72			0.38				0.68			0.83
Chinese, single ethnic origin		0.68			0.31				0.48	0.42		
Citizenship other than Canadian		0.66			0.75				0.89		0.7	
East Indian, n.i.e., single ethnic origin		0.65			0.32			0.41			0.64	
Greek, single ethnic origin		0.64			0.41			0.29			0.53	
Immigrant population		0.62			0.94				0.81		0.87	
India, place of birth		0.61			0.33			0.35			0.63	
Italian, single ethnic origin		0.59			0.5				0.39		0.77	
Non-permanent residents		0.57			0.66				0.29			0.45
Other Asia, place of birth		0.53			0.47				0.65		0.48	
Other Europe, place of birth		0.53			0.83			0.55			0.74	
Polish, single ethnic origin		0.53			0.31				0.68			0.56
Portuguese, single ethnic origin		0.53		0.23					0.33			
Spanish, single ethnic origin		0.5			0.42				0.59			0.6
Under $10,000 family income		0.46				0.72			0.64		0.31	
Irish, single ethnic origin			0.79		0.52			0.83			0.62	
Hungarian (Magyar), single ethnic origin			0.79		0.89			0.73			0.63	
German, single ethnic origin			0.77		0.68			0.81		0.58		
$70,000 and over family income			0.74		0.79			0.71				
British origins, ethnic origin			0.73		0.63		0.74					
Dutch (Netherlands), single ethnic origin			0.72	0.52				0.74				
Educational service industries			0.71		0.54			0.72			0.61	
English, single ethnic origin			0.69	0.42				0.73				
Jewish, single ethnic origin			0.69	0.44				0.32				
Logging and forestry industries			0.67		0.62			0.68				
Real estate operator & insurance agent inds.			0.66		0.78			0.63				0.54
Scottish, single ethnic origin			0.63		0.78			0.77		0.56		
Unemployment rate, both sexes 15+			0.58	0.28				0.58			0.61	
United Kingdom, place of birth			0.57		0.63		0.7			0.67		
United States of America, place of birth			0.52	0.58			0.65					
University - with certificate			0.43		0.4				0.47			

The third high SES other European factor in Montreal does not develop in the same way in the other three Maritime centres. High SES European items cluster under factors one and two in Halifax, as factor one in St. John's and Saint John. These are centres well under half a million, so size seems to again be operating, where diversity and differentiation is not yet as great. These British patterns seem to be very similar segregation patterns of French centres in Table 2.

We conclude that type of North European (French and British), does not seem to be a factor. However, SES and race seem to be important factors which determine where residents live. Let us pursue the racial factor more.

Race: Is This a Major Residential Factor?

Driedger (1999) found that Toronto was becoming a unique metropolitan centre in Canada, where race was the first and dominant factor which differentiated residents. He also found, that except for Calgary, Toronto seemed to be the lone star urban centre where race was the first dominant factor. I predict that urban centres in the east, dominated by the British and French, will not follow what seems to be this recent new trend in Toronto (Driedger, 2001). We see in Table 4 that low SES visible immigrant minorities appear as the first factor; North European high SES residents cluster under factor two, and high status residents in factor three.

Table 4 compares the largest three urban centres (other than Montreal) in Ontario, Quebec and Maritime regions, to see whether race is as important as it is in Toronto. In Ottawa-Hull, immigrant visible minority low SES immigrants indicators tend to cluster in the third factor, not in the first as they do in Toronto. A majority of North European SES resident items also cluster in factor two, but items in factor three are scattered elsewhere. Ottawa-Hull does not follow the Toronto pattern much at all. Basically, visible minority items do not cluster in factor one as they do in Toronto. Examination of a dozen other large urban centres in the west, and Quebec, revealed that none followed the Toronto pattern closely.

The majority of items related to visible minority immigrants clustered in factor one in Toronto, tend to cluster in factor two in Quebec City. In Quebec City, North European high SES items cluster well, but as factor one, not factor two as in Toronto. There is no indication of any factor three in Quebec City. When we examined other large urban centres in Quebec, we also found that race was not a dominant first factor as it is in Toronto.

Findings were similar in comparing centres in Atlantic Canada. In Table 4 we see that Halifax, the largest centre, has no dominant first factor. A majority of the North European items cluster as factor one, where people of British background are dominant, and items related to general high SES residents appear more in factor one, with none in factor three. Comparisons of the Toronto factor structure with St. John's, Saint John and Moncton also show that the items related to low status visible minorities do not cluster like they do in Toronto.

We conclude that race is more dominant a factor in Toronto than in other urban centres in Ontario, Quebec and Atlantic Canada.

Table 3
Residential Segregation Factor Structures of Montreal, Halifax, St. John's, and Saint John

		Montreal			Halifax			St. John's			Saint John	
	French	Visible	High									
Variables	North	Immigrants	SES									
	Europe	Low										
	Middle	SES										
	SES											
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Non-immigrant population	0.97			0.71			0.72				0.65	
Canadian citizenship	0.95					0.73			0.68	0.44		
Trades certificate or diploma	0.94			0.84			0.95				0.81	
$40,000-$49,999 family income	0.94			0.92			0.58			0.71		
French origins, ethnic origin	0.93			0.9			0.21					0.45
Grades 9-13 - with secondary certificate	0.93			0.82			0.95				0.73	
Retail trade industries	0.91					0.69		0.75		0.66		
$50,000-$59,999 family income	0.91					0.68			0.88		0.84	
Grades 9-13 - without secondary certificate	0.91			0.45			0.66				0.84	
Other non-university - with certificate	0.91			0.94			0.81				0.76	
Employed, both sexes 15+	0.9			0.49			0.4					
$30,000-$39,999 family income	0.9			0.7			0.79				0.7	
Construction industries	0.9			0.85			0.46			0.35		
Other non-university - without certificate	0.87			0.89					0.61		0.83	
$60,000-$69,999 family income	0.85			0.73					0.28		0.47	
Manufacturing industries	0.84			0.33			0.88				0.82	
Government service industries	0.82			0.71			0.44			0.64		
Communication and other utility industries	0.8			0.71			0.86				0.67	
Transportation and storage industries	0.79			0.93			0.9				0.83	
$20,000-$29,999 family income	0.76			0.9			0.96				0.72	
Wholesale trade industries	0.75				0.69		0.86			0.75		
Finance and insurance industries	0.74					0.62		0.88		0.7		
Health and social service industries	0.72			0.88			0.78				0.77	
Not in the labour force - both sexes 15+	0.71			0.37			0.79				0.91	
Unemployed, both sexes 15+	0.7			0.96			0.71				0.82	
Accommodation, food and beverage inds.	0.65			0.7			0.82				0.67	
Other service industries	0.64			0.96			0.87				0.68	
Highest level of schooling, less than grade 9	0.63			0.81			0.94				0.85	
Aboriginal origins, single ethnic origin	0.61			0.64			0.95				0.83	
Agricultural and related service industries	0.42			0.9			0.83				0.82	
Mining (incl. Milling), quarrying & oil well inds.	0.41			0.81			0.9			0.79		
Canadian, single ethnic origin	0.34			0.7			0.38			0.46		
$10,000-$19,999 family income		0.92				0.78			0.74		0.61	
0-4 years, age at immigration		0.92			0.92			0.69		0.75		
1961-1970, period of immigration		0.92			0.9			0.76		0.82		

1971-1980, period of immigration		0.91			0.88			0.64		0.86		
1981-1987, period of immigration		0.91				0.72		0.72		0.47		
1981-1991, period of immigration		0.88			0.83				0.83		0.7	
1988-1991, period of immigration		0.85			0.8				0.38			0.52
20 years and over, age at immigration		0.83			0.79			0.95		0.9		
5-19 years, age at immigration		0.78			0.77			0.77		0.87		
Africa, place of birth		0.77				0.68		0.44		0.34		
Before 1961, period of immigration		0.77			0.73			0.61		0.81		
Black origins, single ethnic origin		0.75				0.63		0.31	0.59	0.39		
Caribbean and Bermuda, place of birth		0.73			0.71			0.34				0.28
Central and South America, place of birth		0.72			0.71						0.8	
Chinese, single ethnic origin		0.68			0.71			0.63				0.47
Citizenship other than Canadian		0.66			0.69			0.88		0.86		
East Indian, n.i.e., single ethnic origin		0.65			0.66			0.63				0.37
Greek, single ethnic origin		0.64			0.65							0.28
Immigrant population		0.62			0.64			0.96		0.92		
India, place of birth		0.61			0.61			0.6				0.32
Italian, single ethnic origin		0.59			0.58					0.34		
Non-permanent residents		0.57			0.55			0.56		0.4		
Other Asia, place of birth		0.53						0.76				0.66
Other Europe, place of birth		0.53		0.13				0.64		0.73		
Polish, single ethnic origin		0.53				0.59			0.56			0.42
Portuguese, single ethnic origin		0.53					0.9			0.73		
Spanish, single ethnic origin		0.5				0.58	0.55				0.6	
Under $10,000 family income		0.46				0.46		0.42				0.75
Irish, single ethnic origin			0.79		0.51			0.72		0.84		
Hungarian (Magyar), single ethnic origin			0.79		0.42			0.79		0.93		
German, single ethnic origin			0.77		0.37		0.68			0.81		
$70,000 and over family income			0.74		0.28		0.78			0.83		
British origins, ethnic origin			0.73		0.93		0.67			0.86		
Dutch (Netherlands), single ethnic origin			0.72	0.95			0.83				0.89	
Educational service industries			0.71	0.94								0.42
English, single ethnic origin			0.69	0.71			0.86				0.83	
Jewish, single ethnic origin			0.69	0.71			0.8				0.93	
Logging and forestry industries			0.67		0.48			0.44		0.84		
Real estate operator & insurance agent inds.			0.66		0.43		0.82			0.84		
Scottish, single ethnic origin			0.63		0.7			0.6		0.84		
Unemployment rate, both sexes 15+			0.58	0.54				0.63			0.43	
United Kingdom, place of birth			0.57		0.51		0.66			0.66		
United States of America, place of birth			0.52	0.59			0.95				0.8	
University - with certificate			0.43		0.68			0.41		0.39		

Table 4
Residential Segregation Factor Structures of Toronto, Ottawa-Hull, Quebec City, and Halifax

		Toronto			Ottawa-Hull			Quebec City			Halifax	
	Immigrant	Non-	High									
Variables	Visible	immigrant	Socio-									
	Minorities	North	economic									
	Low SES	Europeans	Status									
	SES	High SES										
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Citizens other than Canadian	0.94					0.88		0.75			0.71	
Immigrant population	0.93					0.74		0.94			0.66	
Immigrant period 1981-1991	0.92					0.69		0.64				0.72
Unemployed, both sexes 15+	0.88			0.56			0.95			0.96		
Residents: non-permanent	0.76					0.65						
Immigrant period 1971-1980	0.81					0.78						
Birthplace: South/Central America	0.75			0.71				0.38				0.63
Occupation: Accommodation, Food Service	0.74					0.79			0.51	0.7		
Birthplace: Asia, Other	0.71					0.68		0.47			0.58	
Income: Household under $10,000	0.7			0.42					0.85			0.34
Ethnic Origin: Black	0.68					0.71		0.39				0.68
Education: Grade 9-13	0.67				0.41		0.34			0.45		
Income: Household $40,000-$49,999	0.62					0.78	0.93			0.92		
Birthplace: Africa	0.6			0.46				0.6			0.79	
Ethnic Origin: East Indian	0.58				0.82			0.32			0.71	
Immigrant period: 1961-1970	0.57			0.57				0.76			0.9	
Income: Household $10,000-$19,999	0.55				0.92				0.81			0.78
Birthplace: Other Europe	0.52							0.83			0.55	
Birthplace: India	0.51			0.73				0.33			0.65	
Non-immigrant population		0.92				0.89	0.67			0.71		
Ethnic Origin: British		0.89		0.71			0.63				0.93	
Ethnic Origin: Canadian, multiple		0.86			0.75		0.66			0.7		
Citizenship: Canadian		0.82			0.7				0.63			0.72
Non-university: Certificate, Trades		0.82				0.77	0.94			0.94		
Birthplace: United Kingdom		0.8		0.59				0.63			0.51	
Income: Household $60,000-$69,999		0.8			0.65		0.79			0.73		
Employed: Both sexes 15+		0.75		0.72			0.37			0.49		
Occupation: Transportation, Industries		0.72			0.88		0.93			0.93		
Income: Household $50,000-$59,999		0.71		0.59			0.62					0.68
Occupation: Wholesale Trade Industry		0.7			0.69		0.68				0.69	
Ethnic Origin: German		0.7		0.78			0.68				0.37	
Occupation: Communications, Retail, Gov't.		0.67			0.61		0.6			0.71		

Occupation: Manufacturing		0.62				0.41	0.27			0.33		
Income: Household $70,000 plus		0.61		0.72				0.79			0.28	
Ethnic Origin: French		0.6			0.88		0.91			0.9		
Ethnic Origin: Dutch		0.56		0.81			0.52			0.95		
Education: University Degree			0.9	0.44				0.33			0.63	
Occupation: Business			0.79		0.69				0.71			0.62
Birthplace: USA			0.7	0.71			0.58			0.59		
Occupation: Real Estate, Insurance			0.66		0.64			0.78			0.43	
Occupation: Educational Service			0.62	0.81				0.54		0.94		
Occupation: Health, Social Service			0.59			0.73	0.85			0.88		
Occupation: Finance, Industry			0.59			0.73			0.71			0.62
Ethnic Origin: Jewish			0.44	0.68			0.44			0.71		

Findings and Conclusions

Innis proposed that Canada had been on the periphery of French, British and American centres of power, and that these powers had exploited various regions of Canada. He said Canada's economy was prone to regionalism, each region trading its own staples to American centres nearby, a short distance south of its border. Thus, Canada had become a collection of Atlantic Canada, Quebec, Ontario, prairie and pacific regions, multiple systems developing each in their own ways.

Turning to urban centres, Driedger found that Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver had emerged as the Big Three metropolitan centres in Canada, each centering the Quebec, Ontario, and the Pacific coast regions, and these three centres had become two special types of residentially segregated urban areas, because of the immigrants they had attracted over the years. When he examined residential segregation patterns in four prairie urban centres, he found Montreal-Vancouver and Toronto types as well as a third hybrid aboriginal Winnipeg type. Thus it seemed logical to study other regions in the same way, and in this paper I focused on the eastern regional urban system.

Since Montreal was the largest metropolitan centre in Canada until 1971, and still is the largest in eastern Canada, I compared the largest other eastern cities, Quebec City, Halifax, and St. John's with Montreal. Using residential concentration comparisons, we found that middle class French Canadians in Quebec City cluster together like Montrealers as a first dominant factor, and that lower SES immigrants live separately closer to the older centres, following the Montreal model. While high SES residents formed a third factor, this did not happen in centres under one million, like Quebec, Halifax and St. John's because of their smaller size.

When I compared Montreal with French urban centres such as Quebec City, Sherbrooke and Moncton, we found that centres in Quebec and northern New Brunswick also followed the Montreal model.

Comparisons of largely British background urban centres like Halifax, St. John's and Saint John seemed to follow the Montreal model. Both French and British dominated eastern centres, seemed to follow the Montreal model, that is, charter North Europeans seem to segregate themselves.

A comparison of eastern urban centres with Toronto residential patterns showed relatively little similarity. Toronto seems to be a unique residential type, where recent low SES visible minorities are dominant in the first factor, followed by middle to high SES North Europeans in factor two, and high SES residents in a third factor.

I conclude that urban centres in eastern Canada follow the oldest Montreal residential segregation model. New residential trends operating in Toronto, where recent low SES immigrants dominate, have not yet formed in the east, because immigration has been a much smaller factor than it has farther west. As the new 2001 census figures become available soon, we need to see whether greater recent racial immigration influences increasingly become a factor as in Toronto. Toronto will be a lead centre to watch, since it has the largest visible minority population, and acts as an important Ontario and Canadian industrial magnet where new immigrants go for jobs. Inevitably race relations, inequalities and cultural diversity will lead to more conflict, as it has in the United States. More research will be needed to examine how well these many people can be integrated into economic, political and social life. There is evidence that Calgary is moving in the direction of Toronto; we need to follow to what extent other urban centres follow the Toronto segregation pattern in the future. Urban management is getting more complex, conflict is on the rise, and calls for justice will increase.

Works Cited

Anderson, W. W. (1993). *Caribbean Immigrants: A Socio-Demographic Profile*. Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press.

Balakrishnan, T.R. (1976). Ethnic Residential Segregation in the Metropolitan Areas of Canada. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 1, 481-98.

Balakrishnan, T.R. & J. Kralt (1978). Segregation of Visible Minorities in Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver. In L. Driedger (Ed.), *Ethnic Canada: Identities and Inequalities*. Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman.

Balakrishnan, T.R. & K. Selvanathan (1990). Ethnic Residential Segregation in Metropolitan Canada. In S. Halli, F. Trovato & L. Driedger (Eds.), *Ethnic Demography*. Ottawa: Carleton University Press.

Balakrishnan, T.R. & G.K. Jarvis (1991). Is the Concentric Zonal Theory of Spatial Differentiation Still Applicable to Urban Canada? *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology,* 28, 526-39.

Darroch, G. A. & W. G. Marsten (1971). The Social Class Bias of Ethnic Residential Segregation: The Canadian Case. *American Journal of Sociology,* 77, 491-510.

Dawson, C. A. & W.E. Gettys (1929). *Introduction to Sociology*. New York: Ronald Press.

Driedger, L. & G. Church (1974). Residential Segregation and Institutional Completeness: A Comparison of Ethnic Minorities. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology,* 11, 30-52.

Driedger, L. (1991). *The Urban Factor: Sociology of Canadian Cities*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Driedger, L. (1996). *Multi-Ethnic Canada: Identities and Inequalities*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Driedger, L. (1999). Immigrant/Ethnic/Racial Segregation: Canadian Big Three and Prairie Metropolitan Comparisons. *Canadian Journal of Sociology,* 24, 485-509.

Driedger, L. (2001). Changing Visions in Ethnic Relations. *Canadian Journal of Sociology,* 26, 421-451.

Driedger, L. (2003). *Race and Ethnicity: Finding Identities and Equalities*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Duncan, O.D. & B. Duncan (1957). *The Negro Population of Chicago: A Study of Residential Segregation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Henry, F. (1994). *The Caribbean Diaspora in Toronto: Learning to Live With Racism*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Henry, F., C. Tator, W. Mattis & T. Rees (2000). *The Colour of Democracy*. Toronto: Harcourt Brace Canada.

Hoyt, H. (1959). *The Structure and Growth of Residential Neighborhoods in American Cities*. Washington, D.C.: Federal Housing Administration.

Hou, F. & T.R. Balakrishnan (1996). The Integration of Visible Minorities in Contemporary Canadian Society. *Canadian Journal of Sociology,* 21, 307-26.

Innis, H.A. (1956). *The Bias of Communication*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Isajiw, W. W., A. Sev'er & L. Driedger (1993). Ethnic Identity and Social Mobility: A Test of the 'Drawback Model' and Resources. *Canadian Journal of Sociology,* 18, 177-96.

James, C.E. (1990). *Making It: Black Youth, Racism and Career Aspirations in a Big City*. Oakville, ON: Mosaic Press.

James, C.E. (1995). *Seeing Ourselves: Exploring Race, Ethnicity and Culture*. Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing.

Kalbach, W.E. (1980). Historical and Generational Perspectives of Ethnic Residential Segregation in Toronto, Canada: 1851-1971. Research Paper No. 118, Centre for Urban and Community Studies. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Lieberson, S. (1970). *Language and Ethnic Relations in Canada*. Toronto: Wiley.

Massey, D.S. (1986). The Settlement Process Among Mexican Migrants to the United States. *American Sociological Review,* 51, 670-84.

Massey, D.S. & N.A. Denton (1993). Trends in the Residential Segregation of Blacks, Hispanics and Asians: 1970-1980. *American Sociological Review,* 52, 802-25.

Massey, D.S. & N.A. Denton (1993). *American Apartheid*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Olsen, S.H. & A.K. Kobayashi (1993). The Emerging Ethnocultural Mosaic. In L. S. Bourne and D. Ley (Eds.), *The Changing Social Geography of Canadian Cities*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Porter, J. (1965). *The Vertical Mosaic*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Reitz, J. (1988). The Institutional Structure of Immigration as a Determinant of Inter-Racial Competition: A Comparison of Britain and Canada. *International Migration Review,* 22, 117-46.

Richmond, A. (1972). *Ethnic Residential Segregation in Metropolitan Toronto*. Toronto: Institute for Behavioral Research, York University.

Richmond, A. (1994). *Global Apartheid: Refugees, Racism, and the New World Order*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Semple, R. K. (1988) Urban Dominance, Foreign Ownership and Corporate Concentration. In J. Curtis, E. Grabb, N. Guppy & S. Gilbert (Eds.), *Social Inequality in Canada*. Scarborough, ON: Prentice-Hall.

Shevky, E. & W. Bell (1955). *Social Area Analysis*. Stanford: University of Stanford Press.

Stamps, J. (1995). *Unthinking Modernity: Innis, McLuhan, and the Frankfort School*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University.

General Information

• What are PCERII Working Papers?
PCERII's working paper series is related to the broad mandate of the Metropolis Project. This initiative is designed to: (1) speed up the dissemination of research results relevant to the interests and concerns of Metropolis researchers, policy-makers, NGOs; (2) fulfill a commitment made in the application to SSHRC/CIC for a renewal grant for the Prairie Centre; and (3) populate the Virtual Library on the PCERII web site.

• Will these be considered "official" publications?
The inclusion of a manuscript in the working paper series does not preclude, nor is it a substitute for its subsequent publication in a peer reviewed journal. In fact, we would encourage authors to submit such manuscripts for publication in professional journals (or edited books) as well.

• What subject content is acceptable?
The Working Paper Series welcomes research reports and theoretical discussions relevant to the mandate of the Metropolis Project, providing insight into the policy concerns not only of immigration and integration, but also ethnocultural diversity. Examples of these areas include: socioeconomic, political, cultural, and educational integration of migrants and refugees; impacts on the host society; language; transnationalism; spatial distribution; gender roles and family; ethnic, cultural, and religious diversity; multiculturalism; media and communication; social cohesion-inclusion; racism and discrimination-exclusion; employment equity-anti-discrimination; youth; identity; citizenship; temporary migration; immigration and demographic planning; justice and security; settlement programs and policy; and population health.

• Who may submit papers?
Paper submissions are open to Metropolis researchers, policy-makers and service providers. Submissions from non-affiliates will be examined on a case-by-case basis.

• How do I submit a paper?
All submissions must include an electronic copy of the paper.
By post please send a hard copy of your paper and an electronic copy on disk or via email to:

Editor, Working Paper Series
Prairie Centre of Excellence for Research on Immigration and Integration
1-17 Humanities Centre, University of Alberta
Edmonton, AB T6G 2E5 Canada
By email please send to: lenise@ualberta.ca with a subject heading of:
Working Paper Series Submission

• What happens when I submit a paper?
The Prairie Centre will acknowledge receipt of the paper via email within 10 working days. The series editors will review your submission to ensure that it falls within the mandate of the Metropolis Project and that it is properly referenced and documented. If these standards are met, the paper will then be referred to the appropriate Domain Leader for review and advice. Once the review is completed the author will be contacted with the results. Note: Authors of papers accepted for inclusion in the PCERII Working Papers Series may be asked to make revisions, in which case they will be asked to provide the Centre with 2 hard copies of the final version of the paper and an electronic copy.

For format and style guidelines please visit PCERII web site at:
http://pcerii.metropolis.net/WorkingPapers/index.htm

Back issue of the PCERII Working Paper Series are
available from the Prairie Centre
for $5.00 a copy.

Please contact the Prairie Centre at
1-17 Humanities Centre, University of Alberta,
Edmonton, AB T6G 2E5 Canada.
Tel: (780) 492-0635; Fax: (780) 492-2594;
Email: lenise@ualberta.ca