

tions on their entry into either Canada or the U.S. Those who have entered legally, or in violation of the immigration laws, however, have generally found employment—at least in the fringe areas of the economy.

While the rhetoric of the “melting pot” has been conventional in the United States, Canada’s political language has adopted the “mosaic” as a more appropriate metaphor for the country’s society. Perhaps the tradition of biculturalism, despite the persistence of problems in ethnic relations, has enabled Canadians to recognize the societal value of multiculturalism more readily than residents of the United States have done.

John Porter’s classic 1965 examination of power in Canada, *The Vertical Mosaic*, argues that access to power in Canada is limited by selective recruitment into the dominant elite. Stasiulis demonstrates that the Canadian elite is capable of making effective use of policies which appear contradictory on the surface—repressive policies combined with apparent responsiveness—to keep the concerns of the visible minorities before the public and on the fringe of public policy making. Her research indicates, as well, that any societal change that might enable the minorities to assert their interests more effectively is obstructed by a politically skillful elite.

Vagn K. Hansen  
Delta State University

## Critique

Stasiulis has not only entered a great debate but has sought to order it. The interconnections between Canada’s recent policies on multiculturalism, immigration, and the efforts to implement the two are the reference points around which that debate is centered. The possibilities for racism, however, need to be made more clear by the author. Scholars can make significant contributions in this regard by investigating what seems to be unrelated programs and practices. Since practices are tied to the same policies, an identifiable theoretical

perspective is proposed as the leverage for yielding insights about relationships between people and things that would not otherwise be apparent.

The persistent failure of governmental programs to resolve contradictions in belief and values systems is cause for concern, but recurring themes can give way to improved speculations about patterns of behavior. For example, the theoretical, social and economic distances between visible ethnic minorities and those at the apex of institutional power are increased when the quality of representation of those minorities is kept poor, when they are in marginal structural positions in *any* system, and when funding for their programs is minimal. In other words, the marketplace of competing values has built-in designs for not tolerating dissent and mediation between the state and the affected population is blocked. By a similar token, "race relations" becomes easy prey to politicalization when people who have legal authority for allocating resources among competing ethnic group interests engage in self-serving activities. Such activities naturally include the hoarding of economic power.

Presentation of the writer's arguments should prompt new lines of enquiry regarding the viability of "corporate management techniques and [certain] scientific forms of decision-making." When such techniques and forms function in autonomous fashion, checks for balancing influences from the outside are missing and intentions regarding any policy implementation become suspect. Scholars need to pay renewed attention to how the discretions of those at the top of a hierarchy influence the behavior of functionaries who are closer to outcomes at the bottom. The result should be an improved working relationship between the two levels of governance and between theory and practice as well.

Delo E. Washington  
California State College,  
Stanislaus