Université de Montréal

« De tout avec ben de la sauce » :
Community Organizing for Social Housing in an Immigrant Neighbourhood

Par
Jill Hanley

École de service social
Faculté des arts et des sciences

Thèse présentée à la Faculté des études supérieures en vue de l'obtention du grade
de PhD en Service social

Avril 2004

Université de Montréal

AVIS

NOTICE

Université de Montréal
Faculté des études supérieures

Cette thèse intitulée:

« De tout avec ben de la sauce » :
Community Organizing for Social Housing in an Immigrant Neighbourhood

Présentée par :

Jill Hanley

A été évaluée par un jury composé des personnes suivantes :

Président rapporteur

Jean-Panet-Raymond, directeur de recherche

Eric Shragge, co-directeur de recherche

Membre du jury

Examinateur externe

Représentant du doyen de la FES

Résumé

Mots clés: action communautaire ; logement social ; immigrants ; État-providence ; politiques sociales

Le logement est considéré un droit humain et est lié par la recherche à plusieurs indicateurs sociaux et économiques. Malgré cela, plusieurs Canadiens n'ont pas accès à un logement décent, approprié et abordable. Le logement social est considéré par les militants pour le logement comme une alternative au marché offrant la possibilité d'augmenter l'équité sociale. Les groupes communautaires, organismes intermédiaires et représentants de l'État interagissent sur le logement social en termes de développement et politiques. Cette thèse explore ces relations afin de contribuer à l'action communautaire visant à influencer le logement social, en particulier dans les quartiers immigrants. Ces préoccupations autour des politiques du logement social ont donné naissance à deux questions de recherche sur comment les groupes populaires s'organisent pour du logement social et comment les relations entre les acteurs influencent le développement de projets et politiques.

Une étude de cas qualitative sur l'action communautaire pour le logement social dans le quartier de Côte-des-Neiges à Montréal était complétée. La littérature sur les analyses de l'état dans les sociétés capitalistes, l'État-providence et les politiques de logement a servi comme début. Les traditions d'action communautaire et les modèles qui guident les choix stratégiques et tactiques ont aussi été examinés afin de créer un cadre conceptuel. Les analyses de l'état libéral et marxiste, les théories des rôles joués par les groupes communautaire face à l'état et les modèles d'action communautaire en ont été les éléments principaux.

Les résultats se basent sur l'observation et des entrevues avec 29 individus travaillant dans 22 organismes connecté avec la politique ou le développement de logement social à Côte-des-Neiges. La complexité des interactions entre l'état, les modèles d'action communautaire employés et le contexte dans lequel ils opèrent sont documentés et analysés. Émergeant de cette constellation d'action, le message est que, étant donné la nature non monolithique de l'état (Ng, Muller, and Walker 1990), une diversité de tactiques est nécessaire et fructueuse. La stratégie d'action communautaire la plus efficace dans le travail pour le logement social à Côte-des-Neiges est finalement, comme m'a dit une des organisatrices, de mettre en œuvre « de tout avec ben de la sauce ».

<u>Abstract</u>

Keywords: community organizing; social housing; immigrants; welfare state; social policy process

Access to housing is considered a UN human rights and is linked by research to a range of social and economic indicators. Despite this, many Canadians are denied access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing. Social housing is seen by actors in the housing movement as an alternative to the shortfalls of the market. Community groups, intermediary organizations, and representatives of the state interact in a complex process, shaping social housing development and policy. This dissertation explores these relationships in order to contribute to the community organizing that aims to influence social housing, particularly in immigrant neighbourhoods. These concerns about social housing policy coalesced into questions about how the relationships between social housing actors influence the development of projects and policy and how community groups organise to have an impact.

A qualitative case study of Montreal's Côte-des-Neiges neighbourhood was used in order to address these questions. Literature on analyses of the state in capitalist societies, the welfare state and housing policy was used as a backdrop. The traditions of community organizing and the different models that guide community groups' choices of strategies and tactics were also consulted in order to develop a conceptual framework. Liberal and Marxist analyses of the state, theories about roles played by community groups in relation to the state and the models of community organizing were the principal elements.

Findings were based on observation and interviews with 29 individuals working in 22 different organizations or agencies that are connected to social housing development and policy for Côte-des-Neiges. The complexity of the interactions between organizational character the roles they play in relation to the state, the community organizing models they employ and the context in which they operate is documented are analyzed. Emerging from the constellation of different actors, organizing approaches and roles, is the message that, given the non-monolithic of the state (Ng et al. 1990), a diversity of tactics is necessary and useful. The most effective community organizing strategy in working for social housing in Côte-des-Neiges has proven to be, as I was told by one organizer, "de tout avec ben de la sauce"!

"De tout avec ben de la sauce!": Community Organizing for Social Housing in an Immigrant Neighbourhood

<u>List of Tables</u>

List of acronyms

AGRTQ	Association des groupes de ressources techniques du Québec
CDH	Groupe conseil en développement de l'habitation
CDN	Côte-des-Neiges
CHFC	Co-operative Housing Federation of Canada
CHRA	Canadian Housing and Renewal Association
CLSC	Centre local de services communautaires
CMHC	Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation
CQCH	Confédération québécoise des coopératives d'habitation
CRDÎM	Conseil régional de développement de l'île de Montréal
FCM	Federation of Canadian Municipalities
FÉCHIMM	Fédération des coopératives d'habitation intermunicipale du Montréal métropolitain
FIM	Fonds d'investissement de Montréal
FLHLMQ	Fédération des locataires d'habitation à loyer modique du Québec
FQHC	Fonds Québécois d'habitation communautaire
FQM	Fédération québécoise des municipalités
FOHM	Fédération des OSBL en habitation de Montréal
FRAPRU	Front d'action populaire en réaménagement urbain
GRT	Groupe de ressources techniques
HLM	Habitation à loyer modique
HRSD	Human Resources and Social Development Canada (formerly HRDC)
IMF	International Monetary Fund
MRCI	Ministère des relations avec les citoyens et l'immigration
NGO	Non-governmental organization
OCAP	Ontario Coalition Against Poverty
OEIL	Organisation d'éducation et d'information logement
OMHM	Office municipal d'habitation de Montréal
OSBL	Organisme sans but lucratif
PALL	Programme d'acquisition de logements locatifs
PARCO	Programme d'achat et rénovation pour coopératives et OSBL
PARC-Q	Programme d'aide à la restauration des immeubles locatifs
PLQ	Parti libéral du Québec
PQ	Parti-Québécois
PROMIS	Promotion - Integration - Société nouvelle
RCLALQ	Regroupement des comités logements et associations de locataires du Québec
ROHQ	Regroupement des offices d'habitation du Québec
ROMEL	Regroupement des organismes du Montréal ethnique pour le logement

RQOH	Réseau québécois des OSBL d'habitation
SAP	Structural Adjustment Program
SCHL	Société canadienne d'hypothèque et de logement (French version of the CMHC)
SDM	Société de développement de Montréal
SHA	Social Housing Agreements
SHDM	Société d'habitation et de développement de Montréal
SHQ	Société d'habitation du Québec
UMQ	Union des Municipalités du Québec

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to the activists and organizers of Côte-des-Neiges who have let me in and helped shape my understanding of the world, my politics, my activism and my organizing.

Acknowledgements

Many people have supported me through the years of my PhD research. I must first thank the staff and members of the housing organizations that allowed me to participate in their events and in their work in order to better understand the process. I appreciate as well that so many staff people trusted me enough to consent to an interview.

At the university, I have been surrounded by a wonderful group of people who have pushed my thinking on issues of community organizing. My two supervisors, Jean Panet-Raymond and Eric Shragge, inspire me with their ability to combine community organizing with academic work. Their patience and encouragement helped me to stick to with it. Damaris Rose shared her time, influencing my research direction in the beginning. My fellow students, Julie Drolet, Amanda Grenier and Anna Kruzynski, who were just enough ahead of me for them to clear a path for me to follow, were invaluable. Their friendship, intelligence and passion for their work gave me much food for thought as I grappled with this thesis. Shannon Collins proved to be as generous with listening and feedback as I have always known her to be.

I must also thank my family. My father never tired of asking me when I was going to finish my thesis (letting me know that he actually thought I could do it) and my mother has been the most enthusiastic (and nitpicky) of editors, without whom this would have been a more painful process. My sister offered both her couch when I needed to get away to work and her perspective on housing and policy development when I needed a different viewpoint. Her reflections and questions have helped me to better understand my work. And last, my partner, a housing organizer himself, has accompanied me through this process, egging me on so that this thesis goes further than it would have without him.

Finally, being the materialist that I am, I should acknowledge the Seagrams Foundation, FCAR/CQRS, SSHRCC and FQRSC for their financial support for the undertaking of this research and my doctoral program.

Chapter One

Introduction

In this dissertation, I will share stories which were related to me by community organizers, members of community groups, technical resource people, policy analysts, civil servants and researchers about the ways in which they interact in the struggle to create social housing in one of Montreal's low-income immigrant neighbourhoods. All of these actors share the objective of creating decent and affordable housing conditions for neighbourhood residents but their ideologies, strategies and perceptions of the process vary greatly. Over the past four years, I have had the opportunity to working closely with three different grassroots housing organizations by participating in their public meetings and training sessions, advising community residents on tenants' rights, going to demonstrations, participating in coalition meetings, and attending their social events. I have also done formal interviews with 29 people involved in 22 different organizations and agencies at the local, provincial and federal levels of the social housing debate. Combining these sources of information and understanding with the perspectives to be found in academic literature, my dissertation will elaborate my arguments regarding:

❖ The ways in which community organizations in immigrant neighbourhoods organize in their quest for social housing.

❖ The ways in which the dynamic interactions between community groups, intermediary organizations and state actors play out in the development of social housing projects and policy.

Why look at social housing?

The right to decent housing is protected in Article 25(1) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations in 1948. Housing

offers physical shelter from the elements, is often a central focus of socializing with family and friends, is a site of economic production and reproduction and has important cultural and social significance – an idea recently affirmed by the president of the federal government's Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) (Rochon 1997:19). Housing, by all accounts, is a fundamental human need. This much is widely agreed upon. What to do about this fact is where the debate begins.

The profit-oriented capitalist system of housing production and distribution cannot adequately house all members of society without government intervention and/or provision (Ouellette 1968:55; Rose 1980:2-3), a fact recognized even by those on Canada's right (Richards 1994:53; Desrochers 2002). Given the basic tension between the need for or the right to housing and the inequality of the capitalist economic system, the welfare states of the mid-twentieth century responded by addressing housing through state policy, thus palliating the worst of housing inadequacies through social housing while simultaneously encouraging and subsidizing the private market. While the form of state intervention varied from nation to nation, none of the western welfare states chose to leave housing entirely to the workings of the market (Doling 1997:3). This significant fact – that welfare states have intervened in the field of housing – reflects both implicit and explicit social commitments, both moral and economic goals (Rose 1980:7).

Housing subsidies in Canada have been scaled back in the past two decades, to the point that today many people question whether there is a future for Canadian social housing at all, despite the federal government's recent return to modestly funding what they term "affordable housing". Traditionally, Canadian housing policy has had two main orientations: (1) "eliminating perceived inefficiencies of the housing market"; and (2) "concern with issues of equity and social justice in housing" (Miron 1993:15). Not to be underestimated is the influence of the classic Keynesian theory of stimulating the economy via state spending on infrastructure and public goods such as housing. These forces have

combined in Canada to create "social housing"; a term generally defined as state-subsidized non-profit housing with collective ownership.

Which of these orientations should have priority has been the subject of 50 years of debate and struggle between the state and housing advocates and organizations. Community-based groups advocating for affordable housing are at a critical juncture in their organizing. The near consensus of the 1960s – that government should intervene in order to correct the inequality of capitalist distribution of housing[1] – has dissipated. While it is clear that we continue to have serious difficulties with access and affordability of housing in the country,[3] there is a lack of agreement about which responses might be appropriate.

Why look at community organizing?

State support for social housing in Canada has declined in the past 15 years, despite the fact that housing affordability difficulties face a growing number of Canadians (Layton 2000; FCM 2000). Working from the assumption that social housing is both necessary within the current economic context and socially beneficial in the long run; this dissertation aims to examine community organizing and its possibilities for reversing this trend.

Without economic or political clout, people have long used their numbers to effect change "since the privileged rarely surrender their benefits to meet ethical standards for equity, the disadvantaged are left with one option, to come together, apply creative energies, and employ collective pressures to have their needs met" (Pilisuk, McAllister, and Rothman 1998).

Community organizing is typically focused on local issues and it can be a stretch for community groups to address and/or influence macro-level policy. The underlying ideology of a community group can greatly influence its propensity to

---

[1] C.D. Howe, however, Canada's post-war housing minister, opposed public provision from the start. In his view, the government should only intervene to stimulate private provision (Hulchanski 1988:16).

[3] 12 percent of Canadians live in what the CMHC defines as inadequate, unsuitable or

challenge the state in terms of housing policy. My goal in this doctoral project has been to come to a greater understanding of the possibilities and limitations of community groups in influencing the state.

Why look at immigrant neighbourhoods?

In broaching a topic such as community organizing, one is quickly faced with the breadth of activity that comes under this term (Wharf 1997:3). What do we mean by 'community', for example? Does the term 'community' refer to a physical entity within a geographical boundary or a group of people with common interests (whether due to their status as neighbours, membership in a social category or because they are faced with the effects of a common problem)? As argued by Jacob Miller, Gillian Walker and Roxana Ng in their 1990 book, *Community Organization and the Canadian State*, not only is it difficult to define 'community' but when we neglect the question of how such communities are established, we fail to address the social relations from which communities result, encouraging a static, apolitical and neutral understanding of community (Muller, Walker, and Ng 1990:14-5). Nevertheless, 'community' remains an important point of identity and a rallying call for solidarity.

For the purposes of this paper, I have chosen to focus on neighbourhood-based community organizing for several reasons:

- ❖ Housing is a physical artifact that is usually confined to a particular geographical place (Doling 1997:6).[4]

- ❖ Neighbourhoods remain an important focus of social, economic and political life for people with low-incomes (those with the most direct interest in my topic of social and affordable housing) but also for people more privileged by our socio-economic structure (Saldov 1988; Dansereau 1993; Bourne 1993; Lopez Turley 2003).

---

unaffordable housing (MacNeil and Warnock 2000:ii).

[4] Motor homes, houseboats and mobile homes are forms of housing that may not be inherently limited to a particular geographical location but, in practice, many people use campgrounds, trailer parks or wharves as "home bases" for significant amounts of time.

❖ Although Canadian cities demonstrate residential segregation according to income, immigration status and race/ethnicity, the segregation is comparatively mild (Ray and Moore 1991; Ray 1994) and urban neighbourhoods are remarkably diverse nonetheless (Fong 1996). I am interested in exploring the ways in which neighbourhood organizations address this diversity within their efforts for better housing.

Although identity-based organizations – particularly women's, seniors' and health-related groups – have made undeniably important contributions to the struggle for affordable housing (Wekerle 1991), I will concentrate my illustrations on neighbourhood-based community organizing for the reasons stated above.

I do not have a concept of community as being uniformly harmonious and homogenous in interests. Just as a community can offer support and affirmation, it can pressure individuals to conform and oppress or reject those who do not. This inherent tension is precisely the reason why I am interested in geographically defined communities: neighbourhoods are communities with little opportunity to choose their membership.

Objectives of this research

My interest in undertaking this research was both academic and activist. From an academic perspective, my objective is to illuminate the relationship between community organizing and housing policy. As we will see in later chapters, there has been little academic work linking community organizing to the development of social policy. From an activist perspective, I aimed to use my time during my PhD to contribute to the work of the organizations I was studying. A more long-term objective related to activism was the desire to generate information that could help community organizers, myself included, to be more influential in the process of developing social policy. I also felt it would be valuable to preserve some of the words, stories, traditions and strategies of the amazing people working on social housing issues.

These two main interests – academic and activist – came together over the course of my research with practical concerns, resulting in my choice of two principal research questions:

How do the relationships between community, intermediary and state social housing actors influence the development of social housing projects and policy?

How do community groups in immigrant neighbourhoods organise in order to have an impact on government social housing policy?

My connection to this topic

I have been involved as an activist and, occasionally, as a paid employee in community organizing for the past 18 years. Out of my activism in high school on anti-nuclear, international development, anti-racism and environmental issues grew an awareness of the interconnectedness of these seemingly disparate issues. I became aware of the links of these issues to poverty and to economic inequity in general. In university, as my involvement in various movements continued, I came to focus more on community (neighbourhood) organizing as a way to involve more people in 'the democratic project'. Also, I came to feel strongly about the importance of 'place' in people's sense of well being and as a manifestation of social relations. My work experience as an organizer has only deepened this belief.

Since 1994, I have been involved in housing organizing in various ways:

- ❖ tenants' rights education (door-to-door outreach, giving workshops and offering drop-in rights counseling),
- ❖ organizing for tenants' collective rights (organizing tenants' associations in private and public housing) and
- ❖ organizing around social housing policy and investment on a more macro scale (through coalition organizations).

I have done this work both as a paid staff person of community organizations and as an activist. I have been involved in Montreal and in Boston, and was exposed to the policy structure of the municipal, provincial/state and federal levels.

I believe that housing is not only a basic social good but also a key element of our built environment where social issues intersect. Class affects our ability to obtain and maintain quality housing and can affect our ability to defend our housing rights. Ethnicity and race can have a strong effect on which neighbourhoods are open to us and neighbourhoods with differing class and ethnic character are serviced differently by municipalities. Gender is also an important influence. Women's lower earning power affects their access to housing and credit for homeownership and the incidence of sexual harassment between landlords and female tenants are all too common. Sexual orientation can lead to discrimination in housing and having a disability can sometimes mean that an overwhelming majority of housing is inappropriate for you. And, of course, membership in these different social categories often overlaps within the same individuals.

For these reasons, I see housing as a highly political field whose struggles are too often played out in the context of the market, with access to housing dependent on social position and earning power rather than on an entitlement as a human right. My interest in organizing around housing issues reflects an interest in challenging discriminatory access to affordable and quality housing but also an interest in shifting power relations, hoping that the housing struggle can contribute to a wider project to obtain democratic control of socio-economic and political resources. Although I have come from a relatively privileged background, I do not feel that these issues are separate from myself. Apart from the fact that I may one day face poverty myself (research has clearly shown that women have a high likelihood of facing poverty at different points in their lives), I also feel that quality housing and respectful treatment for everyone will contribute to my own enjoyment of safety, health, economic stability and community.

Contents of this thesis

Before describing the results of my research, I will begin by offering a theoretical and historical background to my topic. Chapter Two, "Social Housing and the Welfare State in Quebec", will discuss the definitions of social housing from different ideological perspectives and the role of the different expressions of the state in this domain. Drawing on welfare state theory, the contributions of the state, whether municipal, provincial or federal, to social housing will be discussed. Currently, the roles of the private and non-profit sectors also cause much controversy. I will cover the history of social housing policy in Canada and Quebec before describing Quebec's current social housing policy framework. This chapter will conclude by delving into the ways in which immigration patterns have influenced the province's housing policies.

The third chapter will offer an overview of the traditions and models of community organizing in North America. The involvement of immigrants in community organizing will be addressed and the range of issues tackled by the sector will be explored. A more specific examination of the tradition of housing organizing in Quebec will then be offered, especially with regards to the relationship between community groups and the state.

The conceptual framework for the thesis will follow in Chapter Four, discussing how theories of the state, theories of community/state relations and models of community organizing can contribute to a deeper understanding of the topic at hand and its implications for wider understanding.

This theoretical basis will help to set the stage for the research methods chosen for this project. Chapter Five will detail the approach to data collection used, explaining the many detours and reconfigurations necessary along the way. My use of observation and interviews within a qualitative case study will be described.

Chapter Six is the part of the dissertation in which I will present some of the discoveries I made during my research. It will introduce the reader to the neighbourhood that served as case study for the research. All of the housing actors

interviewed were linked to this neighbourhood and this chapter will paint a physical and socio-economic portrait of the community.

Chapter Seven will describe the range of different organizations and state agencies involved in the production of housing projects and policy affecting the case study neighbourhood. The surprising diversity of their mandates will be discussed; the actors' link to housing is sometimes tenuous. There will also be a discussion of the complexity of the different levels of activity (whether local, municipal, provincial or federal) and the complexity of the different roles filled.

Chapter Eight will talk about the diverse approaches to action (community organizing tactics) employed by the many actors in their efforts for social housing. Whether in relation to housing projects or housing policy, actors' choice of tactics varied widely and the interests and traditions behind these differences are fascinating. From action, I move to perceptions, as this is often a driving force in our decisions about how to proceed.

Chapter 9, the analysis, will return to the conceptual framework in order to reflect upon the ways in which these theoretical concepts can shed light upon what has been learned in Côte-des-Neiges (CDN). My two research questions will be addressed. Chapter 10 concludes the thesis, summarizing its contents and then looking to the future.

My intention is for this thesis to contribute to a better understanding of these questions and for the information gathered, in a more popular format, contribute to the community organizing efforts to improve our housing conditions, furthering, in some small way, the goals of social justice. This dissertation is a first step that I hope you enjoy reading. The next is to continue the struggle to put what we've learned into practice.

Chapter Two:

Social Housing and the Welfare State in Canada and Quebec

> Le logement est non seulement un abri qui protège contre les éléments naturels et dans lequel il est possible de se nourrir, de se reposer et de dormir, mais également un lieu de personnalisation et de socialisation où l'individu marque symboliquement sa présence dans la société tout en s'intégrant à celle-ci, ce qui renvoie aux questions d'appropriation de l'espace habité, de consommation domestique socialisée, de relations de voisinage et de vie de quartier. (Morin and Dansereau 1990:1)

This chapter will address the place of social housing within the policy framework of the Canadian and Quebec welfare state. Towards this end, I will begin with the various theories analyzing the state itself before turning to, first, the rise and, later, the retrenchment of western welfare states. The tension between the competing viewpoints on this important issue continues to shape the politically feasible policy options of western nations. More than objective explanations for the development of a particular form of government, theories of the welfare state reflect worldviews and values about the ideal form of society.

I will explore the concept of housing policy as a *social* policy within the welfare state – addressing inequality, serving particular needs and promoting social goals – rather than as a purely economic policy. Traditionally, North American housing policy has straddled the social-economic divide (Miron 1993), with some policies acting to support or encourage the market while others – specifically social housing policy – aim to partially decommodify housing for a certain sector of the population (Bacher 1993).

Having reviewed the literature on social housing policy in general, I will describe the Canadian experience with this form of policy. The different forms of state intervention in housing will be discussed within the context of the political

context of their adoption as policy. I will offer a brief historical overview of social housing in Canada with reflections on the underlying ideologies and interests of various policies.

A discussion of the current social housing policy framework in Quebec is also necessary if we hope to understand the ways in which different housing actors of this case study make their decisions. The political context for housing policy has changed considerably in the past few years, first with a move by the federal government to invest in "affordable housing" – bringing about a particular application of this new federal program by the Parti Québécois government. The current responsibilities of the different levels of government will be addressed as well as the ways in which immigration trends have had an impact on Quebec housing policy.

Finally, I will offer a summary critical evaluation of the role that social housing has played in the Canadian welfare state. I will also discuss the literature on the topic, reflecting upon its most common preoccupations and the ideologies and interests reflected. I will conclude the chapter by discussing the implications of the literature and of the direction of Canadian social housing policy for my dissertation research.

Theories of the state

Underlying any discussion about policy is the question of "What is the state?" The state is so pervasive that it is tempting to avoid this question, brushing over the fact that the answer to this seemingly simple question is highly debated, and has been for centuries. Murray Knuttila begins his book reviewing the range of state theories with this thoughtful citation:

> The state – or apparatus of 'government' – appears to be everywhere, regulating the conditions of our lives from birth registration to death certification. Yet, the nature of the state is hard to grasp. This may seem peculiar for something so pervasive in public and private life, but it is precisely this pervasiveness which makes it difficult to understand. There is nothing more

central to political and social theory than the nature of the state,
and nothing more contested. (Held 1983 in Knuttila 1987:9)

There exists a wide variety of positions on the definition of the state and
the role that it plays in society (Lesemann 2001). What follows is an examination
of the ways in which liberal and Marxist theories of the state, along with their
critiques, account for difference within society as well as basic distribution of
wealth and power. These distinctions have importance if we are concerned with
the state's relationship to social housing in immigrant neighbourhoods.

Liberal theories of the state

Our basic form of government, the parliamentary system, is based upon
the principles of the idealized liberal state: the rights of the individual are
paramount and neutral market mechanisms can mediate most social conflict (Van
Dyke 1977). The only legitimate actors in a liberal democracy are individuals,
hence the baseline idea of 'one person, one vote'. The state does not exist for the
progress of an overarching social project but rather to ensure the freedom of
individuals to negotiate a common social contract in the form of legislation and
social norms. Subgroups within society are not recognized as relevant to the state.
While individuals may choose to identify as members of a group, the state's only
obligation toward such subgroups are to create an environment in which the
individual is free to choose whether or not to be involved with such groups. As we
are, in this dissertation, concerned with immigrants and ethnic minorities, we
should note that the liberal emphasis on individual actors discourages any special
consideration or collective rights for cultural or other groups.

The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms is an example of legislation
based in liberal theory. While the Charter protects individuals from discrimination
for being a member of particular social groups, it does not represent a state
sanctioning or encouragement of the existence of such groups. The viability of
individually-based protections for group-experienced discrimination and inequity
has been widely challenged, however. Nathan Glazer has asked:

Can the rights of individuals be vindicated, can the effects of past
discrimination on the groups be overcome, if only that individual

who takes action on the basis of discrimination receives
satisfaction and compensation as the result of his individual charge
of discrimination? (Glazer 1983)

In a society truly organized around liberal principals, you might encounter
the ideal espoused by Roman Mukerjee:

Dans le cas de l'immigrant, cela signifie concrètement qu'il doive
s'ajuster à son pays d'adoption, mais aussi que le pays en arrive,
réciproquement, à s'ajuster à ceux qui viennent à lui pour rester.
(Mukerjee 1979:15)

Interestingly, the above quotation is an example of the way in which liberal ideals
are frequently invoked in protest against the more communitarian approach
reflected in Quebec's cultural and linguistic policies (Taylor 1994).

The New Right in North America applies to ethnic interests the same
standards they apply to general social policy (Kymlicka 1992:8). Just as overly
generous social policies are argued to have created dependencies among the poor,
neo-liberals believe that government policy recognizing and encouraging cultural
diversity allows the survival of cultures that normally would have been
assimilated as a natural outcome of individual migration and exposure to a
dominant culture.

Despite its continuing dominance in Western political thinking, liberal
theory has been widely criticized. The main criticism is of the liberal emphasis on
the individual as the sole legitimate actor. It is generally assumed that individuals
in Western society are equally free to make decisions based on their personal will
and based on equal access to information and opportunities. There is no shortage
of evidence to the contrary. As self-identified or socially-identified members of
subgroups within society (ex. women, ethnic and racial minorities, people with
disabilities, low-income, gays and lesbians) people have differing degrees of
access to the decision-making in society. As we are told by Vernon Van Dyke
(1977):

Individualism gives an advantage to members from the dominant
groups. Their cultural characteristics permit them to establish
rapport most easily with those who already have influence and
power. They command the dominant language. These qualities are
likely to make them seem most suitable for appointive and elective

offices and for leadership positions in all walks of life. Thus, they
tend to obtain disproportionate representation in the various elites.

As we will see in the next section, feminist and anti-racist critical scholars have argued that the disparity of 'outcomes' in western society belies shortcomings to the assumption of equality of 'opportunity'.

Liberal feminist critique

Liberal feminist theorists agree that every individual is unique and has the right to self-determination but they focus on the barriers to participation that are faced by the members of socially disadvantaged groups (Kymlicka 1992:17). As in other areas of social and political policy, feminists challenge the public/private split liberals apply to culture and ethnicity. While individuals and groups may privately practice culture and ethnicity, there are political implications in the privilege or discrimination that individuals experience as members of such groups.

> The myth of homogeneity is then seen as sustaining a complex of unequal and oppressive relations, and group identities and group specificities are increasingly regarded as part of what must be represented or expressed. (Phillips 1992)

For this reason, liberal feminists critique democratic models based on classic liberalism for their assumptions that the 'public' or 'political' culture is neutral and that every individual is able to participate equally in the setting of public agendas.

Liberal feminists also believe that measures based on group membership are sometimes necessary in order to create a level playing field. Affirmative action programs, for example, are based on the premise that individuals of particular social groups have less access to some opportunities and that it is necessary to legislate access for members of particular groups in order to advance equality among individuals. Amy Go tells us that liberal freedoms accorded to the individual are not enough:

> I believe that any measure taken by individuals, groups, organizations, government or communities that is meant to redress the past and right the wrong should be based on a recognition of

our inherently sexist, classist and discriminatory society. No measure will be effective if it is not based on such recognition. (Go 1997)

Following this line of thinking, feminists were at the forefront of campaigns for affirmative action measures. Most proponents of this system argue that each individual should be judged according to their merits but that since there is systematic discrimination, affirmative action measures are necessary to make sure that employers, universities, etc, have sufficient incentive to do so. Critics of mainstream feminist arguments ask, however, if group representation is necessary to equalize unequal democracy, then why not formalize it? The trouble is that many people see the risks of formalizing group-based politics (rigid membership, coercion, discrimination, enshrining existing power imbalances) outweighing the benefits (Phillips 1992).

Feminist scholars, along with their theoretical cousins in the anti-oppressive tradition (Dominelli 1998) have pushed us in our thinking on the state and democratic theory. In effect, feminism has revolutionized political theory by offering a framework for considering difference. Developing practical suggestions on how to address gender and other difference in power is ongoing.

Group recognition within liberalism

Will Kymlicka is a proponent of the recognition of cultural groups within a liberal framework. He asserts that,

> Liberals, in a misguided attempt to promote the dignity and autonomy of the individual, have undermined the very communities and associations that alone can nurture human flourishing and freedom. (Kymlicka 1989)

This belief leads Kymlicka to support specific rights and protections to cultural groups as an important way to encourage individual development into participating, productive citizens. He does not go so far as communitarians, however, who argue for the granting of collective powers to social groups within society. Charles Taylor criticizes this position. In his view, it is naïve to believe that minority cultural groups can receive the support they need for survival within the "atomistic" and abstract individualism of western liberalism (Taylor 1994).

Kymlicka holds to the liberal ideal, however, of the paramount individual right to reject cultural group membership altogether if the individual so chooses.

Iris Young has proposed a model for group recognition within liberal democracies based on feminist ideals. She asserts that "When an oppressed group is called upon to put its own partial needs aside," as they are asked to do as individuals in western democracies, "it is being asked to legitimate is own oppression" (Young 1993). Rather than be brushed aside as "special interests", Young suggests procedures that could increase representation by all oppressed groups. These changes could include: public funding for groups to meet and formulate ideas and positions; the generation of policy proposals by groups and members of the public for consideration by elected decision-makers and; veto power for groups over the decisions most directly affecting them. Although we will not delve into the model for the purposes of this thesis, consociational democracy does, in fact, offer guidelines of how to allocate political power according to social groupings (Lijphart 1991).

Marxist analysis of the capitalist state

Classical Marxist theory also views the capitalist state as an arena in which social and economic conflicts are fought (Barrow 2000). In contrast, however, Marx' analysis was that the capitalist class controlled the state, using it to serve their interests; "the state [could be understood] as basically organized coercion" (Skocpol 1979:26). Under such a regime, focusing attention on difference – whether ethnic, gender or other social category – is seen as a ploy of the capitalist class to divert working people from identification with the category of true importance: socio-economic class (Walzer 1980). The only meaningful grouping of individuals was according to their position of relative privilege in the industrial economy. Feeling allegiance to a personal identity-based group encouraged the working class to see themselves as having something in common with the capitalists of the same background (Nimni 1989).

In analyzing the capitalist state, Marxists contrast with liberal theorists in their argument that the state is biased, rather than neutral, and serves the interests

of capitalists and other elites[5] (Knuttila 1987:99). Rather than aiding with the neutral mediation of social conflict and competition, the state is described by Marxists as a tool used to protect and promote capitalist expansion (Skocpol 1979:26). With the advancement of the welfare state, however, Marxists began to shift their analysis of the capitalist state, taking into account some of the concrete gains obtained by the working class. As described by Knuttila, many theorists recognized the role played by the state in promoting certain forms of social justice (Knuttila 1987), for example by legislating for gender and racial equality, contradicting a rigid analysis of the state as a simple tool of the elite.

Marxist theorists began to see the state differently. While continuing its protection and promotion of capitalism and elite class interests, differentiation within the state began to be analyzed and the idea that the state might have its own interests, autonomous from the ruling class came to have currency (Knuttila 1987:116). Factions among the elite were observed, the agency of civil servants was explored and the impact of social movements reexamined. Nevertheless, among all of these different actors, the capitalist class is still considered the most powerful.

Marxist feminists brought the issue of patriarchy to the analysis of the capitalist, liberal state. As described by Lynne Haney:

> Initially, feminists drew the state into gender studies through analyses of the state's role in reproducing patriarchal social relations; they examined how women, as a homogenous group, were oppressed by a centralized state. More recently, feminists have eschewed such conspiratorial notions of state patriarchy to take up the more complicated task of illuminating the ways states shape, and are shaped by, gender relations. (Haney 2000:641)

The state can be a supporter of "private patriarchy" through its support of the nuclear family (encouraging individual women's dependence on individual men) (Abramovitz 1988) and a creator of "public patriarchy" through its creation of social policy that requires dependence on the state (ex. repressive welfare and

---

[5] For the purposes of this thesis, I use the term 'elite' to refer to those who are advantaged by their membership in a particular social group, a category of class, gender, race, etc. I am not referring to 'elite theory' per se [Carlton 1996].

public housing administration) (Edin and Lein 1997). It must also be recognized, however, that these same policies can offer women options (Haney 2000) and can even contribute to women's political mobilization (Piven and Cloward 1977).

For Canadian community organizing scholars, the complex vision of the state proposed in the 1990 book by Ng, Walker and Muller has been widely adopted (Wharf 1997). Rather than seeing the state as monolithic, the three authors argue that it can instead be understood as a forum for class struggle, a set of social relations that frames the appropriate way of interacting in political debate (Muller et al. 1990:18). They point out that the state responds to challenges from below differently at different times – sometimes repressive, sometimes unresponsive, sometimes receptive – depending upon a complex set of factors that include relative power dynamics and the wider historical and socio-economic context (Ng et al. 1990:309). Ng, Walker and Muller argue that the Marxist analysis of the capitalist state must also take into account the role of patriarchy and racism in elite domination, a view shared by many others (Pascall 1997; Evans and Wekerle 1997).

Class structure must be analyzed not only according to economic power but also according to the intersections of gender and race. In this view, the economic elite (usually white men) has established and maintains its dominance through a social system that disproportionately exploits the labour and resources of women and people of colour. Departing from traditional Marxist theorist, proponents of New Left ideology have become less damning of the politics of difference. The New Left has become wary of the homogenization of identity to resists the power of capital (LaClau and Mouffe 1999). Marxist theorists used to believe that a common culture was the only way to build an internationalist movement in favour of the working class. In today's context of rapid globalization, however, resistance of the 'global culture of capital' is seen as one way to resist complete domination by the international economy.

This section of the chapter has reviewed the dominant analyses of the state – liberalism and Marxism, along with their critiques and evolution through time –

discussing these opposing position on the role of the state and the interests it represents. Having considered the definition of the state in this broad sense, I will now turn to a more specific theoretical discussion of a late twentieth century manifestation of the western state, the welfare state.

Welfare State Theory and the Canadian Experience

The term 'welfare state' is usually used to refer to the form of government developed in western, industrialized, capitalist democracies after the Second World War. Four of the most common elements of these regimes are "entitlement programs based on citizenship; core income maintenance programs; central planning and co-ordination; and the idea that the welfare state will promote the notion of equality and compassion for others" (Chisholm 1999:15). While the "Keynes-Beveridge paradigm" – basically the idea that by intervening in the market, governments have "a positive role to play in alleviating some of the worst effects of the inequities of the free market and operating as a buffer for some of its most vulnerable citizens" (Evans and Wekerle 1997:5) – may have been relatively stable across the post-war welfare states (Mishra 1990:xii), it is also important to note that nations have used a great diversity of policy tools towards reaching the goal of social equality, with varying degrees of success and with various constellations of interest groups at play (Doling 1997). The concept of social equality itself is the subject of the long-standing debate between whether we should aim for equality of opportunity or equality of results (Banting 1987:311).

The development of the welfare state in western industrial nations was facilitated by a historic conjuncture of availability of resources, political will (whether voluntary or directly or indirectly coerced) and public demand: a historically unique 'rapport de force' between classes. The provisions of the welfare state represented a new conception of the role of government and citizenship, the goals of society and the functioning of the economy. While for opponents, the social policies of the welfare state represented a dangerous

restraint of the 'invisible hand of the market' (Smith 1982), for others the welfare state represented an exciting social project to build equality between citizens.

With such lofty ideals at stake, the welfare state has understandably become a focus of intense debate over its strengths and weaknesses, the interests served by such a form of government, and the prospects for the welfare state's social institutions in the face of globalization. In this section, I will review and critique these different debates, especially as they relate to the Canadian example. The implications of welfare state theories for social housing will be explored in this section, where I will specifically discuss the Canadian experience of social housing.

The rise of the welfare state

Before the Second World War, the reigning political ideology was that of liberal capitalism. Citizens' welfare was to be the result of personal labour, the responsibility of the individual, the family or the community (Chiasson 1997). Any government or charitable benefits were invariably means-tested with strong differentiation between the 'deserving' poor (ex. widows, orphans, people with disabilities) versus the 'undeserving' poor (ex. able-bodied unemployed, alcoholics) (Banting 1987:311).

Opponents of liberalism will concede what may have been "liberalism's significant contributions to humanity":

> Artistically creative societies, rapid economic growth, scientific discoveries, medical cures in abundance, and for ordinary people a supply of consumer goods and services that only ascetics can decry. Unquestionably, its greatest political gift has been the amalgam of rights-based representative governments anchored by tolerant civil societies in which pluralism and the rule of law prevail. (Broadbent 1999:45)

However, unrestrained liberal capitalism also has its problems. Its critics point to such wide-ranging negative effects as the encouragement of consumption as a way of life and the preclusion of state intervention to counteract this system's accompanying class-based inequality, sexism, racism, ecological destruction and unemployment (Broadbent 1999).

The experiences of the Depression, Nazism and the horrors of the Second World War profoundly altered people's expectations of their governments and led to widespread disillusionment with laissez-faire capitalism (MacNeil and Warnock 2000:20). Many academics have studied the rise of the welfare state but John Doling organizes his work through a study of theories that emphasize the similarities between welfare states versus those that stress their diversity (Doling 1997).

Gøsta Esping-Anderson, rather than looking for universal explanations of their rise, offers a differentiation of welfare states based on their approach to decommodifying goods that are necessary for citizen welfare yet inaccessible to some because of their market distribution (Esping-Anderson 1989; Doling 1997:73; Myles 1998:342). Responding to the pattern of working class political formation and coalition-building, states developed policy regimes that are: a) liberal; b) conservative-corporatist; or c) social democratic (Esping-Anderson 1990).[6] I will review the theories about the rise of welfare states and link these theories to Doling and Esping-Anderson's categorizations.

Theories of welfare state similarity

Within the body of welfare state theory, there are those who attempt to find a unifying explanation or logic for the development of all welfare states. One common way of conceiving of the welfare state is that it is the result of **moral necessity**. Under this view, the knowledge and resources that became available through the process of industrialization and increased social research led to an understanding of living conditions that incited the elite to act to improve conditions in the interests of 'fairness' and 'equality'.

> This 'moralistic' approach sometimes forms the discourse of
> popular discussion, so that welfare state reforms are couched in
> terms of normative statements about everyone being enabled to

---

[6] Esping-Anderson's welfare state regimes have parallels with Titmuss' 1974 models of social policy: 1) Residual Welfare Model (similar to liberal reliance on private market and family); 2) Industrial Acheivement-Performance Model (similar to the conservative-corporatist reliance on occupational structures); and 3) Institutional Redistributive Model (similar to the social democracy institutionalisation of welfare in the state) (Titmuss 1974; Graham, Delaney, and Swift 2000).

share certain minimum levels of welfare and society taking responsibility for the disadvantaged. (Doling 1997:62-3)

This theory is difficult to support under current examination. Today we have information about and widespread awareness of social problems that are not addressed by the state in any positive way.

Some theorists argue that it is the **logic of industrialization** itself that led to the development of the welfare state (Wilensky and Lebeaux 1965). In this view, politics were not a factor in the development of the welfare state; the same process will accompany industrialization regardless of the geo-cultural context. Instead of social decision-making, it was technological determinism that led to the policies of the welfare state. The urbanization and wage economy of the industrial economy led to unhealthy and insecure conditions for the workforce at the same time that traditional welfare systems were broken down. Since industrial development requires a workforce with a certain level of health and education, the state has no choice but to institute welfare measures (Doling 1997:65). Today, however, there are examples throughout the third world where industrialization is taking place without much hope a welfare state developing alongside.

One of the best known theories, perhaps, is that it was the **logic of capitalism** that created the necessity for the welfare state. When Marx and Engels predicted in 1888 that capitalism would continue without the least concern for the worker – bringing on the revolution – they did not foresee the welfare state (Marx and Engels 1969). Later Marxists re-evaluated this argument and took the position that welfare state social policy was a capitalist attempt to thwart class consciousness, offering just enough to avert popular revolt. As supporters of this theory will point out, Keynesian economic theory was not pure benevolence: "Keynes was also a Conservative and a strong opponent of socialism. His goal was to set forth a political economy model to save capitalism from the socialist alternative" (MacNeil and Warnock 2000:19). The fact that the global trend toward the free movement of capital appears to have weakened the welfare states lends renewed credence to this theory.

In Anglo-American countries, the work of **Marshall** has been central to understanding the development of welfare states (Evans and Wekerle 1997). Under this thesis, the simultaneous rise of the political concept of citizenship (based on equality) and industrial capitalism (based on inequality) led to social tension (Mishra 1990:10). The achievement of civil rights for all citizens led to demands for political rights and finally social rights. The state's cumulative granting of rights to its citizens, "can be seen both as ameliorating the adverse effects of the developing capitalist system and as acting to defuse moves towards more radical, even revolutionary, political action..." (Doling 1997:64).

Marshall's theory, although it offers some hope that people's sense of citizenship rights will lead them to resist the growing inequality of economic globalization, has sparked extensive and critical literature (O'Connor 1993; Orloff 1993). As argued by Evans and Wekerle,

> To reflect adequately the position of women, an understanding of stratification must move from an almost exclusive emphasis on class relations to incorporate attention to the way that the state may privilege the male 'worker-citizen' status. (Evans and Wekerle 1997:11)

This argument can be applied to other forms of oppression, as well.

Theories of welfare state diversity

While the above theories aim to uncover a universal, pre-determined path toward the welfare state, the theories in this section emphasize the choices made by individuals and groups within a given society's political arena (Doling 1997). The **individualist** explanation of the welfare state, for example, is a variation on classical liberal economics. In this view, an economic model explains the way in which individuals strive to maximize their personal welfare. The welfare states of different nations embody the interaction between individual demand for social policies (through voting and lobbying) and political parties' supply of policy packages (Doling 1997:69-70).

It is quite clear, however, that people do not always act alone or only for their personal interest within society. The **pluralist** explanation of the welfare state addresses this issue, using a collective rather than individualist focus. In this

view, power is widely dispersed throughout society and citizens compete to have their interests addressed by the neutral state. In democracies, the diversity of interests and the fact that power is widely dispersed means that no one group can dominate society (Doling 1997:70). In terms of welfare provision, liberal welfare states such as Britain and the United States place an emphasis on market and personal resources as sources of welfare. These states intervene only when private provisioning fails. Social programs tend to be means-tested, not universal, and are often stigmatized (Esping-Anderson 1990).

In the 1970s, **corporatists** began to dispute pluralism's assumption that power is widely dispersed. Corporatism addressed the role of interest groups in the functioning of the state with a particular focus on industry and unions. Under corporatist regimes, "the objective, and outcome, is a monopolistic arrangement whereby the state and the interest group collude in a manner that excludes other interests" (Doling 1997:71). Through this process, the state buys some peace and interest groups buy some stability and security, thereby encouraging the status quo. Conservative corporatist states such as France provide welfare principally through occupation groups, maintaining existing status differentials. In these systems, unions, church and family remain important sources of welfare (Esping-Anderson 1990). While corporatism is convincing in explaining some aspects of social policy, it cannot account for all political decisions. Most countries considered corporatist, for example, continue to have 'last chance' social provisioning for those individuals excluded from the more powerful occupational groups as well as some social programs that apply universally to all citizens.

Social democracy is a revised form of socialism (Doling 1997:73-4). While fully supporting liberalism's political and civil rights (even certain aspects of capitalism), social democrats "see it as self-evident that the exercise of these rights cannot be equally available to all in a society with a significant degree of income inequality" (Broadbent 1999:47). Policies of full employment are the hallmarks of social democrats. Work still provides the first order of welfare but social democrats believe the state should intervene and regulate the market in order to promote full employment and decommodify certain goods (Chiasson

1997).[7] Esping-Anderson's social democratic welfare states, such as those in Scandinavia, are based on a broad working and middle-class consensus. Social policy is based on universality and the widespread decommodification of welfare (Esping-Anderson 1990). Social democratic theory has probably had the greatest impact on the development of actual policies within welfare states.

The Canadian welfare state

Canada is similar to other welfare states in the range of its social programs (Battle 1998). According to Esping-Anderson's evaluation, Canada combines liberal and social democrat policies but leans toward the liberal (Esping-Anderson 1990:73). In Canada's early post-war years, some analysts believe that the combination of the disillusionment and expectations of returning veterans, the booming economy and the threat of a CCF victory all lent pressure for the flurry of social investment (Broadbent 1999). The 1966 Canada Assistance Plan laid out the terms for federal-provincial cost sharing for social services (50/50), an important principle in the design and implementation of social programs. By the 1970s, the state was providing important services to Canadians at every stage in the lifecycle.

Even at the height of its social program expansion, however, Canada has been at the conservative end of OECD countries' spending and infrastructure (O'Connor 1989). Banting asserted in the late 1980s that, "the social role of the Canadian state is a comparatively modest one, representing a restrained response to the social insecurities of industrial life" (Banting 1987:311). And while the Canadian welfare state hasn't been shown to have had a major redistributive impact, it did "mute the extremes of income inequality and become one element in the remarkable stability in the distribution of income in the thirty-five years following the cessation of hostilities in 1945. ...Even such small gains cannot be ignored." (Banting 1987:315).

---

[7] Ed Broadbent, former leader of the New Democratic Party, is frank in expressing his view of social democracy: "This combination - social rights, market economy, and activist government- laid the foundation for what was neither Marxist nor liberal, but rather a superior new notion of democratic citizenship" (Broadbent 1999:46).

Welfare state retrenchment

Today, it is a widely held view that the post-war consensus for welfare state intervention is broken. Most commentators point to the 1973-1974 world economic recession, sparked by the OPEC oil crisis, as the start of the retrenchment of the welfare state (Mishra 1990; Doling 1997:75). This crisis was the first concrete indication that the phenomenal rate of economic growth of the post-war period might not be indefinitely sustainable as suggested by Keynesian economics (MacNeil and Warnock 2000:19). Until the oil crisis, the welfare state and economy were believed to be engaged in a "virtuous circle: social programs would help serve as an economic stabilizer and help train a skilled workforce; wages from jobs for all who wanted them would pay for social programs and constrain the demands for unemployment insurance, welfare and social services" (Battle 1998:325).

The recession and stagflation of the early 1970s shook many people's faith in this assumption, enabling neo-conservative ideas to gain a foothold in the public conscience (Mishra 1990:1). Underlying the crisis of the early 1970s were economic, demographic, social and ideological shifts that would significantly impact the political viability of the welfare state. The political spectrum was pushed further to the right than it had been in decades:

> ...the events of the 1970s (primarily economic) and their aftermath
> (primarily political) were so much at odds with the conventional
> wisdom of post-war social science - Marxist and non-Marxist - that
> the advent of the neo-conservative regimes and their ideological
> break with the post-war consensus over welfare capitalism caused
> a state of considerable confusion if not panic, especially on the left.
> (Mishra 1990:102)

These major economic changes also brought changes to the housing debate, as we will see in later sections.

Economic changes

By the late 1970s, when the immediate effects of the OPEC crisis had cleared, western nations found that there were longer-term economic changes taking place that required a reformulation of economic thought. In general, it had

become clear that a booming economy might not be the eternal norm. The stagflation of the 1970s was followed by the deep recession of the early 1980s and this was again the case in the early 1990s. In between recessions, most countries have experienced slow, hesitant growth. For many working people, the spectre of the 'jobless recovery' is a fearsome thing to contemplate.

Apart from these economic ups and downs, Western economies were faced with new structural economic readjustments (Wilson 1996). From the 1970s on, there has been low growth in productivity (compared to the post-war expansion) while technological changes (mechanization of the production process, increased use of computerization) were reshaping the traditional occupational structure as these economies were faced with rapid de-industrialization. The nature of work itself has been altered. Part-time, contract and temporary work became a reality for many during the 1980s and real average earnings have fallen since the early 1970s (Evans and Wekerle 1997; Battle 1998).

Demographic and social change

Concurrent with the perceived downturn in economic resources available to fund the welfare state, demographic and social changes were such that demand on the welfare state was poised to grow. Two of the most important changes, and changes that have been high on the political agenda in Canada, are the ageing of the population and the massive entry of women into the paid labour force (Banting 1987; Evans and Wekerle 1997; Battle 1998).

Most western nations experienced a baby boom after the Second World War. In the early years of the welfare state, the high number of boomers compared to those who relied on government programs made it relatively easy to support (through taxation) the programs of the welfare state. The baby boom generation, however, lived through a period when socio-cultural changes (ex. feminism, women's mass entrance into the workforce, increased education, life expectations) lowered the average desired family size and improvements in access to birth control made it easier to achieve one's ideal number of children. As a

result, the generation after the boomers faces quite a different worker-to-welfare-state-dependent ratio from that experienced by their parents. At the same time, medical, work environment and lifestyle changes are helping people to live longer than ever before. Demand for the health and social services, housing and income supports so critical to the well-being of seniors is set to continue to rise while the proportion of the population working will decline. The actual impact of these changes are the subject of much debate, however, and may not be as severe as initially forecast (Gauthier 1995; Chui 1996; Battle 1998).

The second critical change increasing demand on the welfare state, related to the first, is the increased participation of women in the paid labour force. Beginning in the 1960s, women began to enter the paid labour force at rates previously unseen. Cultural and macro-economic changes were making work outside the home a more common experience for women, both married and single, whether by choice or economic necessity. What was traditionally unpaid women's work (ex. caring for children, the elderly, the sick or people with disabilities) still had to be done; women also came to expect access to pensions and unemployment insurance comparable to men's. While the traditional powerhouse in demanding welfare state expansion – the labour movement – was weakened by the changes in the economy, the women's movement picked up the slack in demanding social intervention (Wilson 1977; Banting 1987:318).

Ideological shifts

While the ideologies which came to the fore in the late 1970s and 1980s were not new, their relative political power shifted. The economic downturn of the 1970s revived the popularity of the idea that economic efficiency was incompatible with social equity; it was argued that the state simply could not afford the types of programs that mediated the social inequality that existed under capitalism and that, rather, this should be the responsibility of individuals. The neo-liberalism of the 1980s brought concerns about debt and deficit to the fore (Chisholm 1999). The zero-inflation policies of the monetarists were achieved by raising interest rates that in turn raised the national debt and levels of

unemployment. The typical neo-liberal regime moved to: sell state-owned corporations; deregulate the economy to lower corporate operating costs; cut social spending and balance government budgets; remove controls on the movement of capital between nations or regions; reduce taxes for corporations and the wealthy; increase sales & consumption taxes; end government intervention to correct market inequalities (MacNeil and Warnock 2000:22).

For Canada, as the debt grew uncomfortably high through the course of the 1980s, the Mulroney government became preoccupied with eliminating the deficit and paying down the debt, even if this was to be done at the expense of social programs – most of the actual cutting was done by the Chrétien Liberals, however. Canadian neo-liberal forces have pushed to end provincial equalization and regional development programs, to remove the central bank and monetary powers from the control of elected officials, and to support free trade and the free movement of international capital. Universal programs have been weakened in favour of targeted social programs (MacNeil and Warnock 2000:22).

According to Guy Chiasson, from the 1980s on, it became difficult to challenge the discourse placing debt and deficit at the centre of government concerns. The primacy of economic concerns impeded democratic debate: "By promoting economics to the rank of necessity, the usual position on the crisis of the welfare state blurs and confuses the issue by excluding itself from the level of political debates" (Chiasson 1997:74).

Perhaps more serious a challenge than the economic arguments around the welfare states were the assertions from across the political spectrum that the welfare programs *themselves* were the problem, not necessarily their costs (Fraser and Gordon 1994; Doling 1997:75; Chiasson 1997). Neo-liberal politicians criticized entitlement programs as being too passive, creating dependency, disincentives to work and hampering international competitiveness. Rather than eliminate these programs, however, the left wanted them to become more generous or well rounded (Evans and Wekerle 1997:12; Battle 1998:327).

The welfare state in the face of globalization

Writing in 1990, Ramesh Mishra predicted two main responses to the socio-economic challenges facing industrialized welfare states:

> On the right there is the model of neo-conservatism, with its rhetoric and ideology of retrenching social welfare, relying on the private sector and market forces for economic growth and for the provision of various human services. Its objective is to reduce substantially the 'welfare' element of welfare capitalism. On the left, in a practical and not merely theoretical sense, we have the model of social corporatism that has refused to abandon the goals of the post-war welfare state, notably full employment, economic growth and social welfare. (Mishra 1990:2)

As the 1990s proceeded, Anglo-American states took the route of neo-conservatism. The recession of the early 1990s ushered in the defeat of the neo-conservative governments of the United States (Reagan/Bush), Britain (Thatcher) and Canada (Mulroney). Many of the supposedly moderate governments replacing the right-wing vanguard of the 1980s, however, have continued on much the same track as that laid out by their predecessors (MacNeil and Warnock 2000:24). Ken Battle, for example, characterizes the approaches of Canadian federal finance ministers under both the Conservative and Liberal governments as one and the same:

> The hallmarks of their vision were: a leaner, tougher and more geared-to-income social security system; a reduced though still significant federal presence in social security; a commitment to base public spending on a zero-deficit fiscal foundation; an emphasis on 'active' social programs that will invest in human capital as opposed to 'passive' income programs which are claimed to engender dependency; and the credo that governments do not have all the answers and must work together with partners such as employers, the voluntary sector and communities. (Battle 1998:328)

The 1990s, with governments facing significant pressure from the right,[8] have seen continued cutbacks to social programs, although it seems at this point

---

[8] William Watson sums up the neo-liberal view in Canada in the introduction to his C.D. Howe Institute book: "The view from the right is that Canada's social programs need repair. They are too elaborate. They are too expensive. And they may not be good for the people they are

that programs serving the whole of the population have fared better than those targeted at the low-income or other minority groups (Battle 1998). In Canada, for example, targeted programs such as pre-retirement income security (i.e. welfare), housing and employment insurance have been significantly scaled back while universal programs such as pensions, healthcare and family benefits have fared somewhat better (Mishra 1990:77; MacNeil and Warnock 2000). A turning point was the demise of the 50/50 cost-sharing Canada Assistance Program and the move to the block grant Canada Health and Social Transfer[9] (Evans and Wekerle 1997).

Most recently, however, faced with budget surpluses before upcoming elections, both the federal and provincial governments have actually been reinvesting in some of the very programs they cut in the first place. Among the areas slated for reinvestment are health care and, of most interest for this thesis, social housing.

Having reviewed the theories of the welfare state, and the role of social policies within it, I will now turn to the specific case of social housing policy.

Social Housing as Social Policy

It is widely recognized that the housing industry and housing investment play a critical role in the economy of western nations (Miron 1993:7). There is also wide recognition in the literature, however, that housing plays a significant role in individuals' social outcomes and experiences (Malpass 1999; MacNeil and Warnock 2000:5). Levels of educational achievement, access to employment, physical and emotional health and degree of social integration or exclusion have all been linked to housing conditions (Dickens 1988; Smith 1994:253; Advisory Committee on Population Health 1996; Somerville 1998; Taylor 1998). "Where

---

supposed to help. They many not have caused Canada's current huge debt problem, but they are too large a component of public expenditure not to be part of the solution" (Watson 1994:1).

[9] CHST – which created caps on funding and weakens federal authority in setting

people live is not, then, simply a passive product of who they are; it is also a factor affecting what they can do and who they can become. Housing attainment is therefore implicated in the structuring of society and in the process of social reproduction" (Smith 1994:254). As described by John Miron,

> Satisfactory housing can make a vital contribution to equality of opportunity, the redistribution of wealth, and the nurturing of individual dignity and freedom of choice. Housing fulfils our need for privacy. Home is the place where we usually sleep, prepare and eat food, attend to physical and emotional needs, and engage in family life. It is a place where we can be with our family or friends, a place where we can get away from the rest of society and be free from intrusion or observation. (Miron 1993:7)

There is disagreement between liberal and neo-Marxist theorists as to whether governments intervene in housing purely for the welfare of citizens or whether they do so more to preserve social order and contribute to socio-economic stability. Regardless of their motivation, however, "No government is likely to take the requisite action to provide housing for those who require societal intervention unless there appears to be a policy advantage or unless the pressure for action on the government in power is so strong that it can no longer be resisted" (Rose 1980:3). Apart from social concerns, economic development of communities and economic profit for private developers are perhaps the most common policy advantages considered by government for intervening in housing.

In this section, however, we will discuss some of the more philosophical, moral or social reasons for governments to be involved in protecting the citizen's right to decent housing. Housing, as a physical artifact and durable product – unlike the services or income transfers typical of most social programs (Doling 1997:45-7) – has always held a vulnerable position in the realm of social policy and remains an issue of controversy. Some observers have argued that with the fading of government support for social housing, the idea of housing policy as social policy is also fading (Malpass 1999).

Affordability is the issue most often associated with social housing policy but for some populations housing is also closely linked to necessary social

---

national standards.

services (Morissette 1987; Morin and Dansereau 1990:17; McClain 1993; Ogilvie 1997) For example, it is often social housing that provides the structural adaptations necessary for Canadians with physical disabilities to live independently and social housing is increasingly an important support for older single women living alone (Cooper and Rodman 1994; Spector 1998). State subsidies are essential for the many group homes providing non-institutional care for people with physical and intellectual disabilities, for people living with mental illness, for young mothers, for the elderly, for women fleeing from domestic violence or for people attempting to conquer their addictions. As explained by Janet McClain, the need for supportive housing has grown in the post-war period and appears set to continue to do so:

> These needs are a result of improvements in health care and longevity, changing social policies, decreasing long term care in institutions, the desire for more independent lifestyles, and more openness in society about physical and mental disabilities and social problems. As well, reliance on an informal network of family and friends in one's home community, though still the primary base of support, may be less of an option for persons with special needs than it once was. (McClain 1993:221)

Despite these well-documented needs, however, there continues to be debate about whether housing should be treated at least in part as a social good or purely as a market commodity.

Housing as a Social Good or Housing as a Market Commodity?

As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, the right to decent housing is enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In the conception of the United Nations in 1948, housing did not stand apart from other social rights. It was one socio-economic right among many that would ensure the dignity of human beings. In the words of the Declaration:

> Article 25, Section 1. Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, **housing** and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other

lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control. (United Nations 1948).

In this view, housing is a human right and, as such, an appropriate area of social policy and intervention by governments. This conception of housing as a *right* has been vigorously defended by housing activists and advocates and is a popular idea with the general public (Bennett 1997a; MacNeil and Warnock 2000). However, accepting housing as a right, as does the Canadian government in law, does not in itself lead to consensus on what action this idea should provoke; the appropriate policy response is highly debated (Rose 1980:4; Doling 1997:10).

Housing policies generally reflect the ruling parties' view of the appropriate relation of housing to the market (Melamed 1968:62-3). For socialists, housing is considered a social good and therefore something that should be owned and managed collectively as a way to end class differentiation in access to housing. The far right sees housing as no different from any other market commodity and therefore sees only a residual role for collective intervention (Fallis 1995; Desrochers 2002). The view that has held sway in most western nations since the Second World War, however, is that of the social democrats, somewhere in between socialists and liberals:

> Social democrats contend that certain goods, services, and activities should be deemed to be of such importance to human dignity that they should be removed from dependence on market criteria. They should be citizens' rights. This is a decision made in a political process and it can be achieved only by the state. (Broadbent 1999:48)

For social democrats, there is recognition that housing is not a regular commodity but it is also different from services such as health care or education since it involves significant long-term capital investment. Housing also holds a unique place in North American culture as it is most families' most significant investment (Rose 1980:11).

It seems absolutely clear, however, that regardless of one's definition of what is 'adequate', 'suitable' and 'affordable',[10] the free market is failing to provide appropriate housing to all Canadians, while social housing can ease the burden for those with low incomes (Chekki 1995; FCM 2000). As early as 1968, Hans Blumenfeld urged us to recognize the dilemma that our preoccupation with housing may simply be a diversion from the more important issue of households' inadequate income: "Ce qu'on appelle le problème des taudis, c'est l'aspect logement du problème de la pauvreté. On n'est pas parvenu jusqu'à maintenant à loger convenablement tout le monde parce qu'on n'est pas parvenu à abolir la pauvreté" (Blumenfeld 1968:15). Thirty-five years later, we are as far as ever from that goal.

Defining 'Social Housing'

Before we define 'social housing', we should first define 'decent' housing since this is most often what housing advocates are trying to ensure. In Canada, the state has worked on the principle that it has a responsibility to support its citizens in accessing 'adequate', 'suitable' and 'affordable' housing. Of course, these terms are all socially defined (Blumenfeld 1968; Doling 1997:9). Definitions have changed through time as our social standards have shifted and as political debates were fought (Chouinard 1990). As Cullingworth explains,

> The 'need' for housing, as with the 'need' for health services, or roads, or recreational facilities, is dependent upon the awareness, recognition and definition of 'problems'; these in turn are dependent upon the standards of 'adequacy' adopted and the factors which are accepted as being relevant to them. All of these constantly change: as one 'problem' is met, another emerges. A

---

[10] Patricia Streich underlines for us that, "Though volumes have been written, affordability appears to defy objective measurement. …The magnitude of the housing affordability problem is largely conditioned by the perspective from which it is defined and measured. Affordability is more than a concept of positivist economics: it encompasses issues of social standards, the notion of reasonable payments for housing in attainment of a level of social well-being, and questions about social equity and equality of opportunity" (Streich 1993:257). Interestingly, my interviews indicate that the CMHC has been moving away from its traditional definition of 'affordability' from a measure relative to occupants' income to an absolute measure related to market housing costs. This shift is not yet policy, however, since the definition used in the 2003 Canadian Housing Observer remains the same (CMHC 2003).

'need' is a socially accepted aspiration, and the faster that one is
met the faster do new aspirations arise. (Cullingworth 1979:31)

The most common definitions used in Canada are the official CMHC
definitions (MacNeil and Warnock 2000:4-5). According to the traditional CMHC
definitions,' adequate' housing requires only regular upkeep, has hot and cold
water, an indoor toilet and bath or shower. 'Suitable' housing meets national
occupancy standards: two people per bedroom with children of the opposite sex in
separate bedrooms after age five and with one bedroom for each couple or person
over 18 years old. Housing is considered 'affordable' if a household spends less
than 30 per cent of its income on housing (including utilities). Households are
considered to be experiencing 'Core Housing Need' if they fail to meet one or
more of the above standards (CMHC 2003).

There are a number of ways that a state can intervene in the field of
housing without actually supporting or providing social housing (Doling 1997:40-
3; Steele 2001). Whether by default or by design, the state can choose non-action,
doing nothing to challenge market outcomes in housing. The state can undertake
public education campaigns, for example exhorting landlords to fulfill their
responsibilities, builders to construct safe housing or consumers to defend their
rights. Rather than relying on exhortation, the state can regulate certain
behaviours around housing, making non-compliance illegal and applying
penalties. Taxes can be used to discourage undesired outcomes such as the use of
environmentally harmful materials in construction. Finally, subsidies can be
offered to private producers or consumers in efforts to make housing more
affordable or to encourage particular choices; in Canada, for example, the
subsidies to private homeowners have been substantial (Carroll 1989; Bacher
1993). All of these types of interventions, however, act as supports to the private
market and do not constitute what is usually meant by the term, 'social housing'.

'Social housing' implies that the state is involved in the *provision* of
housing, whether directly, in state owned and managed developments, or
indirectly, through state-funded non-governmental organizations. Richard Morin

and Francine Dansereau suggest the following "zones of consensus" in defining social housing:

> a) Non-profit management: social housing generally refers to housing that is collectively owned and managed outside of private market provisions. Rents are usually below market rates.
>
> b) Allocation according to a socially-defined need or social solidarity rather than according to ability to pay or according to profit-maximization
>
> c) Subject to political decisions and governmental control or public accountability as a function of its reliance on state subsidies (Morin and Dansereau 1990:4-6).

Other characteristics of social housing may vary across different jurisdictions (Morin and Dansereau 1990:7-12). The proportion of social housing within the overall housing stock varies widely across the welfare states, for example. In Canada, social housing is only approximately 5 percent of the total stock (Dorvil and Morin 2001; Connelly Consulting Services 2003) while social housing makes up 15 to 40 percent of housing in the European Economic Community (Morin and Dansereau 1990). As well, the organizations involved in producing and managing social housing vary.[11] Procedures for determining eligibility for social housing and determining rent levels vary according to the priorities and ideologies of those managing social housing (Saugeres 1999).

A recent shift in some actors' definitions of social housing includes a move away from the centrality of the concept of 'collective ownership' and a willingness to include other types of housing that benefit from government subsidies (Vaillancourt, Ducharche, Cohen, Roy, and Jetté 2000). As we will see later in the interviews with social housing actors, some are now ready to include subsidized private rental housing, subsidized individual homeownership (especially when it is non-profit and the affordability is protected by resale formulae) and rent subsidies to individual households living in private housing. This shift is sometimes related to a greater ideological openness to market

---

[11] Municipal, provincial or federal governments may be responsible or third sector secular or religious charities, community organisations, community development corporations or co-

provision of housing and sometimes to a pragmatic acceptance of the current limits of the possibilities of traditional social housing formulae to respond the great need to which we are currently witness (Vaillancourt et al. 2000; Desrochers 2002; SHQ 2003b).

Varying perceptions of social housing

Although many Canadians believe that the government should intervene on some level to ensure access to housing for all Canadians, social housing per se, and especially public housing (i.e. subsidized housing owned and managed by the state, Habitations à loyer modique in Quebec), have come to have a poor reputation in some quarters. Although the large, impersonal housing projects so famous in the United States (Koebel 1998:3; Venkatesh 2000; Mazerolle, Ready, Terrill, and Waring 2000) are relatively rare in Canada, it seems that this style of public housing dominates the public perception. Large-scale public housing, especially in the United States, has been a focus of research examining the negative consequences of this type of development (Bauman, Hummon, and Muller 1991; Wilson 1996; DeKeseredy, Alvi, Schwartz, and Perry 1999; Raphael 2001). These negative perceptions have gained acceptance in Canada. Consequently, public housing tends not to be sited in suburban areas and is more often for seniors[12] (Rose 1980:192).

The CMHC, however, recognized early on the negative attributes of the large project type of housing – with its social stigma, geographical and social isolation, architectural design compromising safety, etc. (Blumenfeld 1968; Dansereau 1993) – and shifted to smaller, more geographically dispersed developments (Glasser, Fournier, and Costopoulos 1999). Many of the federally-owned larger housing projects were actually sold to the private sector in the 1980s

---

operatives might be involved.

[12] Largely due to a fear of crime, 'troubled' families and a lowering of neighbouring property values. Social housing for families has been less popular due to an unwillingness to address the issues of so-called 'failed' families and a preference for intervention in favour of those groups readily accepted as 'the deserving poor' by the public. A notable exception to this trend was the housing built in the suburbs by the Metro Toronto Housing Authority in the 1960s, when a metropolitan approach allowed for the dispersal of public housing developments (McMahon

(Bennett 1997b). Nonetheless, it is the country's Regent Parks and Habitations Jeanne-Mance that shape the public conception of public housing. The concept of the negative effects of the 'concentration of poverty' is a strong one in Canada but also in the housing literature in general (Raphael 2001). It is believed that large-scale public housing:

> ...traps people in areas of cumulative disadvantage and lack of opportunity. Poor housing (by no means necessarily cheap), poor employment opportunities (with little opportunity for advancement), poor schools (or adequate schools lacking the social stimulus to educational achievement) all reinforce each other. (Cullingworth 1979:163)

The negative perceptions of social housing in the (especially American) literature do not seem to match the experiences of Canadian residents of social housing. A 1990 CMHC survey found that 60 percent of public housing residents had lived in their development for more than five years and that 87 percent were satisfied with their accommodation while, in 1993 a CMHC study found that public housing usually means better affordability, physical condition, size and privacy for its low-income tenants (Prince 1998). As well, in my five years experience working with residents of social housing, I have not met many who dislike their housing. Dissatisfaction seems to arise more from lack of respect from management and stereotypes held by those outside of social housing than from the poor quality of the housing itself or from poor social relations among residents. As well, we must also distinguish between traditional public housing and co-op housing and non-profit housing which tends to be favoured among low-income tenants (Jetté 1998; Lalonde, Mercier, and Tremblay 2001).

Now that I have defined the concept of social housing and discussed some of the varying perceptions of it, I will turn to the experience of social housing policy development through the years in Canada...

1990).

Experience of social housing policy in Canada

Canada was similar to other welfare states in many aspects of its housing policy development, a hybrid of the public provisioning prevalent in continental Europe and the market supports preferred by the United States. But overall, the federal government was in line with other welfare states that saw their role as:

> ...fixing up market shortcomings and helping those whom the market could not serve. Beginning in the 1950s, and continuing through the 1970s, governments assumed a much more activist role. They deliberately used new housing construction to stimulate the economy and provide housing for groups unable to access adequate affordable accommodation in the private market. (Carter 1997:596)

Although according to the constitution housing should fall under provincial jurisdiction (Rose 1980:182), the federal government undertook in the late 1940s to directly provide residual housing to those most disadvantaged in society. Overall, however, the Canadian state preferred to use market mechanisms to intervene in housing, investing more over time in both rental and homeownership through such mechanisms as mortgage guarantees, tax breaks for owners and direct subsidies for construction (Hulchanski 1988:11; Miron 1995).

Pre-WWII: Little state intervention in housing

Before the Second World War, the government did little to intervene in the housing market. In the 1930s, tenant struggles demanding fair treatment and legal protections were the purview of left-wing groups, the Communist Party and unions (Chouinard 1990; Bennett 1997b). Industry and capitalists also called for government intervention, however. According to Vera Chouinard,

> Capitalist support for greater state involvement in housing did not extend to non-profit, community housing initiatives, however. In the 1930s and late 1940s, for example, loan and trust companies demanded government guarantees against loan defaults, but strenuously opposed housing programs which departed from an 'assisted market' approach (that is, public or non-profit housing)... (Chouinard 1990:1298)

The Canadian government did pass interventionist housing legislation prior to the Second World War but it was generally intended to support private production and homeownership (Miron 1993:9-10). In 1918, subsidized mortgage loans were available for the construction of new homes for returning veterans of the First World War. During the Depression, the 1935 Dominion Housing Act again offered subsidized and flexible mortgages for the purchase of moderately priced homes. The Act was considered a temporary measure in response to the Depression, however, and did not reflect a long-term commitment to intervening in the housing market (Rose 1980:3). And while the National Housing Act, first adopted in 1938, made possible funding to local authorities for the construction of public housing, the Act was not put into practice (Morin and Dansereau 1990:13). It took the socio-economic changes of the Second World War and the general acceptance of Keynesian economic principles to allow for serious consideration of public or state-funded non-profit housing.

Post-WWII: Economic growth & support of private housing market

By the end of the Second World War, Canada was facing a serious housing shortage. During the Depression and then during the War, very little new housing had been built and much of the old stock was in poor repair. The literature cites several ways in which the overall demand for housing was raised or changed after the war.[13] The National Housing Act was amended in 1944, laying out the federal government's intention to support private housing development and improve access to credit for Canadian homebuyers; Wartime Housing Limited was transformed into the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation in 1946 to administer the Act (Hulchanski 1988; MacNeil and Warnock 2000). There remained interest among activist groups such as the Co-

---

[13] There was an absolute growth in population (wave of immigration and baby boom); family and household compositions were changing; the population is ageing; there was a migration from rural to urban areas, and; a growing affluence allowed for people who never before had the option to live independently (Rose 1980:189; Rose and Wexler 1993:239; Miron 1993:11-4).

operative Union of Canada, the Canadian Union of Students and the Canadian Labour Congress for public and non-profit housing, but their demands went, for a time, unanswered:

> ... the co-operative and trade union movements had joined forces to advocate state assistance for non-profit and co-operative housing. But struggles for less commodified forms of housing assistance foundered on difficulties in political mobilization, especially under conditions of relative economic prosperity... Although the federal Committee on Social Reconstruction recommended that a comprehensive national housing program should form part of the state's post-war economic and social development strategy, the 1944 National Housing Act (NHA) stressed only the Keynesian use of housing programs to stimulate the economy and housing construction. (Chouinard 1990:1298-9)

In a context where the fact that wages were rising faster than inflation made housing more affordable for most of the population, social housing advocates were unable to rally enough support to pressure the federal government to invest much in this area. Very few public or non-profit housing units were built during this era (Chouinard 1990). Although a National Public Housing program was adopted in 1949, it faced significant political and ideological resistance and public housing construction remained stalled until 1964 (Hulchanski 1988:18). Between 1949 and 1964, only 11,624 units of public housing were built, an average of only 0.7 percent of annual housing construction (Morin and Dansereau 1990:13).

Instead, from 1954 to 1964, the CMHC acted more as a financial institution, insuring mortgages, and as a centre for research and demonstration projects. In 1955, the CMHC reaffirmed that it would not take on responsibility for that which the private sector could provide (Hulchanski 1988).

Mid-1960s: Growth of the welfare state & provision of public housing

In the mid-1960s, there came a realization among the public and among policy makers that the 'golden age' being enjoyed by the majority was failing to reach a significant proportion of the population. Poverty had not been eradicated

and housing affordability found its way onto the public agenda. At the same time as the advent of this realization about poverty, North American politicians were intrigued by the promises of urban renewal (Glasser et al. 1999). This combination was potent:

> Political pressure for public housing became more effective as housing affordability problems for low-income Canadians worsened... Members of parliament from across Canada argued that measures to house the poor and homeless were overdue, and that public housing should therefore be an integral component of urban renewal. (Chouinard 1990:1300)

Pressure was mounting for more effective state intervention in housing. The Ontario Association of Housing Authorities, for example, was clear in its disparaging of the outcomes of the National Housing Act: "Housing performance under the National Housing Act has been production oriented rather than distribution oriented, a quantitative operation qualitatively devoid of broad social objectives and economically inaccessible to many Canadians" (Ontario Association of Housing Authorities 1964:49).

The 1964 amendments to the National Housing Act supported the twinning of construction of public housing and inner city commercial development with urban renewal through the 1964 Public Housing Program.[14] For politicians and suburbanites, the affordable if rundown housing in city centres was an eyesore that slowed down economic growth. Rundown housing could be demolished and replaced by newer, better quality – sometimes public – housing (MacNeil and Warnock 2000:29). Unfortunately, as early as 1968, it had become clear that this 'slum clearance' almost always resulted in more expensive rent and more apartments were destroyed than created[15] (Blumenfeld 1968:17; Cullingworth 1979).

---

[14] The Public Housing Program provided CMHC funding for the construction of housing projects to be owned and managed under federal administration. Provinces were expected to make a 12 to 25 per cent contribution for construction (Carter 1997). Tenants of CMHC public housing had rents set according to their incomes (25 to 30 per cent). The difference between rent paid and a development's operating costs were shared between federal and provincial governments.

[15] One Montreal exception to this rule was the neighbourhood of Little Burgundy where the local residents were displaced and many heritage buildings were destroyed but there was, nonetheless, a net increase in the number of housing units available after "urban renewal". (Hamel

The implementation of the Public Housing Program in the mid-1960s marked the beginning of Canada's public housing building boom. Between 1964 and 1978, 164,000 public housing units were built in Canada, most of them managed by provincial authorities with a 50/50 cost-sharing arrangement with the federal government (Morin and Dansereau 1990:14). In this same period, the federal government used the Limited Dividend Rental Program to subsidize private construction of low-income rental units. Loans with 50-year fixed-rate mortgages were made available via the CMHC to landlords who agreed to set rents based on their actual costs and to target tenants below a specified income cut-off. Landlords also had to accept restrictions on rent increases (Miron 1995).

By the late 1960s, however, housing affordability was still an important issue in Canada and, although public housing construction was at its height, the federal provisioning did not seem to be providing all the answers. In 1969, a federal task force confirmed that "housing is a universal need, yet the private market on which Canadians have relied is anything but universal in its present scope and applications" (Federal Task Force on Housing and Urban Development 1969:14) yet the CMHC seemed unable to fill void. There was growing disillusionment with the large-scale public housing in some major cities. The Task Force reflected the public impression "that they [large public housing projects] stigmatized the tenants, became ghettos of low-income people and produced environments that led to criminal activity" (MacNeil and Warnock 2000:30).

Housing advocate groups were already looking for alternatives. In March 1968, the Co-operative Union of Canada, the Canadian Union of Students and the Canadian Labour Congress had come together to form the Co-operative Housing Foundation (CHF), the first national organization for the co-operative housing movement (Chouinard 1990). The CHF's negotiations with the federal government over the next few years would change the direction of Canadian housing policy.

1983)

Early 1970s: Welfare state crisis and inclusion of the third sector

As discussed in the earlier section on theories of the welfare state, by the early 1970s, economic conditions coalesced to create significant demand for social housing: stagflation led to soaring housing costs; wage increases fell behind increases in housing costs; labour unrest in the construction industry increased costs and slowed down production; major development corporations were speculating on urban land. In 1970, the federal government announced a new program to encourage private-sector provision of low-income and moderate-income housing:

> Internal CMHC memorandums indicate that officials were searching for alternatives to assisted housing that could serve people eligible for public housing, provide shelter for moderate-income households no longer able to afford owner-occupied housing, and help to control state expenditures. (Chouinard 1990:1301)

The 1973 oil crisis and subsequent recession led to further reassessment of state involvement in a range of social policy arenas, housing included. Unwilling to abandon efforts to stimulate the economy by encouraging housing production, the federal government was not ready to withdraw from housing at this point. Instead, federal officials were interested in reducing the state's financial obligations (at least as a proportion of each project) (Morin and Dansereau 1990:14) and in addressing the stigma and public concerns related to the 'concentration of poverty' created by large-scale public housing projects (Hulchanski 1988:20).

Partly in response to negotiations with the CHF – but also under pressure from the NDP who held the balance of power in parliament at the time (Hulchanski 1993) – 1973 amendments to the National Housing Act changed the funding structures for public housing and allowed third-sector, or non-profit, housing initiatives to benefit from federal support (Carter 1997). Housing co-operatives and housing owned and managed by non-profit organizations became important new partners in providing affordable housing to Canadians. The

Canadian government had adopted the concept of 'social housing'. The adoption of third sector funding programs, however, did not signify the state's turning away from supporting the private sector. In this same period, the government also expanded its supports to the private housing market through the 1973 Registered Home Ownership Savings Plan, subsidies for multi-unit residential buildings (MURBs) and the Assisted Home Ownership Program. Later, in 1975, the Assisted Rental Program was created.

Originally, the co-op movement fought for funding to support mixed-income housing. The federal government accepted this approach in its 1973 legislation but by the mid-1970s there were reports that CMHC was informally pressuring co-ops to abandon the mixed-income approach and already by the late 1970s, there had erupted intense conflict over the future of co-operative and non-profit housing. Representatives of the private housing market, including banks, developers, landlords, and large builders, charged that the mixed-income approach of third sector explained the continued affordability problem of housing in Canada.

> Although New Democratic Party (NDP) members of parliament argued that federal housing programs had failed to deal with spiraling costs of housing precisely because they continued overwhelmingly to favour assistance to the private housing industry, critics of the alternatives of public and non-profit housing claimed that 'social' housing programs were not only a drain on state finances but also inefficient in comparison with private housing provision. (Chouinard 1990:1303)

There was increasing pressure to shift social housing from a program conceived as a 'universal' program which should serve all Canadians, to a 'targeted' one which would require that beneficiaries be subjected to needs testing based on such factors as income and health problems.

In 1979, private housing interest groups won several concessions (Morin and Dansereau 1990:14). CMHC direct loans were stopped in favour of insuring private loans, private builders and consumers would receive interest-rate subsidies and it was proposed that responsibility for co-operatives and non-profit housing be devolved to the provinces (Chouinard 1990; MacNeil and Warnock 2000:30).

Except for Quebec, where the provincial government instituted a rent-geared-to-income co-op housing program, the co-op movement was able to resist devolution to the provinces but this idea would resurface in the future.

Early 1980s: neo-liberalism brings social housing retrenchment

Lack of support for social housing continued into the 1980s. In 1983, for example, a CMHC review of social housing concluded that co-ops and non-profit housing had failed to house low-income Canadians efficiently (Chouinard 1990). The election of the Conservative Mulroney government in 1984 brought the beginnings of neo-conservative politics home to Canada. By 1986, the CMHC was asserting that its role was to assist "in developing a climate of stability for the private market so that it can function effectively" (Hulchanski 1988:17). Assisting those who could not afford market rates was a secondary concern. Construction of public housing slowed considerably and instead, during this period, third sector housing made up 80 percent of new social housing, marking a withdrawal of the state from this sector (Morin and Dansereau 1990:14).

For almost all welfare states under the siege of neo-liberalism in the 1980s, funding for social housing was one of the first programs to face major cuts (Linneman and Megbolugbe 1994; MacNeil and Warnock 2000:26-9). The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, for example, withdrew almost completely from the direct provision of social housing (Koebel 1998:3) and the Canadian government attempted to follow suit. In 1987, the Conservative budget introduced the first-ever cuts to the federal housing program (MacNeil and Warnock 2000:3) by ending federal funding for middle income tenants in social housing, targeting all spending to only the low-income. "Curieusement, après un élargissement du concept d'habitation sociale, on en est arrivé à un resserrement de l'aide de l'État canadien sur les clientèles les plus démunies, dans chacun des volets du logement social" (Morin and Dansereau 1990:15).

In the same year, the Meech Lake Accord called for the decentralization of social programs. Five years later, the 1992 Charlottetown Accord was specific in

calling for six areas of social policy to be devolved to the provinces. One of these areas was housing (Canada 1992; Carter 1997). Both of these accords failed but their ideas lived on to return in different forms during the 1990s.

Mid-1990s: devolution of social housing to the provinces

What the Conservatives were not able to achieve under Mulroney, the Liberals were happy to undertake themselves. Mishra argues that the fear of electoral repercussions prevented the Conservatives from fully implementing their neo-liberal agenda (Mishra 1990:77,96-7), and instead leaving the full elimination of funding to new social housing to the Liberals, a government that has enjoyed an unusual lack of serious electoral competition. The 1993 budget heralded the end of an era in Canadian housing policy. In that year, the federal government ended funding for new social housing and made clear its intention to transfer responsibility to the provinces by capping its spending on existing projects. Many provinces responded with housing cutbacks of their own (Carroll and Jones 2000).

In 1996, devolution became formal policy. "With very little fanfare and even less public discussion" (Dunphy 1997:23), the federal government announced its intention to negotiate Social Housing Agreements (SHAs) with each province in recognition of the constitutional responsibility of the provinces for housing (Styles 1997).[16] As pointed out by Chisholm, this devolution should be seen as part of the larger pattern of federal withdrawal from social program responsibility. While the federal government often claims to be attempting to appease Quebec demands for increased autonomy, the trend of devolution of powers cannot be separated from "other more powerful trends, such as a freer market system, the desire to reduce government and a perceived need to reduce

---

[16] The federal principles for the Social Housing Agreements include: (1) SHA funds can only be used for housing programs; (2) SHA funds can only be used for non-institutional residential accommodation; (3) CMHC-set income eligibility criteria will apply to SHA-funded housing; (4) SHA funds are only to be used for income-targeted housing assistance unless federal moderate-income units already exist. When these moderate-income units no longer exist, SHA funds should be diverted to targeted programs; (6) Savings from efficient management of SHA developments will be kept by the provinces but must be reinvested in housing (Prince 1998:833-4).

taxes to make the country more competitive in global markets" (Chisholm 1999:14).

The provinces were slow to take up the offer of devolution, however, wary of the financial and political implications (i.e. future federal contributions frozen at their 1996 levels, thereby eroding the value of their financial obligations with inflation) (MacNeil and Warnock 2000:3). From the very beginning of this process, the co-operative housing movements were also wary. They saw these agreements as a threat to their continued funding and independence (Canadian Housing 2000). The Co-op Housing Federation of Canada launched a 4-year campaign that recently won the concession that co-operatives be excluded from Social Housing Agreements and returned to federal jurisdiction. Now, 90 percent of the co-ops outside of Quebec remain under federal administration (Canadian Housing 2000). It is noteworthy that the only two provinces that continued investing in social housing after the federal freeze on new construction, Quebec and British Columbia, were among the minority that most resisted the Social Housing Agreements that transferred responsibility for federally-owned housing projects (Chisholm 1999).

Even now, housing advocates are issuing the same lament first heard in the 1970s (Dennis and Fish 1972). At a May 2000 symposium on affordable housing, Eileen Badiuk, president of the Canadian Housing and Renewal Association (CHRA) reflected that

> Perhaps it is one of the great ironies of our country that we are considered one of the best-housed nations in the world yet we do not have a clearly articulated affordable housing policy. We do not have a housing policy that defines the roles of government, the private sector, and the community. (Badiuk 2000:9)

We are at a critical crossroads in Canadian housing policy with changes in policy that are historic in scope (FCM 1998; Suttor 1999; MacNeil and Warnock 2000). The devolution of social housing, with the exception of co-operatives, to provincial or municipal governments brings into question the fundamental underpinnings of Canadian housing policy. Do Canadians have a *right* to decent and affordable housing? If so, how will this be provided for? Who will pay for it?

Who will define what is decent and what is affordable? These are important questions considering the observation of Tom Carter:

> Although the federal government continues to be active through initiatives to smooth the operation of the marketplace, particularly through regulation of the financial system, funding for new affordable units has virtually ground to a halt... Despite a growing acceptance that housing is a provincial responsibility, most provinces, with a couple of exceptions, have followed the federal lead and cut funding step by step with the federal government. (Carter 1997:628)

Things have changed rapidly since the last federal election – yet many things remain the same. For example, at the May 2000 symposium mentioned above, hopes for renewed federal investment in social housing were discouraged. The CMHC's Director of Strategic Planning and Policy told the crowd that housing strategy for Canada should not solely be a federal government responsibility. Seemingly unaware that a federal "Affordable Housing" subsidy program was in the works, he restated that

> ... housing is primarily a provincial and municipal responsibility; the federal government will not likely get back into direct delivery of programs. However, the federal government can support the private sector and use interest rates and tax provisions to deal with obstacles to the development of affordable housing. (Dowling 2000:10)

Federal coalitions have brought significant pressure to bear on the federal government, arguing that their neglect of social housing has contributed to our current crisis (FRAPRU 1997; Suttor 1999) Despite the negotiation of the federal government's feeble return to the financing of subsidized housing, the prospects for social housing in Canada continue to seem limited. The next few years will undoubtedly be a time when community-based housing organizations will have to take serious stock of their organizing strategies and policy demands. Unfortunately, early estimates suggest that the provinces and the third sector will not be able to keep up with the need for affordable housing (Skaburskis and Mok 2000) and the funds injected by the Affordable Housing program seem unlikely to make the difference(MacNeil and Warnock 2000:14-7).

The current policy framework in Quebec

In order to understand the relationships between community groups, intermediary groups and the state – as is the goal of this thesis – it is paramount to understand the policy framework in which such relations develop and play out. I have approached 'the state' as an entity with many different faces. I have considered borough, municipal, provincial and federal levels of government, para-governmental agencies of these different levels of government, their civil servants and politicians. All of these different types of state actors have an influence on the process of the development of both social housing policy and social housing projects. In this section, I will briefly describe the responsibilities of the different levels of government and the basic funding programs that exist within Quebec for social housing. Details of the mandates and practices of the different levels of government will be discussed in more depth in later chapters dealing with interview results.

Roles of the different levels of government

Constitutionally, housing is a provincial jurisdiction. The federal government continues to play an important role, however. The federal government agency, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) has numerous subsidy programs for private home ownership and many Quebecois take advantage of these programs. With regards to social housing, the federal government played a historical role in financing the development of public and third sector housing. Today, this has been taken over by Quebec, with the exception of the recent injection of the "Affordable Housing" financing (50 percent of $323 million for Quebec). At one time, the CMHC owned and managed several important public housing projects (such as Benny Farm) but these have slowly been sold off. Almost none remain today.

The province is the real mover and shaker in social housing in Quebec but mostly in terms of funding. It is the province, through the Société d'habitation Québec (SHQ), who is implementing the Affordable Housing Program and they

contribute 33 percent of the $323 million to be invested through this program, with 50 percent from the federal government and the remaining from municipal or other local contributions. This program subsidizes both third sector and private housing initiatives that will provide rental units at or below market rents (SHQ 2003a). Apart from the Affordable Housing program, the SHQ includes four other programs in its Social Housing dossier, revealing a broader conception of the term than most community actors, but keeping a focus on low-income households: public housing (Habitations à loyer modique – HLM – owned and managed municipally); rent supplements (paid to landlords so that tenants' rent become geared to income); Shelter Allowance (for families with children or people aged 55 and beyond); and AccèsLogis (a subsidy program for the creation of co-operative or non-profit housing units) (SHQ 2003b). Note that the province avoids becoming a landlord or providing any long-term commitments to housing spending. Most of these subsidies have one-time or short-term agreements (i.e. 5 years or less). After the 1993 withdrawal of the federal government from funding new construction, Quebec froze construction of HLM units, focusing entirely on co-ops and nonprofits. With the return of some federal funding, however, the province is once again looking at HLM construction. The Shelter Allowance is the only program administered directly by the province through Revenue Québec, with payments made directly to individual tenants.

While it is the province that designs and funds the majority of social housing programs, it is usually the municipality that administers them. Working with the assumption that local authorities will have a better idea of where the investment is most needed, it is left to the municipality to make allocation decisions about subsidies under the Affordable Housing, AccèsLogis and Rent Supplement programs. Under the first two of these programs, the local authority is also required to invest a percentage of its own funds in order for the project to go forward.

In the case of Montreal, the Montreal Housing Agency (Société d'habitation de Montréal – SHM) works with co-ops and nonprofits developing subsidized units and their approval is essential in order to receive provincial

funding. In the past, the City of Montreal was even more proactive on the affordable housing front, using its Montreal Housing and Development Agency (Société d'habitation et de développement de Montréal – SHDM) to redevelop neighbourhoods in distress and construct new affordable units that were managed by nonprofits. The City is also responsible for the management of HLM units through its Housing Authority (Office municipal d'habitation de Montréal – OMHM).

Since the 2003 municipal mergers that took place in Quebec, housing activists have been faced with the new powers given to borough councils. These local councils are now responsible for basic approvals of new projects and for any zoning changes that may be necessary for the project to proceed. While this does allow for more local input into decision-making around urban planning and land use, it has also been used to serve the less laudable not-in-my-backyard phenomenon in several Montreal neighbourhoods. At the time of writing this thesis, in the middle of a serious housing shortage in Montreal, there are many social housing projects stalled at the level of the borough council.

Influence of immigration on social housing in Québec

In general, immigration has not been a factor given much weight in Quebec social housing policy. Housing is recognized as an essential element for the settlement of new immigrants (Aumont 1998) for the same reasons that it is important to other Canadians: health, security, employment, education, social networks, etc. There is also recognition of some differing needs for immigrants in such housing (as will be discussed in the interview chapters) but this has not been reflected in policy. It is addressed on an ad hoc basis. Although federal housing programs made some room for ethnic-specific housing projects (co-op or non-profit) Quebec, in keeping with its need to promote a common, francophone public culture while allowing for diverse cultural expression within communities and families, has long rejected this model with the argument that it contributes to the ghettoisation of new immigrants and ethnic groups.

In recent years, municipal housing offices, the SHQ and the Ministère des relations avec les citoyens et l'immigration have been sponsoring research and pilot projects which deal with the cohabitation of ethnic groups within housing developments as well as the integration of new immigrants into the wider Quebec society (Dansereau and Séguin 1995; Rose 2000; OMH de Montréal-Nord 2001). These concerns are at the forefront as the proportion of immigrant households continues to increase in public housing. In the year 2000, for example, 46 percent of new applicants to the OMHM were landed immigrants (OMH de Montréal-Nord 2001). Explanations for this disproportionate representation of immigrant tenants are still tentative but include: less stigma in using public housing among recent immigrants; disproportionate poverty of recent immigrants; larger families making it more difficult to find affordable and appropriate housing.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have explored the literature on theories of the state, the rise and retrenchment of the welfare state, the role of social housing within the welfare state and Canada's experience with housing policy, in particular social housing policy. It is clear that housing is a contentious area for policy intervention, not quite a market commodity and not quite a social service. Changing political ideologies have had a major impact on housing policy through the decades and will surely continue to do so. My interest lies in furthering an understanding of how grassroots community groups can have a role in setting the agenda.

One gap I noted was that the literature does not focus much on the socio-political *process* that led to the adoption or defeat of different macro-level housing policy initiatives. Some interesting examples were the work of Chouinard (1990), Bacher (1993) and Carroll and Jones (2000). This question of process is of utmost importance to community groups, provincial and national coalitions interested in strengthening social housing in Canada. On a more local level there are numerous descriptions of tenants' rights campaigns or of the process of

establishing co-operatives, but these are more often from a community organizing perspective and focus less on the policies themselves.[17]

In terms of my dissertation research, my focus on the grassroots process of alternative housing policy development and organizing to have these policies implemented addresses a gap in the literature. There is a lack of attention given in housing research to the political process of housing policy adoption and implementation and the perspectives of actors at the grassroots have been neglected.

---

[17] I will address this housing organising literature in the third chapter.

Chapter 3:

Community Organizing for Social Housing in Quebec

This chapter will explore the literature on community organizing, examining models of community organizing and the relationship of community organizations to the state. I will begin this chapter with a section outlining and critiquing the tradition of community organizing, particularly in Canada. I will offer a brief historical overview of organizing in Canada and Quebec before turning to more contemporary examples. The distinction will be drawn between community organizations as *institutions* and the *process* of community organizing. I will also introduce the most common models used by community groups to address community concerns, both private (internal to the organization) and public (dealing with the outside world).

In the second section I will survey the most common ideological underpinnings of contemporary community organizing and the implications of these ideologies for engagement with the state on housing issues. Although many groups take positions and use strategies reflective of more than one of these ideologies, it is useful to distinguish between them here for the sake of comparison and critique. Liberalism, Marxism, identity politics and communitarianism will each be described as they relate to community organizing and critiqued along with illustrations of the different relationships to the state suggested by these dissimilar ideologies.

In my concluding discussion and reflections, I will describe my overall impression of the community organizing literature as it relates to state housing policy before reflecting on the state of housing policy organizing in Canada today. In this chapter, I have used the community organizing literature on local-level housing issues to further a broader examination of how community organizing reflects different ideologies and the implications of these ideologies for ways in

which community groups might or might not work to influence state policy on housing.

The tradition of community organizing

Since the 1980s, academics have been bemoaning the demise of community organizing, especially class-based neighbourhood organizing. According to some, the late 1960s and early 1970s were the height of neighbourhood organizing and it has been declining (or at least changing to be less of a challenge to the status quo) ever since (Gittell 1980; Lustiger-Thaler and Shragge 1998). Robert Putnam's 1995 article, "Bowling Alone", caused a great stir with its assertion that democracy was threatened due to the decline of civil society in general (Putnam 1995).

The reasons given for this supposed demise of the community movement have been varied. Some would argue that the community victories of the 1970s (resulting in greater state intervention in social provisioning) dampened the impetus for organizing (Dionne 1997; Shragge 1999). Others argue that the rise of a neo-conservative political environment in the 1980s has made community organizing for redistributive purposes difficult and required a shift toward a professionalized community development model (Fisher 1994b).

Still others argue that the partnership paradigm currently being used by the state to enlist community organizations in the provision of services has resulted in groups often being too overwhelmed to raise an effective opposition to the state or, at worst, completely co-opted to the interests of the state (Panet-Raymond 1992; Lamoureux 1994; Hasson and Ley 1994:267; White 1997)(Hasson and Ley 1994: 267). Many housing activists see this as the case in social housing as the government has withdrawn from direct provision and relied on community groups to develop social housing while retaining control over the process. Many see partnership as one of the only possibilities for gains in our current political context (Hasson and Ley 1997). The argument that has probably been the most hotly contested in the literature (not to mention in practice) is that

identity-based organizing has caused the demise of more class-based neighbourhood-oriented organizing (Gitlin 1995; Miller 1996; Calpotura and Fellner 1996; Gitlin 1997).

The degree to which this decline actually took place is a subject of debate (Miller, Rein, and Levitt 1990; Fisher 1994b; Borgos and Douglas 1996). What does seem clear is that direct-action, conflict-oriented neighbourhood organizing declined in popularity while more collaborative community development approaches increased (Shragge 1999). What is unclear is whether this transformation is simply a change in tactics or whether it represents a fundamental change in values and ideology. Recent trends indicate, however, that radicalism and direct action may be making a return to the community scene as the fight against globalization begins to have more impact on the community movement (Kruzynski 2000; Fisher and Shragge 2000)(Fisher and Shragge 2000). Before delving into the underlying ideologies of the contemporary community organizing movement, however, it is important that we outline what is entailed in this field of activity.

A brief history of community organizing in Canada

The field of community organizing was first formally identified by American sociologists and adult educators during World War I and has been taught in colleges and universities since the 1940s (Austin and Betten 1990: 3). Michael Austin and Neil Betten describe how Lindemann's description of community organization – as "a conscious effort on the part of a community to control its affairs democratically, and to secure the highest services from its specialists, organizations, agencies and institutions by means of recognized interrelations" – was popular with community workers in the 1920s (Austin and Betten 1990:18; Fisher 1994a). In Canada, however, it seems that neighbourhood-based organizing of the type with which we are concerned was not a dominant form of organizing until later in the century (Lustiger-Thaler and Shragge 1998).

18

In Canada, early 20th Century precursors to community organizing include co-operative organizing in Quebec, the Atlantic provinces and the Prairies, ethnic political organizing in our major cities and organizing for women's and labour rights across the country (Lotz and Welton 1997; Lotz 1997). The community movement as we know it today blossomed in the late 1960s and early 1970s, reaching its height of activity in the late 1970s. The approach in the 1970s was confrontational, making clear demands of the state and threatening social disruption if they were not met. The provisions of the welfare state were expanded in this period and community groups were able to win many concessions in the field of housing, including tenants rights and funding of third sector (i.e. cooperative and community housing). By the 1980s, the confrontational approach was facing diminishing returns and retrenchment of state social spending convinced many community groups to move to a more collaborative, community development approach. Partnership and coalition-building were common practices by the early 1990s (Panet-Raymond and Mayer 1997; Mayer, Lamoureux, and Panet-Raymond 1998; Lustiger-Thaler and Shragge 1998; Shragge 1999). Since the mid-1990s, however, when it became clear that state cutbacks were unlikely to be temporary and that economic growth did not seem to be 'trickling down' to the community level, there has been renewed interest in more radical forms of organizing (Fisher and Shragge 2000; Kruzynski 2000). The success of efforts such as the World March of Women (in mobilization and education if not in terms of state concessions), the rise of international resistance to the "globalization of misery" and the increasing interest of community groups in anti-globalization activism hold promise for the coming decade of organizing given their mobilization of youth and a turn towards more activist approaches.

Contemporary community organizations: the institutions

The potential definitions of the term 'community' are numerous. One of the most important challenges in defining 'community', whether geographical or identity-based, is that while community members may share an interest in one aspect of their lives, their interests may differ, even compete, in another. In the

case of neighbourhood-based organizing – the focus of this thesis – neighbours may share an interest in having adequate municipal services in the community (garbage pick-up or snowplowing, for example) but may still experience tensions around race, class or gender differences.

The potential definitions of 'community organization' are similarly numerous. Often, the term is used to refer to any non-governmental organization serving a local constituency or a specific identity group, without reference to the function or structure of the organization. For neighbourhood organizations, I prefer the type of definition proposed by Seth Borgos and Douglas Scott:

> Community organization is a notoriously elastic term, but its most common usage refers to organizations that are democratic in governance, open and accessible to community members, and concerned with the general health of the community rather than a specific interest or service function... Practitioners sometimes use direct action or mass-based to designate organizations that empower their members to speak and act on their own behalf rather than through professional intermediaries. (Borgos and Douglas 1996)

This definition is limited to organizations actually *controlled* by their neighbourhood or constituency. By this I mean that the defining aspects of community organizations are that the people whose interests they purport to serve should be the ones setting the organizational agenda and priorities, be involved in the public representation of the organization and be directly involved in the work of the organization. Maintaining this control by the constituency is a major challenge in the face of the increasing professionalization of community organizations, relating in part to the structures of funding available from the state.

It is important to note that organizations can operate with a structure that is democratic for the membership while having aims that are oppressive to others or to minorities within the group (Barton 1985; Austin and Betten 1990: 13-4). I will discuss the phenomenon of right wing organizing later in the chapter but at this point I will focus on organizations with the social justice orientation described by Lorraine Gutiérrez and her colleagues:

> Social justice includes a focus on the structures and outcomes of social processes and how they contribute to equality, places

explicit value on achieving social equity through democratic
processes, and assumes that the [community] work role is to
develop policy and practice that contribute to these goals....
Although community organizers may work toward local or short-
term goals, the overall goal is social justice and social equality.
(Gutiérrez, Alvarez, Nemon, and Lewis 1996)

Establishing a community organization makes a political statement in
itself about the role of the state. The existence of community groups asserts that
there is a role for citizens in collectively challenging, opposing, supporting or
even circumventing the state. Community organizations act within the political
space described by Raymond Breton:

L'action politique est celle qui cherche à agir sur la direction des
affaires publiques dans un domaine ou l'autre de la vie
communautaire... Un champs d'action politique est donc un
domaine constitué de ressources, d'occasions d'action et de
problèmes d'une part et d'individus et de groupes qui s'intéressent
plus ou moins activement à l'évolution des affaires publiques de ce
domaine, d'autre part. (Breton 1983:24)

Community organizations are, as political actors, an important component
of democratic society. In general, however, since community groups tend to
generate more public information on their campaigns than on their democratic
process, they are considered by some to be merely "special interest groups" rather
than "a vital thread in the social fabric" (Borgos and Douglas 1996). This
dismissal ignores the fact that for some people, community organizations are the
most accessible point of entry into collective political life. Although community
organizations do not always live up to their ideals, their striving for a participatory
democratic structure means they can be important training grounds and
experiments in collective co-operation.

Having discussed community organizations as institutions with a social
justice orientation, I will now turn to *how* such organizations strive to achieve
their goals: the *process* of community organizing.

Community organizations in action: private and public processes

When community organizations take action in order to address the concerns of their constituencies, it is the **process** of their work that distinguishes them from other social actors. Over the years, different schools of organizing, along with the organizing literature, have put forth idealized models to guide organizers and activists in their work. The models can be separated into two main categories: (1) models that address the democratic internal functioning of community organizations; and (2) models that address the public actions taken by organizations in order to effect social change. There is an interest in ensuring that the means of community organizing reflect the desired ends, both on an internal and a public level.

As reflected in this description by Dave Beckwith and Cristina Lopez, community organizing relies on both internal and public processes and action:

> Community organizing is the process of building power through involving a constituency in identifying problems they share and the solutions to those problems that they desire; identifying the people and structures that can make those solutions possible; enlisting those targets in the effort through negotiation and using confrontation and pressure when needed; and building an institution that is democratically controlled by that constituency that can develop the capacity to take on further problems and that embodies the will and the power of that constituency (Beckwith and Lopez 1997:2).

Despite the difficulty of achieving this comprehensive ideal, many community organizers consider the process of organizing to be as important as the outcome (Staples 1984; Kahn 1995); both personal and collective empowerment are considered important to community change (Barndt 1989; Saegert and Winkel 1996). More than just problem solving, community organizing aims to democratize the way we go about addressing issues, reaching out to a broad constituency for input. For many activists, without democratic involvement in selecting issues, crafting demands and negotiating victories, a community organization is a "hollow sham, without the empowering aspect that humanizes

and ennobles the effort" (Beckwith and Lopez 1997: 2). Good direct action organizing is generally considered to have a participatory culture, inclusiveness, breadth of mission and vision and a critical perspective (Borgos and Douglas 1996).

In this section, I will review the different models proposed for both and public processes of community organizing. These models must be thought of as a continuum; few organizations fit neatly into only one category. Most organizations will try different models at different times or may use different approaches on different issues.

Community organizing within an organization

Throughout the past century, the definition of what constitutes a 'democratic process' has been contested and has evolved. From the earliest days of the community tradition, the concept of 'participatory democracy' has been central. Since the 1960s, however, community organizations have been challenged to ensure that the social groups marginalized in what passes as 'democracy' on a macro level do not find themselves in the same position in the process of community organizing. Out of this critique have emerged important new **models for the -processes** of community organizing, the internal working of community groups. The two most powerful new paradigms for participatory democracy in the community organizing process are feminist and cross-cultural organizing.

Participatory democracy

Organizers of the 1920s were influenced by ideas of participatory democracy as essential to the process of community organization (Dewey 1927; Dewey 1929). This basic idea – that organizations should be run with the assumption that individuals have both the right and the ability to contribute in some way, however small, to social decision-making – is often cited as something that makes community organizations unique. Participatory democracy suggests that organizations should function in such a way that they are open to new members, that members have real power in setting the agenda and priorities of the

organization, that conflicts can be addressed and hopefully resolved within the structure of the organization and that members may participate on an equal basis (Students for a Democratic Society 1999).

Recently, there has been a hot-blooded debate – particularly among anti-globalization groups preparing for the April 2001 Summit of the Americas in Quebec City – over whether direct democracy (face-to-face, with an equal say for all those present for decision-making) is necessary for true democratic functioning or whether participatory democracy (which can allow for forms of representative democracy) can offer the equitable sharing of decision-making power sought by activists.

An example of an internal model that reflects the participatory democracy perspective would be what I termed the "Open-Door Policy" in an earlier study (Hanley 1999).[19] Organizations working in the 'Open-Door Policy' approach hold a basic desire to be inclusive and reflect the neighbourhood. The membership of these groups is usually concentrated among people from one or two cultural backgrounds. For example, in Boston, many organizations are majority African American and white American. In Montreal, white Quebecois and Anglo Canadians tend to dominate. These groups recognize that the demographics of their neighbourhoods are changing and they wish to invite their new neighbours to participate in their community initiatives. Using traditional multicultural tactics, 'Open-Door Policy' organizations reach out to newcomers or those traditionally underrepresented.

'Open-Door Policy' organizational structure can be likened to traditional liberal political structures. The rhetoric says that every individual is equal and that his or her contributions are equally valued. Without specific efforts to ensure that this is so, however, 'Open-Door' organizations can be critiqued in the way as liberal democratic theory has been critiqued: the rhetoric doesn't measure up to the results. Social, economic, gender and other inequities interfere with full

---

[19] This study was undertaken between May 1997 and May 1999 for a Master's thesis at Tufts University's Dept. of Urban and Environmental Policy. It was based on interviews with 15 organizorganizers from a wide range of ethnic and ideological backgrounds, as well as participant

participation in the organization. While overt discrimination may not be easily observable, there are systematic barriers to participation.

While 'Open-Door Policy' organizations take steps to attract diverse participation, they are rarely able to create a situation where the different cultural groups participating have equal impact. This is because organizations working in this framework fail to recognize that the pre-existing structure of the organization was designed to serve their own cultural expectations and ways of working. It is fairly common for members of the dominant culture to believe that they do not have a culture or that their culture does not impact their organization. As we are told by Gutiérrez *et al* (1996), "Acknowledging the importance of one's own culture helps one recognize its importance to others."

The end result of 'Open-Door Policy' organizing may be an organization with a diverse membership but with divergent levels of participation, influence, sense of ownership and commitment.

Feminist organizing

Feminist organizing is another important approach to the process of community organizing within a group (Guberman, Fournier, Beeman, and Lamoureux 1997). To some extent, feminist organizing arose out of women s frustrations as participants in the male-dominated social movements of the 1960s (Evans 1979; Minkoff 1995). At the core of the New Left and Civil Rights movements of the 1960s, many women were frustrated that while they were fighting for justice, their own rights were often not respected within activist organizations (Evans 1979; Dominelli 1989; Naples 1998b). Feminist organizers argue that status quo participatory democracy does not necessarily create a context in which all participants have an equal opportunity to both voice their interests and have them listened to seriously. Susan Stall and Randy Stoecker are damning in their critique of traditional, participatory democracy organizing:

> Despite a rich and proud heritage of female organizers and
> movement leaders, the field of community organization, in both its
> teaching models and its major exponents, has been a male-

---

observation of two community organizations in Montreal and one in Boston.

dominated preserve.... Strategies have largely been based on "macho-power" models, manipulation, and zero-sum gamesmanship. (Stall and Stoecker 1998)

In feminist organizing, special attention is accorded to working with traditionally marginalized groups and to working in a non-hierarchical manner. The range of what is considered an appropriate issue for discussion and possible action has also been expanded with feminism's classic assertion that "the personal is political". According to Lorraine Gutiérrez and Rosegrant Lewis, feminist organizing holds particular salience among women of colour and immigrant women, often the backbone of inner-city neighbourhood organizing efforts (Gutiérrez and Lewis 1994). One explanation is that: "feminism presents a holistic vision of the type of involvement needed for sustained action under repressive circumstances" (Pilisuk et al. 1998). Within feminist organizing, there is an attempt to integrate personal and family life interests into the struggle for social change, reflecting the reality that these issues are central to our quality of life but also that women remain primarily responsible for these domains (Naples 1998a).

A practice model that reflects one stream of feminist organizing is the 'Differences are Fundamental' model (Hanley 1999).[20] Organizations working with this model share many of the characteristics of traditional identity-based organizing. Whether because they feel excluded from mixed organizations, because they feel they have unique interests or because they simply want to preserve a unique perspective, 'Differences are Fundamental' organizations choose to organize based on a particular identity. While they exercise their right to remain separate, 'Differences are Fundamental' groups also recognize that there are many situations in which they can best represent their interests in collaboration with other groups. Organizational representation in such institutions as neighbourhood councils, school boards and issue-specific coalitions becomes a key strategy for these identity-based community groups.

---

[20] Boston researcher Molly Mead has studied youth organizations' approaches to addressing gender differences and developed a typology from which I have borrowed (Mead 1998).

Cross-cultural organizing

As we confront the increasing diversification of our neighbourhoods, feminist organizing also offers a new way to think about bringing people together to work for common cause. "Communities that really are not communities - that lack the networks, culture, support systems and other qualities - require first the foundation that the women- model can provide to prevent self-destructive oligarchies" (Stall and Stoecker 1998). The cross-cultural approach has adopted many such feminist critiques and applied them to the questions of race and ethnicity. Rather than simply inviting marginalized groups to be present in community organizations and assuming that they will be able to fully participate in the existing structure, cross-cultural organizing seeks to change the *way* in which organizations work, building in mechanisms for true participation (Heskin and Heffner 1987). According to Calpotura and Fellner,

> The critical difference is between the concept of inclusion and that of self-determination. Some traditional community organizing has moved, in more and less effective ways, to be inclusive, bringing women and people of colour into their existing organizational structure and culture. But the women and people of colour who rise in the ranks of traditional community organizing endeavours are those who buy into the traditional culture - a policy and practice of affirmative action, at best. That is far different from having the room to redefine or transform organizational life. (Calpotura and Fellner 1996: 3-4)

Organizations working with a 'Cross-Cultural' model (Hanley 1999) make a deliberate effort to change their ways of working so that different cultures have a structural forum in which to voice their views. There is an awareness of an ongoing need for change and readjustment as well as the fluid nature of individual cultural identities. In resistance to the structural racism and discrimination that exists in our society, 'Cross-Cultural' groups undertake affirmative action within their own organizations in an attempt to both gain from different cultural perspectives and to give each cultural group an opportunity to address their interests.

Few organizations ever feel that they have achieved true equality within their ranks. Aiming to do so within today's social context requires strong ideals. There are several preconditions that are essential to this pursuit:

❖ Members of socially privileged cultures must be willing to give up some of the power they hold by default of numbers or recognition by wider society.

❖ Members of the organization must be willing to experiment with structure in order to find an approach that works for everyone. There must be recognition that this structure may have to be adjusted through time as the neighbourhood or the organization changes.

❖ There must be an ongoing dedication of both time and resources to the development and maintenance of cross-cultural cooperation.

In culturally diverse neighbourhoods, organizing with a 'Cross-Cultural' framework can allow for the building of a strong and united organization able to take on a variety of issues of interest to a wide spectrum of the community. The postmodern cosmopolitan political theory may best serve the aims of such organizations.

The challenge of achieving true inclusion of different points of view (whether the difference be due to gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, economic status, etc.) is daunting within community organizing. Both the feminist and the cross-cultural approaches, however, offer some guidance on how to address diversity in a concrete fashion. In the next section, I will discuss the more publicly-oriented models of community organizing but it is important to remember that each of these models is most powerful when based upon sound internal community organizing.

<u>Community organizing on the public scene</u>

Apart from their models of democratic internal process, community organizations are also distinct for their explicit desire to take public action and create social change. Teachers of community organizing have long relied on the use of models to help pass on the strategies of community organization. Perhaps the most famous model of community organization practice is Jack Rothman's in the influential 1974 book, *Strategies of Community Organization.* He divided the activities of community organizations as follows: (1) locality development, (2) social planning and (3) social action (Rothman 1974). This basic model has been adopted as a baseline of analysis but many authors and trainers have modified it through the years (Dominelli 1989:7; Austin and Betten 1990:8-9; Beckwith and Lopez 1997; Wharf 1997:8; Lamoureux, Panet-Raymond, and Mayer 1998:443). My categorization of strategies (alternative service delivery, advocacy, community development, social action) reflects an amalgamation of these many authors.

Alternative service delivery

The alternative service delivery model of community organization involves community groups providing non-profit services to the community, at least partially independently of the state. There can be different reasons for community groups taking on the responsibility of service delivery once a need is identified: (1) the service does not exist and it is felt that either the state will not (due to lack of political will) or should not (according to ideological positions of activists) get involved; (2) the service is provided either by the state or by private interests in a way that is deemed unacceptable or inaccessible to community members and, more recently; (3) the state contracts out service delivery to community groups (Davies and Shragge 1990). Alternative service organizations may want to increase independence from the state or, in contrast, want to place pressure on the state to intervene in a particular field (Dominelli 1989).

While many innovative services (including the context and structure in which they are offered) have been developed using this strategy, it faces several

important critiques (Beckwith and Lopez 1997). The first is that providing alternative services, especially in what are traditionally areas of state responsibility, takes pressure off the state to act in a redistributive manner to ensure access to quality services for all citizens (Ng et al. 1990; Davies and Shragge 1990). The other critique is that although it is not always the case, too often alternative service organizations end up doing things *for* people, rather than involving service-users in the planning and decision-making process. Professionals may simply be addressing a problem on behalf of those assumed not to be able to speak for themselves (Beckwith and Lopez 1997).

Advocacy

Advocacy is an activity in which it is clear that an organization is speaking *on behalf of* people assumed to have a problem, representing their interests with government officials, landlords, economic actors, the media, etc. Advocacy requires the definition of a problem and a formulation of a desired solution, without necessarily involving the people assumed to be suffering from the problem, or without necessarily involving them on an equal basis. Once a position is set, negotiation and lobbying are the most common tactics employed.

Community organizing is usually not a process associated with advocacy (Miller et al. 1990: 360-1) but many community organizations engage in advocacy at different times, particularly if they are trying to address many issues without the resources required to undertake proper organizing. The lack of constituent participation – not to mention the implication that some groups are not competent to represent themselves (Buchanan and Brock 1986) – involved in advocacy is the principal critique of this strategy. Empowerment of marginalized groups is not a central aspect of the strategy, instead tending to perpetuate their position of powerlessness by speaking for them. Advocacy is also criticized as serving the interests of the state by subduing conflict (Dominelli 1989).

Community development

The social hygiene movement of the late 19th century and the social planning of the 1920s (Gilliland and Olson 1998) are the precursors to the

community development strategy (Austin and Betten 1990: 4). Community development is a "strategy that gets the group directly into the business of delivering a physical product" (Beckwith and Lopez 1997). Similar to alternative service delivery, community development advocates argue that: (1) they can do it better than either the state or the private sector; (2) the state or the private sector are uninterested in serving the interests of their constituency anyway, and/or; (3) community development means building things differently, perhaps providing skills training in the process or with greater economic spin-offs for the local community (Wharf 1997).

Critiques of this strategy are also similar to those proffered for alternative service delivery. Community organizing may begin the process of community development but the professional skills necessary to complete the work often results in the sidelining of community participation. In housing or community economic development, professionalized staff too often become de facto representatives of their neighbourhoods without necessarily having a process of input and feedback with community members (Shragge 1997). The high capital investment necessary to undertake community development puts pressure on community groups to mainstream their positions in order not to offend banks, the state, and other funders. Finally, there is the fear that even the small scale of development possible through nonprofits gives an exit for state involvement in areas such as housing (Muller et al. 1990; Graefe 1999; Fisher and Shragge 2000).

Social action

Social action was the trademark of community organizations in their 1970s heyday. This strategy often involves confrontation, holding authorities accountable for their actions, designing and demanding programs for the state to implement, and collective action to block negative development or behaviours (Beckwith and Lopez 1997). Social action implies the mobilization of members of the community to address a common concern through public action. Community groups often undertake community organizing as the method of mobilization.

At different moments in the past 20 years, community organizers have asked whether it was time to "Burn the Placards" (René and Panet-Raymond 1984) Those who seek social change are often encouraged to work "within the system" and avoid "direct agitation" as too confrontational (Austin and Betten 1990: 5). Critics of social action will charge that it is counterproductive to address problems with conflict, lessening the chance of winning concessions. Social action can also discourage the participation of some segments of the community who cannot risk direct confrontation with authorities (ex. single mothers or immigrants with precarious status for whom arrest can precipitate serious legal repercussions such as losing custody of children or losing the right to remain in Canada). Finally, too often social action is *only* action-oriented, without sufficient planning for long-term strategy and without fully developing a common understanding of the reasons and demands in undertaking the action (Dominelli 1989; Naples 1998b).

Ideology & community engagement with the state

Ideology, whether taken to mean the "system of ideas at the basis of an economic or political theory", a "manner of thinking" or "visionary speculation" (Pearsall and Trumble 1996), lies at the heart of community organizing. In this section, I will discuss the political ideologies most common in community organizing today and their implications for community groups' engagement with the state on housing issues. I will isolate different ideologies so that we can compare and contrast them but it is important to remember that ideologies are idealized accounts of reality and community groups may jumble them when they turn to action. Different forms of engagement with the state may seem appropriate to community activists in different situations; pragmatism sometimes overcomes idealism (Keyes 1987).

I have selected, based on the literature and also my practical experience, the four ideologies that I feel are most relevant to an understanding of the ideas guiding community groups' engagement with the state. Liberal pluralism and

Marxism are the classic ideologies guiding community organizing, with communitarianism and identity-based politics being later ideologies that arose out of their respective critiques. For each of these ideological perspectives, I will begin by identifying its view of the state and society, situating them historically. I will then discuss the organizing processes and strategies suggested by these ideologies and give examples of efforts in the field of housing. Finally, I will critique the goals of the ideologies themselves.

Liberal pluralism

One of the most powerful (and oldest) traditions in community organizing is that of liberal pluralism. Prior to the First World War, the ideologies of social Darwinism, pragmatism and liberalism were prominent in conceptions of the community movement (Cox and Garvin 1974: 40-6). This political view proved durable and reflects a strong North American belief that our democratic political system is just.

Basic ideology and typical organizing approach

In the liberal pluralist view, society is conceived as consisting of different interest groups competing to have their interests represented and acted upon by the state. The state is conceived of as a neutral entity that responds to demands made by citizens; the concentration of power is not believed to be significant (Frank and Kelly 1979: 595). Community groups are conceived of as vehicles for the collective expression of individual desires (Wilson 1973; Bennett 1997c). Community organizing with this underlying ideology acts with the understanding that there is a problem with the pluralist equation when it results in some citizens being denied their fair say in government. Their goal is to correct this situation (Marcuse 1987). **The focus issue for liberal pluralist organizing is unequal access to the power and resources of the state and political system.**

The basic goal of liberal pluralist organizing is to build power among groups not equitably represented in the state and to fight to establish a place for themselves at the table. Apart from increasing the equity of representation, liberal pluralists do not aim to change the basic structures of the state and do not

necessarily question the overall socio-economic system. It is assumed that if the marginalized gain access to the state then greater equity in the distribution of resources will result.

Embodying a pluralist view of society and of politics, the Alinsky community organizing tradition works to build power among the 'have nots' in order to force the hand of the 'haves' in sharing access to power and resources (Alinsky 1972).[21] "Since Alinsky saw society as a compromise between competing self-interested individuals, conflict was inevitable, and a pluralist polity was the means by which compromise was reached" (Stall and Stoecker 1998).

Building coalitions of existing community groups and using direct action and confrontation to demand attention are the trademarks of Alinsky organizing (Betten and Austin 1990) and both Alinsky-style organizing strategy and tactics and the 'organization of organizations' approach have proven immensely popular (Miller et al. 1990: 356-7). In particular, congregation-based organizing is an Alinsky approach that has survived the test of time and is even gaining in popularity (Calpotura and Fellner 1996; McRoberts 1997; Ramsey 1998). Many of the most powerful community movements of this century have borrowed their strategy and tactics from the work of Alinsky's Industrial Areas Foundation, even if they do not share the liberal pluralist ideology (Miller et al. 1990: 356-7; Hasson and Ley 1994: 170).

Liberal pluralism does not imply that the state has an inherent responsibility to directly provide housing but rather to ensure conditions under which citizens have equal opportunity to access housing, whether public or private. If the state is involved in housing provision, for example, liberal pluralist community organizations would demand that their constituents have a fair share

---

[21] As a 1930s graduate student, Saul Alinsky began organizorganizing poor neighbourhoods in Chicago, adapting union organizorganizing techniques from the CIO. Coalitions of leaders from existing community institutions (churches, small businesses, unions, bowling leagues, etc.) came together to demand improved conditions and services in the neighbourhood (Alinsky 1946). The success of this style of organizorganization led to the creation of the Industrial Areas Foundation (Wood 1997).

of access to such housing and that they should have a fair say in the decision-making and planning of such housing.

Social action is the specialty of Alinsky organizing. For example, demonstrations and civil disobedience might be organized to protest a neighbourhood's unequal share of the social housing stock, for example. Landlords who do not respect the rights of tenants might find themselves awoken one morning with Alinsky-inspired tenants picketing their suburban front lawns. The mayor's office might be occupied until it is agreed that community residents will hold seats on the board of the public housing authority. The idea is to use confrontation to gain access and representation in decision-making in order to have their interests addressed by the state.

In theory, both alternative service delivery and community development practices fall outside the usual purview of Alinsky-style liberal organizing, although it is not unusual for a group that starts out with liberal pluralist social action focus to evolve into a housing developer (Gonzalez 1993; Hasson and Ley 1994: 171) or enter into partnership with the state if it is felt that community members have control over the process (Ahlbrandt 1986: 128). Although many Alinsky groups end up providing services, they typically see their role as pressure groups, not providers. They are fighting to make the system work, not replace it.

Critique

Communitarian detractors of the Alinsky-style approach criticize its practitioners for focusing on outside authorities for the resources for problem solving rather than looking within the community (Kretzmann and McKnight 1993). Feminists are especially critical of the Alinsky model because of its almost exclusive use of tactics that fall within the traditionally male public sphere, neglecting the transformation of interpersonal and intra-organizational relations. Alinsky used the patriarchal social structures already in place and tried to turn them to benefit the grassroots instead of the elite. The basic structure remained unchallenged and the 'grassroots' remain removed from decision-making (Miller et al. 1990: 257-8). Stall and Stoecker suggest that "the masculine, confrontational

style of the Alinsky model, that must assume prior community bonds so it can move immediately into public sphere action, may be disabling for certain grassroots organizing efforts" (Stall and Stoecker 1998). And multicultural organizers are equally critical:

> Traditional Alinsky-based organizing practice does indeed have its own culture, which is largely hierarchical, defined by a specific methodology, focused on issues that can be won sooner rather than later and uncontroversial enough to be broadly subscribed to within the target geographic area - i.e. not so contentious that it alienates key members or funders. (Calpotura and Fellner 1996: 4)

Overall, Alinsky-style liberal organizing made an invaluable contribution to community organizing by offering concrete tactics to exercise 'people power'; Alinsky-style tactics are now a mainstay of community action. It was also this form of organizing that popularized the idea that the state should work *for* the people, not against them. Despite these contributions, however, Alinsky-style organizing neglects the more grassroots community building and fundamental social criticism that must also take place if long-term change is to be effected. It also seems that liberal-pluralist organizing is more effective on a local level (where politicians and other authorities are more directly accountable – (Glazer 1987: 275; Betten and Hershey 1990; Muller et al. 1990) – than in helping local communities come together to have an impact on a macro level. It is important to remember that participation alone does not guarantee power (Neysmith 1987: 107).

Communitarianism

Communitarianism is relatively new in influencing the field of community organizing. While the basic ideas are not particularly new[22] – some might even call them neo-liberal – it was only in the early 1990s that communitarianism as an ideology began to be strongly promoted as offering guidance to community

---

[22] For example, Alinsky urged organizers to consider community assets in their strategies. An important difference, however, was that Alinsky maintained the idea that these assets be used to leverage redistribution of resources within society, not only that community assets be used locally to independently improve the situation (Alinsky 1946).

organizations, particularly through private foundations such as the Ford Foundation. Amitai Etzioni, in his book, *The Spirit of Community*, describes how a group of intellectuals met in Washington, D.C. in 1990 and hammered out the principles of what they baptized the 'Communitarian movement' (Etzioni 1993: 15). From there, the idea took off. I would argue that important (and controversial) community organizing ideas from the 1990s (such as "assets-based community development" (Kretzmann and McKnight 1993) and "social capital" (Putnam 1993)) follow in this vein. The links between this ideology and the community development and planning approach are fairly strong.

Basic ideology and typical organizing approach

For communitarianism, local communities (and sometimes communities of interest) are considered the fundamental building blocks of society. Communities are sites of moral socialization and education, they are places where social solidarity is possible and they often hold an under-utilized store of talent and resources (Etzioni 1993). In this view, the community is respected as a collective entity that has the capacity to solve many of its own problems. Communitarians would argue, however, that a combination of social culture and state and professional intervention has resulted in communities being unable to manage their own social problems (McKnight 1995). This is partially due to individuals failing to fulfill the responsibilities that should accompany the rights we demand and partially due to the state attempting to regulate the lives of the poor.

Communitarians aim to diminish the role of the state, believing that local communities can better address complex social problems. While social inequality is recognized, the principal concern is with state paternalism interfering with communities using what assets they have to assert their independence and improve their lives. **Replacing state intervention with community empowerment and collective responsibility is the fundamental concern for communitarians.** Communitarian organizing begins with identifying the assets of a community, rather than its deficits, and then developing strategies to put

collective assets to the most effective use (Kretzmann and McKnight 1993). Encouraging a public morality that encourages mutual aid and respect and taking on responsibilities along with rights is a top priority.

Given communitarians' disdain for state intervention, it is not surprising that alternative service provision and community development are among their top priorities. Communitarian community development organizations would look first within their communities for the funding necessary to build affordable housing. Potential homeowners might be invited to give sweat equity toward their down payment (Medoff and Sklar 1994). Skilled but unemployed neighbourhood residents might be supported in forming a small construction contracting firm. A youth apprenticeship program might be developed that paired young people with skilled adults. The state would not be called upon for much assistance. Advocacy and social action have few benefits for the communitarian approach disinterested in receiving help from the state. The exception might be communitarian organizations asking for zoning or other legal frameworks to enhance their control of the neighbourhood.

Critique

It is now common in community organizing to speak about using an assets-based approach and aiming to develop social capital (Cortes 1996; Borgos and Douglas 1996; Wood 1997). Communitarians have faced heavy critique from those interested in left-leaning community organizing. While the basic belief in the strengths of communities is shared by most in the community-organizing field, the communitarian slant that the state should therefore withdraw is disputed. Critics may recognize that the state has in fact had negative outcomes when it has intervened on behalf of communities. Nevertheless, many do not want to let the state off the hook in addressing poverty and inequity:

> Notions of substituting voluntarism and philanthropy for
> government funding are naive at best and intentionally deceitful
> and manipulative at worst. Half-truths abound in both the rhetoric
> of politicians who see the sector as solving the nation's domestic
> problems on the cheap and in the rhetoric of advocates who pay

scant attention to the sector's limitations and shortcomings.
(Koebel 1998: 4)

The argument remains that the state – if we can manage to make it respond to the needs of society's disadvantaged in a democratic fashion – may be the only vehicle able to summon the authority and the resources to effect redistribution. While the question of who controls the state, who gains the right and/or power to speak for others, who defines common interests will remain a struggle, a truly democratic state can be a potent mediator between competing/conflicting interests, protecting the rights or interests of weaker communities against the excesses of a stronger one.

Another problem with the communitarian approach is that it places a great deal of faith in community morality setting the standard for behaviour and participation. Communities themselves, however, can be hierarchical and oppressive to those who do not conform. As discussed earlier, they are not necessarily locations of sweet social harmony. The emphasis on morality begs the question, 'Whose morality?' What will happen to those who do not agree or conform (Shragge 2003:113)?

The communitarian agenda, even if its central authors intend it to be empowering for low-income neighbourhoods, has been adopted by neo-conservatives (Monti 1989) who appreciate both the ideology's emphasis on morality (neo-conservatives are happy to tell us 'whose morality') and the emphasis on state withdrawal from community intervention (they are also happy to stop spending state money on 'special interest groups' such as the poor and on people who are obviously just too lazy to look after themselves). Unfortunately, for some neo-liberals and neo-conservatives, 'empowerment' means 'fend for yourself'.

Although I cannot support communitarians' position on the state, I do think they have made some valuable contributions with the concepts of 'assets-based community development' and 'social capital' if used in combination with a critique of the structural inequities and efforts to counter this inequity through redistribution. A fundamental problem remains: the assumption that local

neighbourhoods enjoy cohesion and common interest – with minimum interference from outside the community – is utopist.

Marxism

Critique of the capitalist system has been present in the community organizing movement from its earliest practice (Alperovitz 1991: 525). The Communist organizers of the 1920s and 1930s had considerable influence on the community movement and were involved both in landlord-tenant struggles (Fisher 1994a; Bennett 1997a:2) and in pressuring the state to intervene in the market to create collectively-owned (public) housing (Chouinard 1990: 1297). While the Alinsky-style approach may have remained the dominant form of community organization, it is not uncommon to come across Marxist rhetoric from the members and organizers of liberal pluralist groups (Clapham and Kintrea 1994: 224). In this section, however, I will discuss approaches that work with the explicit goal of transforming, even overturning, the capitalist system. Of course, 'Marxist' organizations includes a wide range of community groups under its umbrella, from the staunch Marxist-Leninist groups of Montreal in the 1970s, to the co-operative housing movement, to today's international movement against exploitative forms of globalization.

Basic ideology and typical organizing approach

In the Marxist view, society is conceived as embodying the tensions and interactions between different socio-economic classes (Smiley 1975:162). A classic Marxist interpretation would have a capitalist class owning and controlling the means of production, a working class providing the necessary labour under exploitative conditions and a bourgeois class as the liaison between the two. Neo-Marxist analyses have adjusted the categories somewhat to reflect the move in western nations away from a manufacturing economy to one dominated by the knowledge and service industries. The state is seen as serving the interests of the wealthy by protecting their economic control or, in the case of the welfare state, by providing the working class with just enough to stave off the revolution (Harrison 1990).

Community organizing with this underlying ideology acts with the understanding that the modern socio-economic system acts to serve the interests of the few at the expense of the many. According to Marxists, "Democracy dies when inequality grows - and capitalism generates extraordinary degrees of inequality" (Alperovitz 1991:524); Marxists work to correct this situation, fighting for the principle that human dignity should be independent of economic value and that wealth and resources should be produced by all (according to their ability) and shared by all (according to their need). The state should act as a forum for ensuring that the economy serves the needs of people rather than capital accumulation. For practitioners working with a Marxist ideological framework, **the focus for organizing is the inequities and injustice resulting from the capitalist economy and social structure. For more radical Marxists (or perhaps the more hopeful) the goal is the overthrow of the entire system, the long-awaited revolution.**

While Marxist organizing shares with Alinsky organizing a basic desire to increase equality and further the interests of society's 'have nots', it operates with a more fundamental critique of society. Also, the process of organizing is much more varied. Marxist organizations often take on a co-operative, collective or anarchist organizational structure but others, especially moderate welfare state anti-capitalist organizations, may use a structure based on the more traditional participatory democracy. In contemporary Marxist organizing:

> One finds echoes of the argument for a third-way, community-based vision, organized step-by-step, locality-by-locality... There are also numerous experiments and examples - from worker-owned firms and co-ops, to new energy and ecological approaches, to community land banks and land trusts - that suggest possibilities in this as yet only vaguely defined direction. (Alperovitz 1991:525)

The new anti-globalization movement, a movement that is anti-capitalist but does not necessarily consider itself Marxist, is making steps in this direction (Kruzynski 2000).

Marxist groups engage both in challenging the state and creating alternatives to it. There is debate within this tradition about whether one should

try to circumvent the state through alternative institutions or whether the role of community organizing is to remain in opposition to the state, either demanding that the state reform to serve the interests of the 'working class' or challenging its very authority (Piven and Cloward 1977). There is also a recognition of the fact that the state may not be monolithic in its exercise of power in favour of the elite, opening the door to certain forms of collaboration with sympathetic actors within the state (London Edinburgh Weekend Return Group 1979; Ng et al. 1990) Of course, many Marxist groups combine these strategies (Miller et al. 1990), offering housing services, for example, while still engaging in social action to challenge the state for more fundamental change in terms of separating access to housing from market mechanisms.

Social action by Marxists on housing issues could include demonstrations demanding a combination of state investment in social housing and the cessation of state subsidies for private housing development or tax breaks for wealthy home or rental unit owners. In Toronto, for example, the Ontario Coalition Against Poverty (OCAP) threatened to sabotage the city's economy by demonstrating at film shoots, in tourist areas and during events towards securing the 2008 Olympics unless the city offered a serious response to homelessness. A combination of social action and community development would be the squatter take-over of abandoned buildings or public spaces to transform them into social housing, as OCAP had unsuccessfully tried with a tent city in a park before they threatened Toronto with economic repercussions.

The community development strategy was used fairly successfully by Marxist activists in the 1960s when they were able to pressure the state into providing public housing and then in the 1970s and 1980s when the federal government agreed to support co-operative and non-profit housing (Chouinard 1990:1300-2). Community-based housing is used by Marxists to achieve social control and access to housing rather than private ownership and accumulation (Bratt 1987:325-6). In terms of alternative service delivery, tenants' rights clinics are a strategy Marxists share with Alinsky-style organizations, but while liberal pluralist organizations would put the emphasis on landlords respecting tenants'

legal rights, Marxists would emphasize the injustice of the basic for-profit institution of rental housing. While the leadership of hierarchical Marxist organizations might practice advocacy, it is not a strategy that fits well with anti-capitalism's usual collective approach.

Critique

The most common critique of the Marxist ideology these days is that it is no longer relevant, reflecting an acceptance of the "There Is No Alternative" doctrine. While overturning the capitalist system is far from being a reality, it seems that Marxist organizations and activists have managed to create important alternatives in the field of housing (both state and independent) that pose a reasonable challenge to the market, albeit limited in scope. Many community organizations take the position, however, that in the current context of the supposedly unstoppable globalization of capital, it is politically unwise to place Marxist ideology at the forefront of their activities. Apart from the current anti-neo-liberal uprising, the 'communist' tag has been used for decades to suggest a totalitarian, anti-patriotic or simply naïvely idealistic approach.

Critics from the identity politics perspective argue that the Marxist ideology downplays the importance of race, gender and other social categories in shaping people's experience of the class system. The focus on macro issues is in opposition to the communitarians' call to return to the local level for the source of improvement and change, while liberal-pluralists would reject the Marxist goal of overturning the political and economic system, rather than simply reforming it. There is often also a sense of discomfort with Marxists' clear separation of the owner/landlord class as an inherent opponent (Cohen and Phillips 1997). Another critique is that Marxists' concern with society's larger processes sometimes leads them to neglect the here-and-now of people's lives, dismissing reforms that may not contribute to long-term change but which offer people some relief in the meantime or urging community members to take risks without an appreciation of the consequences in the lives of people with few alternatives (Croft and Beresford 1988).

In my opinion, the Marxist framework's greatest strength is the analysis of macro impact on local communities and they have been quite successful in promoting the basic critique of capitalist inequalities. It is not at all unusual for community groups to publicly criticize when people's access to basic social goods is impeded by their economic standing, for example, although such groups may be more in favour of a welfare state than a socialist state. For those who work using the Marxist approach in their work, the greatest challenge is to overcome class oppression – today usually with an analysis of the ways in which other forms of oppression such as racism, sexism and homophobia intersect with economic exploitation. Linking international, community and workplace issues is the focus of many such organizers.

Identity politics

Identity-based politics – focusing on social categories such as gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, physical ability, etc. as sources of common interest – has its roots as an ideology through the 1960s and 1970s when women's and racial equality became prominent public issues (Evans 1979). Many activists were disappointed to find that the discrimination according to gender, race, sexual orientation, ability, etc, so present in broader society could be equally present in social justice organizations (Minkoff 1995; Anner 1996; Delgado 1997). The movement to combat this systemic discrimination and to recognize and preserve diversity (rather than stifle it in the name of solidarity) resulted, in the 1980s, in a movement to transform the standards and priorities both in organizing process and goals (Lawson and Barton 1990).

Basic ideology and typical organizing approach

In identity politics, society is conceived as consisting of different identity groups (either socially imposed or self-defined) which have different experiences in our society due to systemic discrimination. In his book *Race Matters*, Cornell West makes a particularly eloquent argument for the continued need to single out issues of discrimination as we try to understand our contemporary social context (West 1993). In this view, certain groups (for example, whites, men, and

heterosexuals) are privileged by our social structure and hold a disproportionate amount of power. For those not privileged by the system, economic disadvantage, social marginalization and internalized negative stereotypes result.

The state is often critiqued in this approach as serving the interests of the structurally privileged and is called upon to instead intervene to counter discrimination or offer services or programs to overcome the effects of discrimination. In his landmark book, *Beyond the Politics of Place*, Gary Delgado lays out the critical role of identity-based organizing as a way to level the playing field for people marginalized from the political process (Delgado 1997). Not only can identity-based organizing initiatives address the concerns of a particular group overlooked in wider collaborations, but they can serve as a more comfortable and familiar environment in which people can develop their leadership skills before taking on wider society (Breton 1983: 37). Gary David's observations about ethnic organizations can be generalized to other identity-based community groups:

> The omnipresence of ethnic organizations stems from the various functions these groups serve for community residents... Ethnic organizations help the ethnic community member to 'reconstruct his [or her] interpersonal field' by providing a place to reconnect with other group members. Also, ethnic organizations help to strengthen the ethnic group's identity by raising consciousness of individuals into a group consciousness... Finally, ethnic organizations serve as intermediaries between the ethnic community and mainstream society, ...especially when the ethnic community has no other outlet to have its voice heard. (David 1999)

Of course, some identity groups had no choice but to organize separately, either explicitly excluded from, marginalized within, or treated disrespectfully within mainstream organizations (Laferrière 1982; Rosenberg and Jedwab 1992; Ley, Anderson, and Konrad 1994; Dorais 1998). It is also important to recognize that diversity and differences of opinions exist within identity groups; it cannot be assumed that one organization speaks for all members of a particular group (Chimbos 1986; Andrew 1998: 172). When focused on one specific identity, this approach is unable to address most people's experience of multiple, intersecting

identities and oppressions. New forms of organizations – autonomous ethnic/women's organizations, for example – have been established in an attempt to address some of this complexity and the balance sought between specific interests and the need to collaborate for increased power.

Identity-based organizations often share with Alinsky organizations an interest in transforming the state to allow the participation of their constituencies in the political process, but identity-based organizations focus on a particular demographic of the population. In common with Marxists, identity-based organizations argue that power is concentrated among an elite (typically rich, white males) and believe in the latent power of the 'majority' if different identity groups choose to collaborate for their common interests. **Equality and respect for difference is the fundamental concern for those practicing identity politics.** Unlike liberal pluralists, however, there is a feeling that the state has a responsibility to intervene in favour of those disadvantaged by the current socio-economic system and there is **a commitment to working for the transformation of society's underlying sexism, racism and other forms of oppression.** Diversity is considered a societal asset and people are considered to have the right to practice and protect their differences. More than just gaining a share of the power, identity-based organizations aim to change the way power is exercised.

For identity-based organizations, individual experiences of discrimination or experiences that arise from being a member of a particular social group are often a starting point for collective involvement. Issues related to motherhood, for example, prompt many women activists to get involved (Boris 1993; Naples 1998a). Identity organizations often prioritize an anti-oppressive working process as central to their mission (Dominelli 1998).

Identity-based organizations have made use of the full range of strategies in engaging the state in housing. Feminist organizations, for example, are well known for their creation of alternative services. Creating independent shelters for women escaping domestic violence has been a focus for many neighbourhood women's centres and the demand is always that the state has a responsibility to fund this critical service (Wekerle 1991). Often feminist emergency shelters take

the next step by creating transition housing for women wanting to regain their independence after the trauma of domestic violence. Advocacy is also a common strategy for identity-based organizations, although, as we will discuss below, this is often criticized. Nevertheless, the leadership of local immigrant organizations, for example, may intervene with the state to press for the enforcement of housing codes in their constituency's neighbourhood without involving residents directly (Jordan and Hanley 1997).

Community development has become a focus for identity-based organizations that aim to provide affordable housing for their constituencies. Often the state does not respect the particular interests of the identity constituency and therefore should fund the community organization to develop an alternative and help to create a policy environment that facilitates non-profit development. Ethnic community development organizations are an example of such groups (David 1999). Finally, social action is a common strategy for such organizations, aiming both to pressure the state and raise awareness and sympathy among the wider public. Recently, for example, the Quebec section of the World March of Women mobilized 30,000 through its network of community organizations to call the state to task on social issues. Among the demands was the insistence that the province fund the creation of 8,000 units of social housing per year.

Critique

Identity-based politics has been successful in having its tenets accepted by a wide range of community groups. Today, it is considered inappropriate for community organizations to ignore the concern of minorities or the disadvantaged among their constituencies (Rivera and Erlich 1998) (this is not to suggest that it doesn't happen anyway). Moreover, the attention to difference within the organizing process suggested by identity politics has been widely accepted in the progressive organizing sphere. What has not been so widely accepted is that identity-based organizations can form a basis for a sufficiently broad social movement as to effect serious change (Fisher and Kling 1993). Liberal organizations may see the identity basis of such groups and their demands for

differential treatment by the state as promoting 'special interests' (Andrew 1998: 172) while those supporting a class-based movement feel that focusing on difference takes away from the recognition of class-based common interest in the face of a capitalist state (Miller 1996). Also, within the feminist movement, there is a similar debate about to what extent (on a practical basis) the differences between women can be recognized before the idea of 'gender' as a unifying issue might be lost.

Identity-based organizing has been successful in changing the boundaries of issues considered appropriate for organizing. As well, the ideas of anti-oppression put forth via identity-based organizing seem to have infiltrated wider society (Miller et al. 1990: 359-60). Representation of the concerns and interests of women, people of colour and other politically marginalized groups has definitely increased since the 1960s. Discrimination and lack of power for some identity groups persist within community organizations and identity-based groups are not as influential as some might like on issues of social policy (Andrew 1998: 176) but at least there is a commonly known basis on which to critique such neglect.

Having discussed some of the more theoretical models and traditions of community organizing, I now find it important to turn to the concrete, discussing the structure of the Quebec community movement and, more specifically, the experience of housing organizing within the province.

Quebec community movement and housing organizing

The Quebec community movement, has, over the years, developed a relationship with the state that is close with the state at the same time that it can be quite oppositional to the state. The issues around which citizens are mobilized, organized and educated on a neighbourhood level are many: welfare, immigration, ethnic-specific interests, gender, education, household consumption, women's rights, leisure, religion... The list is long. Housing has long been a part

of this repertoire and, in many neighbourhoods, it was one of the earliest issues
for action. As a basic issue for quality of life, housing is considered among many
community organizers as an easy issue to begin with when trying to organize a
new neighbourhood. A good indication of the range of issues being addressed by
community organizations is in the categories developed by the provincial
government and its community advisory board on the recently adopted the
Politique de reconnaissance de l'action communautaire autonome (Quebec 2001).
Under this agreement, the recognized areas of intervention are:

Multisectoral Coalitions[23]

- Coalition des Tables régionales d'organismes communautaires
  (TROCs)
- Mouvement d'éducation populaire et d'action communautaire du
  Quebec (MÉPACQ)
- Table des fédérations et organismes nationaux en éducation populaire
  autonome (TFONEPA)
- Mouvement québécois des camps familiaux
- Table des regroupements provinciaux d'organismes communautaires et
  bénévole, santé et services sociaux (TRPOCB)
- Association québécoise des banques alimentaires et des moissons
  (AQBAM)
- Table nationale des Corporations de développement communautaire
  (TNCDC)

The sectoral coalitions recognized under this system include groups that work on:
Communications; Consumer rights; Environment; Family; First Nations;
Housing; International Solidarity education; People with disabilities; Popular
literacy; Refugees, immigrants and ethnocultural communities; Rights advocacy;
Volunteer action; and Women.

  In order to understand the context in which this system evolved and in
which Quebec community actors are currently working, it is helpful to consider
the particular structures that have evolved over the years. Unique within the North
American context, the Quebec community movement is highly structured. Almost
every neighbourhood (or other geographic area in rural areas) has a community
council bringing together local actors on a variety of issues. On a broader level,

---

[23] http://www.comavis-aca.org

community or grassroots organizations tend to regroup themselves according to the sector in which they work. In general, the groupings develop along the lines of the population concerned (ex. women, seniors, youth), the issue being addressed (ex. welfare, environment) or mode of intervention (ex. popular education). Sometimes these sectors take shape out of autonomous development of common interest and sometimes they develop in response to the government's identification of a particular policy concern or mode of funding.

Sectoral coalitions have been created for more than 20 different concerns at the municipal/metropolitan and provincial levels. Links with Canada-wide coalitions are not a given in Quebec, not only due to provincial jurisdiction over most social programs. Some organizations are eager to have contact with parallel organizations in other parts of Canada (seeing this as a source of strategic strength and a source of information) while other organizations choose not to due to ideological reasons (believing that, as a nation, Quebec should be the focus of action) or due to language and/or cultural barriers (few Canada-wide coalitions are functionally bilingual and the lack of understanding of Quebec's national question outside of the province can be frustrating to activists working within a context where this issue pervades most social action as a central political debate).

In terms of interactions with the government, there has been a long-standing love/hate relationship between the community sector and the provincial government in Quebec (Lamoureux 1994; White 1997). Those who have chronicled the history of the Quebec community movement credit its activists with contributing many of the models (not to mention political pressure) that were eventually adopted by the government to be implemented via social policy. These gains were without question victories for the community movement but time revealed unintended negative effects (Shragge 1999). One of these was that many activists were demobilized, feeling that they had achieved many of their goals. The decline of militant action made it harder to fight for the expansion or adaptation of the social welfare system and to resist future cuts. And while the community movement was able to achieve an official recognition of their role in providing services, expertise and connection with the community, they sometimes

found themselves on advisory boards without real power, in a sub-contracting position for state services, and totally dependent on state funding.

Housing organizing in Quebec

Housing has historically been an important issue in Quebec urban centres and in Montreal in particular. The early days of industrialization drew on immigration (particularly of the Irish) and rural-urban migration for its labour force. This quickly increased the population of Montreal and created pressure on the existing housing stock. The resulting overcrowding and the poverty in which most households were struggling led to a terribly unhealthy urban environment with very poor housing conditions. Class status regulated access to housing as well as the distribution of housing within the city. This was especially important as a housing unit's location within the city had a major impact on health and life expectancy through its determinant impact on many factors: access to a sewage system; style of toilet facilities; more exposure to fetid, disease-bearing run-off by living further downhill; air circulation; concentration of housing stock; low-lying areas with still water; crowded occupation of housing (Copp 1974; Olson and Thornton 1991; Gilliland and Olson 1998).

Early efforts to organize around housing were mostly charity-oriented or used a social planning approach. The urban hygiene movement, dominated by upper-class women, including social workers, focused on improvements in housing conditions, city planning, green spaces, etc. The Communist organizers of the 1920s and 1930s had considerable influence on the community movement and were involved both in landlord-tenant struggles (Bennett 1997b: 2) and in pressuring the state to intervene in the market to create collectively-owned (public) housing (Chouinard 1990: 1297). Bennett tells of tense, even violent, confrontations between tenants and landlords and of community members coming together to forcibly block the evictions of their neighbours.

The post-war years brought a major housing crisis as returning troops, new families and rural migration created a demand for housing that far outstripped the supply. The combined effect of poor housing maintenance and slowed

construction during the Depression, halted construction of new units during the war, the delay of new household formations (young men were away fighting and young women worked in industry supporting the war), and the baby boom that ensued at the end of the war was a housing crisis of remarkable proportions. Veterans' lobby groups and other interest groups (including the construction industry) put pressure on the federal government to intervene. Aiding their efforts to influence the government was a prevailing sense that the state had a moral responsibility to contribute to the housing of returning veterans and their families (Hamel 1983).

During the late 1960s and early 1970s, Montreal's urban movements, notably the Front d'action politique (FRAP), focused their efforts on the democratization of municipal structures. Their strategy of organizing on the neighbourhood level quickly led them into housing issues, particularly within the context of the ruling municipal Civic Party's lustre for urban renewal. Raising the issues of the concentration of property, the profit motive of landlords, the way that rent increases outstripped salary increases and the destruction of working class housing and neighbourhoods for the construction of highways and high rises, the FRAP put forward the analysis that housing inequities were at once social and ethnic:

> ...Nous constatons qu'il y a deux villes à Montréal:
>
> Une **minorité** de personnes, pour la plupart d'expression anglaise, possédant et contrôlant son économie (à la Bourse, à l'usine, au bureau, au cinéma, dans nos quartiers...).
>
> Une vaste majorité en tutelle, pour la plupart travailleurs salariés et locataires, laquelle se retrouve surtout chez les Montréalais d'expression française et chez les immigrants. (FRAP 1970:21 – original emphasis)

The early 1970s saw the creation of citizens' committees in most working class neighbourhoods of Montreal and housing remained one of their central concerns. Tenants' association and local housing shared many of their demands with FRAP: the renovation (rather than the clearance) of older working-class neighbourhoods; citizen participation in decision-making around urban planning,

regulation of the private housing market and the management of social housing; stronger protections of tenants by the Rental Board (including a standard lease – a demand won some 20 years later, universal rent control, enforcement of the Housing Code with significant penalties for non-compliant landlords, measures against discrimination and the right to have collective claims recognized by the Board); increased construction of social housing. One of the more original ideas of the time was the separation of the ownership of land versus buildings, the idea being that if the city retained collective ownership of the land, imposing certain conditions on its use by private property owners, then real estate speculation and the abusive seeking of profits could be tempered (FRAP 1970: 55).

By the mid-1970s, the development of third sector housing (cooperatives and community housing) was in full swing, with the effort to create the Milton Park Cooperative seen by many as a decisive struggle. Many central working-class neighbourhoods, such as Pointe-St-Charles, St-Henri, Little Burgundy, Centre-Sud and Hochelaga-Maisonneuve, were transformed in terms of their housing stock through the 1970s and 1980s. The combination of available land, destruction of the old housing stock (fires, urban renewal) and the mobilization of local citizens led to the construction or renovation of a great number of cooperative, community and public housing in these neighbourhoods.

Also during this period, towards the end of the 1970s, the "institution" of neighbourhood-based housing committees was being consolidated. Centraide, a powerful private funder within the community movement, became a supporter of local tenants' associations and played a role in shaping their structures. Notably, in the early 1980s, Centraide suffered a smear media campaign organized by the Quebec Landlord's Association calling for a boycott of the charity, claiming that Centraide funded "exclusive" and "discriminating" organizations by funding "tenants associations". After long debate with the different parties involved and much controversy, Centraide announced that it would only fund "housing committees" open to both tenants and landlords. This decision led to widespread name changing among tenants' associations and, debatably, a slight change in their political orientation. Some groups, such as the Association des locataires de

Villeray, refused to make the name change or to open their doors to landlords, a decision that, to this day, excludes them for eligibility from Centraide funding.

Accompanying this consolidation of neighbourhood housing committees was the creation of coalition organizations that pooled the efforts for changes around tenants' rights, social housing and urban renewal policies. The Regroupement des comités logement et des associations des locataires du Quebec (RCLALQ) and the Front d'action populaire pour le réaménagement urbain (FRAPRU) both saw the light of day in the late 1970s.

In the 1980s, the community economic development approach began to take hold as our governments began to slowly withdraw from social provisioning. In the housing sector, this was reflected through the growing sophistication of non-profit housing development and management organizations that were taking on the development of social housing. A division developed between those organizations that adopted this development approach versus those who remained focused on tenants' rights and pressure tactics to improve housing policy. The 1990s, with the withdrawal of the federal government from social housing development, the general trend towards "public/private partnerships" and the official sanctioning of the "social economy", saw an exacerbation of this split.

Today this tension between development and rights advocacy remains in the community housing movement. Groups with different orientations continue to work together on a neighbourhood level, however, and sometimes these two orientations are reflected within the same organization. This basic tension between offering much needed services (requiring collaboration with the state in order to secure state funding) and the necessity of challenging the state with political action (addressing the reasons for the need for such service but also thereby threatening access to state funding) is one that is found across the community movement, across the full range of social issues addressed.

Summary chapter analysis

In this chapter I have attempted to develop a critical overview of the field of community organizing. Beginning with the distinction between community *organization* and community *organizing* was important for me, as it is the latter on which I focused my dissertation research. I also took the position that groups operating with a variety of ideologies can use community-organizing strategies. While this may seem an obvious observation, strategy is frequently believed to be a manifestation of ideology. In my ideology section, I illustrated the ways in which different ideological practitioners can transform strategy. The four ideologies I chose to highlight are the ones I consider the most important in the contemporary community movement.

It is difficult to determine whether the links in the literature between community organizing and housing policy are weak because community groups have not had a great impact on housing policy or because the subject has not been of interest to academics. My own organizing experience on housing policy issues (especially in connection with FRAPRU) and reading about the struggles of the third sector social housing approach (Rose 1980; Hulchanski 1988; Chouinard 1990; Canadian Housing 2000) indicate that community groups *are* active in this field. Housing policy, as observed by Elliot Barkan, "was not made in an ivory tower... It was the product of a tri-level interaction: the public, local government and federal agencies" (Barkan 1986: 184). This forms the central crux of my thesis investigation.

I am led to share Stall and Stoecker's musing that: "It is possible that community organizing is neglected [in the literature] for the same reason that women's work in social movements has been neglected. Women's work and community organizing are both, to an extent, invisible labour" (Stall and Stoecker 1998). While this was disappointing for me (as a reader eager to learn about the links between community organizing and state housing policy), it at least indicates a gap in research to which I am able to make a contribution with my own research.

Finally, my interest is in exploring the *process* of community organizing in attempts to influence *state policy*. Although there were some examples in the literature with somewhat of this orientation (Rose 1980; Hamel 1983; Chouinard 1990; Bennett 1997a) (Morin and Dansereau 1990), I was confronted with two tendencies. Housing policy literature tends to (1) refer to organizing efforts without much consideration of the process and interests leading up to community demands and subsequent successes or (more often) defeats and (2) focus on local-level housing issues where groups are acting within a pre-existing policy framework (i.e. tenants rights or organizing to establish a co-op or non-profit housing) without much attention to how the policy itself came into being.

Conclusion

My particular interest is the work of cross-cultural organizations in low-income neighbourhoods, the most common site for housing organizing. The most exciting organizing, for me, is that which follows the base values described by Francis Calpotura of the Centre for Third World Organizing and Kim Fellner of the National Organizers' Alliance:

- ❖ The equitable redistribution of wealth and power to assure each person the necessities of healthful physical survival and the maximal realization of human potential, in viable communities, on a planet safeguarded from degradation.

- ❖ A multicultural, communal space where our various identities can shine and interact within an environment of equally shared power and mutual respect. (Calpotura and Fellner 1996: 1)

Since federal support for new social housing was eliminated in the mid-1990s, community-based housing organizations have struggled to bolster public support for a reinstatement of these crucial programs. Sadly, it took a declaration of a national homelessness crisis (FCM 1998) for community groups to begin to make inroads into the public consciousness. It has been fascinating to watch the information being put out during recent election campaigns at both the federal and provincial levels. Although activist and community networks can be far from a

reflection of public sentiment (Davies and Townshend 1994: 1758), I have been surprised to see social housing support being expressed on environmental, women's and anti-globalization list-servs, reaching a constituency not usually involved in housing issues. My impression is that the World March of Women's making social housing investment a priority in their campaign has also helped revitalize the issue on a national scale. Of course, the dominant neo-liberal political parties still do not concern themselves with social housing (preferring to offer funding for homelessness and subsidies to private, for-profit landlords) but in activist, community and progressive political circles, the issue seems to be enjoying a renaissance of support. It seems, however, that the query posed by Brian Wharf in 1992 remains far from being answered:

> While social policies in Canada are largely developed in provincial capitals and Ottawa, their consequences are played out and experienced in local communities. Community organizations, and indeed local governments, have little influence on the design of social policies, and the central issue addressed throughout the book is whether increased involvement on the part of community organizations and municipal governments would improve social policies. (Wharf 1992: 9)

The basic goal of community organizing is to create or harness "community power" in order to effect change in the interests of the organizing constituency or a particular target group. In the progressive tradition, the change sought by community organizing is usually in favour of a more just distribution of resources, more power for marginalized groups, or cultural change that promotes equality. The basis of the power built through community organizing can be varied and usually the sources of power must be combined in order to have a real influence. The sheer power of numbers, the power of information or knowledge, the power of moral authority and the power of positive public opinion, for example, are all potent levers when community groups are confronting the state or other powerful actors. This thesis will explore how community actors in one neighbourhood take up this challenge, organizing to influence government programs and policy around social housing.

Chapter 4

Conceptual Framework: connecting the ideas of 'the state', 'community/state relations' and 'community organizing'

This chapter outlines the theoretical concepts that emerge from my literature review on both the welfare state and community organizing and the relationship between the two, which guided my exploration of community action for social housing in immigrant neighbourhoods. After summarizing the most relevant points taken from the literature reviewed in earlier chapters, I will develop a framework that will guide my exploration of the social housing organizing as explored in Côte-des-Neiges. I have selected what I consider the most intellectually and empirically compelling concepts from the literature, concepts that not only are strong theoretically but which are also supported by research data as reported in the literature and in my own previous research experiences. What follows is a summary of the concepts I have extracted from my literature review in order to guide my analysis.

Concepts from the literature: 'the state', 'community/ state relations' and 'community organizing'

To better understand how community groups organize for and influence social housing development and policy (and vice versa), I felt that it was important to gain a perspective on the different analyses that exist of 'community organizing' as an action or process and 'the state' as an entity that is influenced by and also influences such action. Community actors' relationship with the state was a third area of interest within the literature. Community organizations, intermediary organizations and state agencies all have roles in the social housing

debate and many factors (such as political analysis, moment in history, balance of power, availability of resources, etc.) influence the choices made by the social actors in the housing field. My initial exploration of the literature related to this field led me to focus on the intersection of the following areas as useful to understanding the specific situation of Côte-des-Neiges:

> 1) Theories defining the state and the significance of housing policy within the welfare state

> 2) Roles of community actors in relationships with the state (partnership, advocacy and confrontational)

> 3) Models of community organizing

The literature on these three concepts ('the state', 'community roles' and 'community organizing') is rich and it offers much guidance in establishing a starting point for understanding how CDN community groups organize for social housing development and policy.

The literature theorizing the state and the significance of social policy is important to this thesis in two specific ways. First, my analysis of the state and understanding of the literature informed my choice of research questions, research design and approach to analysis. Second, community organizations' analysis of the state informs their choices about strategy and their relationship with the state. In terms of the role of community groups in relation to the state, at present, examples of all of three strategies (opponent, advocate, partner) relating to the state can be found among housing actors and an interesting aspect of this thesis has been looking to discover the influence of these different ideologies on the various groups in terms of their analysis and strategies. Finally, the constellation of choices of approaches to organizing, both public (alternative services, advocacy, community development and social action) and private (open-door policy, cross-cultural, identity-based), will be analyzed for each actor included in this study.

Of critical importance in bringing these concepts together in order to understand a concrete situation, however, is a consideration of the social and

political context in which activity is taking place. Social norms and trends, cultural context, political winds and economic ups and downs will all converge to affect the context in which community organizations and other social housing actors must make decisions for action or give meaning to events and policies.

Theories of the state and social policy

In Chapter 2, the literature theorizing the state was discussed with a particular interest in analyzing the class, gender and race interests that compete within and/or around the state. The influence of one's analysis of the state on one's understanding of the 'welfare state' as a phenomenon and the significance of 'social policy' within the welfare state was also discussed. Here I will summarize the points most salient to the analysis of my topic in terms of definitions of the state, explanations of the welfare state and the place of housing policy within it.

For the purposes of this thesis, it is important to address state theories since the state and its social policies can be a target of community organizing, a 'partner' in community initiatives, and also an influence on the context and parameters in which community organizing occurs. The basic components of the state are widely agreed upon:

> The state is a complex of institutions, including the government, but also including the bureaucracy (embodied in the civil service as well as public corporations, central banks, regulatory commissions, etc.), the military, the judiciary, representative assemblies, and (very important for Canada)... the sub-central levels of government, that is, provincial executives, legislature, and bureaucracies, and municipal government institutions (Panitch 1977 in Knuttila 1987:122).

How these different components work, however, and who controls them are subject of much debate and theorizing. I will present the two most prominent theories defining the state, **liberal pluralism** and **Marxism,** and then take into consideration certain variations and critiques. I argue that the key element in this debate is understanding the role of the state in relation to competing social interests.

Liberal pluralism

The liberal view of the state, as discussed above, is that it serves as a broker, a neutral forum in which individuals compete and negotiate a social contract (Van Dyke 1977) Under this view, the state does not represent the interests of any particular group and does not have any interests of its own; rather, it mediates contextual conflict that may arise within society. This position has roots reaching back to the 15th century, with many linking its genesis to the economic and social changes that accompanied the development of mercantilism and then capitalism, the move from a hierarchical yet collectivist view of society to one based more on the value of individualism. The 17th century work of Thomas Hobbes popularized the concept of the state as the "social contract" which mediates competition and by which "individuals give up certain rights of 'self-government'…and in return are assured an improvement in their condition" (Knuttila 1987:19). By the mid-19th century, liberals had come to see the ideal form of such a state as a representative democracy, as exemplified in the work of John Stuart Mill.

As capitalism continued to develop in the late 19th century and into the 20th century, social divisions became more and more apparent: the existence of economic classes was undeniable and international migration (both voluntary and involuntary) led to increasingly ethnically and racially diverse societies. The idea of pluralist democracy grew in influence (Knuttila 1987). This theory amended classical liberalism by recognizing that some individuals may want to ally themselves with others who share their interests. Individuals may choose to associate themselves with others who share their interests in order to increase their influence upon the state. Hence the recognition of the role of "interest groups", including political parties, political and social movements. The state, according to this perspective, still viewed as a rational and neutral mediator or broker, with no responsibility to support the existence of such groups, only the freedom of individuals to associate if so desired (Glazer 1983).

In the late 20th century, important critiques of liberal pluralism emerged. As discussed in Chapter 2, liberal feminist and anti-racist theorists agree that

every individual is unique and has the right to self-determination but they focus on the barriers to participation that are faced by the members of socially disadvantaged groups such as women and ethnic or racial minorities (Kymlicka 1992:17). Under this critique, the state itself is viewed as neutral but social conditions mean that not all have equal access to its decision-making structures or benefits and protections. The argument is that, upon achieving equal access to the current form of state, women and other socially disadvantaged groups would be able to ensure rational and fair state policies that would protect their interests, often viewed as equal opportunity but not necessarily equal results (Phillips 1992). Another important critique of liberal pluralism, discussed below, is Marxism.

Marxism

Marxism and liberalism have been long been at odds; both theories emerged as attempts to explain the new social relations that emerged with the development of capitalism. Karl Marx began writing in the mid-1800s, focusing on the material and historical condition of the newly emerged working class in its relation to capital. In contrast with liberalism, Marx' analysis was that the state was not neutral but rather controlled by capitalists in order to further their interests (Knuttila 1987:99). Rather than seeing conflict as contextual (existing within society but separate from the state), Marxists see it as inherent to the capitalist state, arguing that, when it comes to conflict mediated by the state, the capitalist class is in control, viewing the state "as basically organized coercion" (Skocpol 1979:26), a tool used to protect and promote capitalist expansion (Barrow 2000).

Over time, and especially with the development of the western welfare states to be discussed shortly, Marxist theorists began to amend their view of the state:

> It was clear to many that the state was not merely an executive
> committee acting as a repressive agent of the bourgeoisie, using
> rigid force to maintain the capitalist system. In many of the social
> and political developments the state took a leading interventionist

role and conceiving of it as a class instrument of the bourgeoisie became more and more difficult. (Knuttila 1987:106)

A new conception of the state emerged, one that recognized conflicting interests within the state. The state was still considered to protect and promote capitalism and the interests of the elite class overall but the state was no longer seen as monolithic. Although many provisions of the welfare state can still be considered measures to support the capitalist class by contributing the maintenance and training of the workforce, the state nevertheless came to be seen as having "a degree of autonomy in relation to the 'ruling class'" (Knuttila 1987:116). Within the state, there may be conflicts between different factions of the elite, non-elite civil servants may exercise a degree of influence on the state's actions and popular political movements also put pressure on the state from the outside. Among these different actors, the capitalist class is still viewed as the most powerful: "the state must be understood as having relative autonomy, capable of mediating the internal differences within the dominant class in such a manner as to ensure the continued existence of capitalist relations of production" (Knuttila 1987:119). In Canada, the dynamic perspective on the state put forth by Ng, Walker and Muller (1990) is one that has become quite popular among other scholars, especially those concerned with the role of community organizations (Wharf 1997):

> Challenging the standard use of the 'state' are analysts who view the state as a struggle between classes or a set of social relations. They see the state as legitimizing certain courses of action, thereby making alternate forms illegitimate and organizing how people relate to one another. (Muller, Walker and Ng 1990:18)

In their concluding chapter, Ng et al. argue, "…state responses to demands from below are not unitary. At times, they are extremely oppressive and coercive… at other times… grassroots struggles can find a place in state reforms" (Ng et al. 1990:309), thus legitimizing community efforts to influence the state.

A further critique raised in the Ng, Walker and Muller volume is the idea that a Marxist view of the state must expand to recognize the role of patriarchy and racism in elite domination. This view is echoed by Evans and Wekerle:

> An emphasis on class, and class with a male cast, also pays particular attention to the important role played by political parties and the labour union movement in social change, but ignores the activity of women in the early reform movements who generated and shaped policies through their own organizations. (Evans and Wekerle 1997:9)

Class structure must be analyzed not only according to economic power but also according to the intersections of gender and race. In this view, the economic elite (usually white men) has established and maintains its dominance through a social system that disproportionately exploits the labour and resources of women and people of colour. This dominance is maintained via the state and the social policies it develops and implements.

Social policy

The capitalist industrialized countries of the West developed social policies and programs after the Second World War that came to be described as the welfare state. Based on Keynesian economic theory that argued that the economy could be maintained and improved through social spending, welfare states developed in an effort to encourage and, later, maintain post-war economic growth (Mishra 1990; Chisholm 1999), a theory that lent itself especially well to housing policy (Chouinard 1990; Doling 1997). While these programs have significantly improved the quality of life of the majority of citizens of these countries, Keynesian economic theory has long been politically disputed, contested by those on the right as expensive, unrealistic and even contributing to laziness amongst citizens. With the socio-political shifts that resulted in the 1980s rise of neo-liberalism, however, the struggle between those forces aiming to dismantle the welfare state versus those aiming to preserve and expand it has become the core of the mainstream political forum.

Again, as in defining the state itself, the two dominant positions in theorizing the changes to the welfare state and its social policies are liberal pluralism and Marxism. In the liberal view, individuals strive to maximize their personal welfare. Welfare states are the result of the interaction between individual demand for social policies (through voting and lobbying) and political

parties' supply of policy packages (Doling 1997:69-70). In the pluralist view of the welfare state, power is widely dispersed throughout society and citizens may join together in order to compete to have their interests addressed by the neutral state. Women and people of colour have been able to organize and win some concessions under this system. In democracies, the diversity of interests and the fact that power is widely dispersed means that no one group can dominate society (Doling 1997:70).

In contrast, when Marxist scholars argued that the contradictions of the capitalist system could not be hidden by the guise of a state mediating interests and that these contradictions would soon bring about an economic crisis that would lead inevitably to a revolutionary uprising, they did not foresee the welfare state as a means of appeasing the working class (Marx and Engels 1969). By the mid-1960s, however, Marxist theorists in Western countries saw that the social policy concessions offered by the state since the Second World War had, in fact, begun to address some of the most flagrant abuses under the capitalist economic system, thereby 'keeping the lid on' potentially threatening social dissatisfaction. The 1960s and 1970s, in particular, were decades of popular mobilizations that did lead to important concessions but Marxist theorists estimate that they had never posed a fundamental threat to the system (Knuttila 1987).

Critical Marxists re-evaluated this argument and took the position that welfare state social policy was a capitalist attempt to thwart class-consciousness; welfare state policies and programs were not pure benevolence. While these critical theorists concede some of the gains made by women and people of colour under the welfare state (Dominelli 1989), it is maintained that the state still helps to maintain patriarchy (Evans and Wekerle 1997) and neo-colonialism (Muller et al. 1990). Under this view, the welfare state cannot be fully understood without considering its differential impact and intersections with other forms of oppression:

> Feminism and socialism meet in the arena of the welfare state...
> only a feminist analysis of the welfare state that also relates it to a
> socialist perspective can enable us fully to understand why the

> conglomeration of legislation and services loosely labeled the
> Welfare State has come to be as it is. (Wilson 1977:7)

By this is meant that the welfare includes elements of gender and racial
oppression and discrimination, in addition to its class function. If we hope to
understand the welfare state, we must recognize that it is experienced differently
by women, people of colour and other specific social groups. Ignoring their
experiences leads to the replication and reinforcement of the oppressive social
relations that exist in the political system being critiqued.

This idea that the welfare state has served in some ways to consolidate
elite power can be supported by an examination of the history of housing policy.
The housing industry and housing investment play a critical role in the economy
of western nations (Miron 1993:7) yet housing also plays a significant role in
individuals' social outcomes and experiences such as educational attainment,
physical and mental health, employment opportunities, etc. (Malpass 1999;
MacNeil and Warnock 2000). Despite these points of convergence, however,
there is disagreement between liberal and neo-Marxist theorists as to whether
governments intervene in housing for the welfare of citizens, to preserve social
order, to contribute to socio-economic stability or some combination thereof. As
discussed in Chapter 2, there is also very little written specifically about the actual
impact of interest groups on the particular debate around social housing policy,
either from the community or the private for-profit housing perspective.

Returning once again to the concern of differentiated impacts of housing
policy upon women and people of colour or immigrants, the literature on social
housing recognizes that women are more often the residents of social housing.
There is also a rich literature on women in relation to housing in many ways:
disabilities, older women, women and access to credit, housing and
neighbourhood design, etc. (Morissette 1987; McClain 1993; Cooper and Rodman
1994; Novac 1995; Ogilvie 1997; Spector 1998). Immigrants and people of colour
tend to be studied and discussed in terms of home ownership (Moore, Ray, and
Rosenberg 1989), discrimination within private housing market and as 'clients' in
social housing (particularly public housing) (Morin and Dansereau 1990:17). In

this thesis, I plan to further develop the issue of immigration as a factor of consideration in the organizing for social housing policy.

Having considered, in this section, different analyses of the state, I will now turn to the different roles that community groups may take on in dealing with the state.

Community actors and their relation to the state

In the context of the welfare state, where the state plays a role in providing social goods and intervenes to some degree in shaping social relations (Muller et al. 1990), examining the relationship between community and state actors can help to answer the question of how social change takes place. For example, how do community groups influence state action and policy as partners, advocates and/or opponents? Groups' choices about how to achieve social change and the resulting engagement with the state becomes a type of relationship, relationships that have recently been generating much discussion (Wharf and Clague 1997).

Partnership – between community and state but also between public and private – is the relationship promoted by the Québec Secrétariat à l'action communautaire autonome (White 1997), a trend that has been maintained despite the change in government from the Parti Québécois to the Liberal Party of Quebec. The appropriate form of engagement with the state has been widely debated among community groups and academics; this is one of the central issues of my thesis. Among housing organizations, I have suggested that relationships between community organizations and the state can be understood according to the following categorizations: community group as opponent, as advocate and as partner.

Community group as opponent to the state

There are three main tendencies among community organizations regarding the best strategy to engage with the state. The *confrontation* strategy fits most easily with the Marxist view of society in which the state serves the interests of the elite. This powerful minority will not rescind any power or resources unless they are forced to through power dynamics or in order to protect their own interests. Increasingly, thinkers combine the factors of class, gender and race with

other social categories to understand the definition of "oppressor" in a more complex fashion, depending up social location. In Quebec, the confrontational role was the most common for community groups during the 1970s when Marxist-Leninist political parties exercised significant influence among community groups (Panet-Raymond and Mayer 1997). Within the confrontational tendency, community groups see themselves as in basic opposition to the state, resisting exploitation and wielding collective power to block harmful policies and force beneficial ones. Distinctions are drawn between reforms (moderately beneficial immediately but dangerous in their tendency to hide basic inequalities) and long-term revolutionary change.

As with the other types of relationships, however, groups with more moderate liberal goals (eg. liberal pressure groups) sometimes resort to confrontational relations if they assess this as the best way to achieve reform. Once the reform is gained however, the conflict will end.

Community group as advocate to the state

Advocacy is another strategy that is widely employed in working for social housing, and for the purposes of this thesis, I use the term 'advocacy' to refer to representation or provision of information without building or applying political pressure. By this I mean that groups may present briefs or write letters to policy-makers but will not mobilize citizens to support this view via direct, mass-based political pressure. This strategy rests more upon the liberal belief that state policy seeks the common good, the result of negotiations and competition between different interest groups, all of whom have more or less the same potential power. This relationship became stronger and more common in the 1980s when "community groups recognized that strong, well-planned lobbying could bring about changes as well as political action" (Panet-Raymond and Mayer 1997:43). Advocacy proponents often believe that the state, without interests of its own, reacts to rational information about a given problem and that awareness of problems faced by a specific segment of the population will have a favourable impact on state actions. Community groups using advocacy as their main strategy

generally see themselves as separate from the state but having an important role in representing community interests in interactions with the state. Groups with a more Marxist interpretation of the state often act as advocates for pragmatic reasons, seeking short-term gains and often hoping to use the process as an opportunity for political education among members.

Community group as partner

In Quebec today, there has been more than a decade of the state promoting a neo-liberal *partnership* model that subcontracts services to community groups without necessarily providing adequate funding, a model now accepted by many community groups (White 1997), although not necessarily by choice. Whether this acceptance is due to the conditions for receiving state funding or due to a belief that it best serves community interests, however, remains hotly debated. In the view of Panet-Raymond and Mayer, for example, "Community groups became partners, though unequal and dependent, with the state as it opted out of services it could no longer afford" (1997:45). The partnership strategy implies that community groups are an extension of the state, or at least on a continuum with it, as reflected in this quote from Deena White:

> [Community action] is coming to be seen… as an established and legitimate category of social organizations and relations – an institutional 'sector' – rather than a local form of resistance, advocacy, or protest movement. (White 1997:63)

Proponents of this type of relationship believe that community groups are able to negotiate with the state to create a partnership that is beneficial to both the group's constituents and the greater good, a situation which is sometimes referred to as "l'arrimage entre le communautaire et le secteur public" (Mathieu and Mercier 1994). The community movement finds itself in a difficult situation:

> Many community organizations had demanded that recognition for the last ten years, but in recognizing their contribution, the government is also jeopardizing the groups' autonomy and creativity because they will have to fit into the public policies and priorities and be evaluated on that basis. (Panet-Raymond and Mayer 1997:48)

The choices that community groups make about the role they take on in relation to the state have important implications for the models of community organizing that are both interesting and feasible for them, as we will see in the following section.

Models and traditions of community organizing

Ideology about the nature of the state and society, although often unstated, is at the heart of community organizing. Although the pragmatism of funding, roles accepted by the state and of political conjuncture may push community organizations (via the decisions of their organizers and members) to select tactics and strategies that diverge from their theoretical analysis of society, their ultimate goals generally reflect their view of the state, their relationship to other actors within society and of the way society should work. The choices that community groups make – from (1) defining a constituency; to (2) identifying problems; to (3) analyzing the cause and responsibility for the problem; to (4) deciding upon the desired response to the problem; to (5) choosing a strategy to address the problem – all reflect an analysis of society, community and the state, whether this ideology is articulated or not. Community organizing manuals (both public and private) are surprisingly devoid of specifically ideological content about the nature of the state (O.M. Collective 1971; Barndt 1989; Kahn 1995; Bobo, Kendall, and Max 1996; Center for Third World Organizing 1998) but social analysis is nevertheless unavoidable as an undercurrent in community action.

Community organizing models, as frameworks for action, offer prescriptions for action about what we discover in our analyses of the state and of society, and about how to bring about change (Wharf 1997:7). Continuing on from the basic split to be found in theories of the state, community organizing models can also be categorized according to two principal divides. The first divide is whether the group's ultimate goals reflect what is basically a liberal pluralist view of the state (reforms to attain inclusion within what is considered a legitimate system) versus a Marxist view (opposition for fundamental transformation of what is considered an illegitimate system) (Shragge 2003).

The second is whether the group adopts a political action strategy (pressuring other actors – such as a corporation, the state or another institution – to take action to address injustice) or a community development strategy (in which the organization *itself* seeks to develop new infrastructure or services) (Shragge 2003:198).

Apart from the insistence that gender and race be considered as elements in all aspects of organizing, feminist organizing built on the idea that the process of organizing is as important as the goal by insisting on a consideration of the different experiences of individuals within organizations (Dominelli 1998; Gutiérrez and Lewis 1998; Naples 1998b). This division of models along the lines of public and private is also relevant to understanding community organizing practice.

While the community organizing literature has fostered an interesting debate about the best way to categorize organizing practices and how to divide them into models (Dominelli 1989; Wharf 1997; Pilisuk et al. 1998), this has proven difficult to achieve in a satisfying way. As stated by Shragge (2003:63),

> ...even though the concrete outcomes of a campaign from a pluralist or radical orientation may be the same, the goals of the latter are longer term and linked to an understanding that for fundamental social change to occur ongoing social processes are a necessary precondition.

This is opposed to the liberal pluralist view that "directs practice to the formation of pressure groups and advocacy for specific social change within the limits of the system" (Shragge 2003: 62). The real difference is whether the organization's ultimate goal is to gain access to social benefits and participate in the system on an equal basis or whether the ultimate goal is to challenge the very existence and legitimacy of our socio-economic system and eventually build an alternative.

Ultimate goal: social integration or social opposition

To begin with the division of models along the lines of ultimate goals, certain models of community organizing aim to gain equitable access to the state and its benefits (**social integration**) (Shragge 2003). This goal reflects the liberal

pluralist interpretation of the state, whereby either social pressure or community development strategies could be employed in order to win reforms from the state in the form of legislative changes, public investment or public infrastructure, for example. The state is seen as neutral, mediating competing demands rationally and fairly. In reference to the conceptualization of community/state relationships to be discussed in the next section of this chapter, those seeking social integration would tend to use strategies and models in which they play a partnership or advocacy role in relation to the state. Conflict would not be their usual role, but conflict could be used to achieve integration.

In contrast to those seeking social integration, others aim to fundamentally challenge social relations and, eventually, alter the state (**social opposition**) (Shragge 2003). This goal is more reflective of the Marxist interpretation of the state and, again, either social pressure or community development strategies could be employed toward such a goal, by wielding power in order to win concessions as a short-term step or by creating autonomous parallel institutions as alternatives to the status quo. Under this view, the state is seen as serving the interests of the class, gender and/or race elite, although not necessarily as a monolithic actor without any agency of its own. A social opposition approach would tend to use strategies and models which create a confrontational role in relation to the state but advocacy could be used to achieve short-term victories and partnership might be entered into with the hope of subverting this role for more radical ends.

Again, as raised in Chapter 3, in practice these models often overlap and complement each other. In the real world, the distinctions between models or approaches can be very blurred (Rothman 2001; Shragge 2003:69).

Conclusion

As I have explained earlier, my main interest in undertaking this project has been to better understand the ways in which community groups influence government policy and my review of the literature has led me to believe that the *relationships* between community, intermediary and state actors were key in the

struggle around social housing, both its development and its social policy framework.

Having reviewed the literature on the nature of the state, community organizing and relationships between the community and state, I have arrived at my own framework through which to examine my thesis topic. This framework identifies five major concepts around which to centre my analysis: formal state structures; political and economic context; underlying power dynamics as they relate to social policy; community roles in relation to the state; and community actions in relation to the state. I will here reaffirm the way in which I plan to make use of these concepts in my thesis.

Formal state structures

The state is promoted as and is formally structured according to the **liberal** conception of the state. The electoral system, parliamentary system and lines of government accountability are designed and defended as a way to allow individuals to influence the state through representative democracy. The state promotes itself as a neutral forum that responds to and mediates citizen interests. Many forms of community organizing can facilitate participation in such formal structures through participation in government policy commissions, state/ community roundtables, or using the designated processes to communicate with the state. Use of public hearings and lobbying Members of Parliament or Members of the National Assembly are usual parts of the policy process.

Political and economic context

The state exists within a historically specific political and economic context that creates parameters for action, introduces new influences and see other influences diminished with time. The state is subject to many influences: international (ex. trade agreements and relations, war and other international conflicts, international financial bodies such as the IMF/World Bank, UN conventions); national (ex. relative popularity of political parties, scandals, pressure groups, economic situation, culture around authority, legal framework for state action) and local (personal relations, local traditions, local economy,

relative power of pressure groups). At the same time, all of these pressures come to bear on the other actors involved in social housing as well as the following three elements of analysis...

Underlying power dynamics as they relate to social policy

The liberal structure of the state masks unequal power relations behind the scenes in government and in society in general and these are what determine the ultimate social policy outcomes. The **Marxist** argument for the power of capital to control the state is supported by an analysis of government policies and government actions. To best understand the dynamics of the state, however, the classic Marxist class analysis requires the contribution of **critical theory** supporting gender and race as important axes of power within society and as concentrations of power within the state. The state is not monolithic in its use of social policy to protect class, gender and race elites, however. The recognition of the role of actors applying pressure from within the state is also essential, as is the consideration of shifting socio-political contexts that affect the balance of power and resulting policies. Those forms of community organizing that mobilize citizens and raise general political consciousness aim to build power in counterbalance to the concentration of social power among elites. In the case of housing policy, there are such actors as politicians who hope to retain power, private developers seeking profit, community organizations seeking funds, and community members who seek access to decent and affordable housing.

Community roles in relation to the state

Faced with the liberal structure of the state and the shifting power dynamics behind it, community groups must make choices about how to relate to the state in order to intervene in favour of their interests. Within parameters defined by state policy and organizational context (especially funding and membership profile), community organizations may become **partners** (cooperating with the government in order to achieve common goals), **advocates** (participating in the structures of representative democracy and policy development) or **opponents** (rejecting state structures in order to challenge the

state directly or through parallel activities). Differences may exist between rhetoric and reality as groups are not always in a position to act entirely in line with their analysis and ideology.

<u>Community actions in relation to the state</u>

Community groups' analysis of the state, their socio-political context and the role they feel is most effective will then influence the **strategies of community organizing** chosen (integration/opposition, public/private) in order to intervene in favour of their interests. Again, groups may use seemingly contradictory strategies since their choices will be shaped by the formal structures of participation proposed by the state, the political and social context in which they are situated, their group's traditions of organizing, and pragmatic decisions about how best to have an impact.

The results chapters (7, 8 & 9) will present a sketch of the organizations involved in social housing in Côte-des-Neiges (community, intermediary and state), the models of organizing or of action that they employ and the relationships created between them. The interviews with actors, observation of their work and the consultation of their materials have provided the details to be discussed in the following chapters. The concepts outlined in this framework, however – theories of the state; models of organizing; and roles within state/community relations – will help to inform our discussion of the CDN social housing debate as described in the final analysis chapter of this thesis.

The concepts of 'the state', 'community organizing' and the relationship between the two have framed my doctoral dissertation in terms of development of the research problem, choice of methods, analysis of the data and concluding remarks. Keeping in mind the ultimate goal of developing a more complete understanding of the dynamics between community and state actors in order to better work towards social housing, these theoretical concepts will guide the presentation of information, my reflections and analysis of the situation in Côte-des-Neiges.

While these theories offer guidance in understanding the community-state dynamic around social housing, questions remain when we try to apply them to particular contexts. What happens when immigrant communities and the state interact around housing policy and practice? How do they influence each other's actions and analyses? What are the interests of different actors within this relationship? How does resulting policy reflect the dynamic between the two? How do their basic ideologies affect their analyses and decisions? These are the questions I aim to address within my thesis.

Chapter 5

Research Methods

In this chapter, I will describe the evolution of my research project, my initial goals and the reasons for their modifications. I will then discuss the approach to research I retained, justifying my decisions with both practical and theoretical considerations. Finally, I will explain my decisions in relation to analyzing and communicating the results of my research. This dissertation was built on an intensive case study of one immigrant neighbourhood in Montreal, and centered around two principal research questions and always taking into account the specific political and socio-economic context in which the neighbourhood was situated:

1. *How do community groups in immigrant neighbourhoods organize in order to have an impact on government social housing policy?*

2. *What is the process that shapes the relationships between community, intermediary and state social housing actors in the development of social housing projects and policy?*

My research plan underwent a series of significant changes due to a number of factors: practical considerations, changing political climates, academic concerns, and personal factors. I will describe these because they are illustrative of some of the challenges facing community organizations and the staff and activists within them as they struggle to improve the lives of their members and constituencies.

What happened along the way?

Some of the most important changes that occurred brought me from my initial idea of a three-city comparison, to a two-city comparison, to a two-neighbourhood comparison and, finally, to a case study of one Montreal immigrant neighbourhood.

Practical considerations

Early on in the research process, the practical difficulties of undertaking a three-city comparison became clear. In fact, I was participating with a group of Montreal researchers in a team research project that was concentrating on the comparison of questions of local economic development for four cities. Experiencing the complications encountered by four professors and four research assistants in covering four cities over three years, I quickly realized that, as a lone researcher, covering three cities in four years was an unrealistic task. This is one of the limitations of PhD research; the student is expected to work alone, as opposed to the team approach that is increasingly common.

Gaining a more meaningful understanding of the community organizing contexts in both Toronto and Boston would require spending at least four months (and probably more) away from my home base of Montreal. Although this was a possibility (I had housing organizing contacts in both cities), the extra financial cost and the time away from my other research and activist work in Montreal were concerns to me. Trying to get a proper grasp of three completely different policy frameworks within the timeframe I had available to me also seemed to be an overwhelming task for a sole researcher.

My first attempt to address these concerns was to limit the comparison to Toronto and Montreal, in the belief that their shared federal policy framework would ease the level of background work. I decided to begin my fieldwork in Montreal, and planned to take six months later to do fieldwork in Toronto. I began to make inquiries regarding home base organizations in Toronto but most of my energy went into gaining access to Montreal neighbourhood groups, which was already time-consuming in itself, given the number and diversity of community organizations involved in housing.

Academic concerns

Academic motivations also contributed to my decision to modify my initial research plan. Again, my experience with the four-city comparative project played a role in the change in my thinking. As the person responsible for the

fieldwork on the Pittsburgh case study (Silvestro and Hanley 2001), I had been disappointed with the depth of information I had been able to gather using a distance approach of literature review and informational phone interviews combined with a one-week trip for intensive interviews. I had a strong sense that my insight had remained rather superficial and that a longer exposure to the city would have led to more interesting information. For my dissertation, I was interested in a deeper analysis. I felt that I had to make a choice between depth versus breadth of information and comprehension. My feeling was that in order to study the process of community organizing and policy development, a longer-term, more in-depth look was necessary. Initially, I thought that limiting the comparison to Toronto and Montreal would allow for this type of study.

I began my research with fieldwork in Montreal. I approached two organizations working on housing issues in two different neighbourhoods in Montreal with a high proportion of immigrants and low-income households. Both organizations agreed to my spending at least one day a week working with them, participating in their activities and contributing the skills I had to offer. Both organizations were informed and agreeable to the fact that I was gathering preliminary information for my doctoral thesis as a participant observer.

This involvement began in the first year of my PhD and quickly became quite intensive. It quickly became clear to me that I had the possibility of developing close relationships with the people I was working with in Montreal and an in-depth understanding of the neighbourhood dynamics. This level of analysis would not be possible with the Toronto neighbourhoods chosen for the comparison, as I would not be able to spend enough time there to develop the same type of relationships. Of course, my personal history of involvement in Montreal (as an activist and an organizer) was also opening doors for me in a way that would not occur in Toronto where I was a stranger.

The impossibility of attaining balanced information from both Toronto and Montreal, combined with an academic interest for more in-depth data on the Montreal neighbourhoods, led to my decision to drop the Toronto comparison and

focus on the two Montreal neighbourhoods. I made these decisions in the first year of my PhD program.

Changing political climates

Once the decision to focus on Montreal was made, I began to intensify my involvement in the two principal organizations I had chosen for study. As both an activist and a student researcher, I was spending one day a week in each of these two organizations, and an additional day in these neighbourhoods working with other organizations, taking part in related coalition meetings and actions and participating in general community events. I had the opportunity to get to know the members and staff of the home base organizations very well and gain an understanding of their policies and practices through participation. By being so involved I was able to gain a deeper understanding of the topic I was studying while, at the same time, make a contribution to the work at hand.

Whereas the chance to be so involved allowed me to learn more than if I had remained detached – as expected in traditional research roles – it later became clear that there were major disadvantages as well. After two and a half years of participant observation in one of the neighbourhoods, a serious local conflict developed and I found myself caught in the middle of it.

All of these events created tension within the neighbourhood and, unfortunately yet realistically, I am identified as a participant. Although I gained a lot of understanding about housing organizing through my experience in this neighbourhood, it became clear that it would be impossible for me to conduct reasonable interviews with staff from other organizations in the neighbourhood or with the state representatives (especially municipal). I have a lot to say about the process of organizing in this neighbourhood, and at points in this dissertation I will make comparisons with the remaining neighbourhood, but I felt forced to drop this neighbourhood as a case study for comparison.

Personal factors

Discussion of these choices would be incomplete without some reference to my personal history with the two neighbourhoods. The neighbourhood that

finally served as the focus of this study, Cote-des-Neiges, is the first neighbourhood in which I became involved in community organizing nine years ago. Prior to that, I had only been involved in student organizing or issue-based organizing. The organization chosen as my "home base" in the neighbourhood is one that I have worked with for the past ten years. I began as a volunteer doing social rights advising, door-to-door outreach, and eventually, serving on board committees; this involvement continues with them today. I have also worked there as a summer student and on a temporary contract. I have good relations with this organization and I hope to continue working with them in the future. They were very supportive of my project and interested in the results. My long history with them clearly contributed to my understanding of the neighbourhood social housing context.

Another connection I have with Cote-des-Neiges is my work with another organization that is dedicated to education and organizing around labour rights, particularly for immigrants. I spend one day a week working in this group's office. I am also this organization's representative on the local community council that exposes me to a wide range of local organizations and to the neighbourhood dynamics between organizations. My work in these two organizations has revealed more to me about the lives of neighbourhood residents; housing, work, immigration, health and other concerns are all brought to the two groups for information and action.

Finally, there were personal factors that contributed to my deciding to leave the second neighbourhood out of my PhD thesis. While my relationships with the staff at the first organization in Cote-des-Neiges are friendly, they remain professional. I rarely see them outside of the organizational context. The same is not true of the second neighbourhood. I became a close friend of the coordinator at the second housing organization so when his firing became the centre of the organization's crisis, it seemed impossible for me to be able to approach others and interview them in any sort of neutral fashion. This lack of professional detachment led me to drop the second neighbourhood from my thesis.

The case study as research strategy

My research question is one that centres on questions of process and human interaction. As I argued in my literature review, there has thus far been very little research documenting the ways in which social actors intervene in the process of social housing policy formation and implementation. With my background in the Montreal social housing movement, I had the possibility of close access to the groups who work directly on the issue in a particular area. When I began to explore different alternatives for my research design, the conditions under which Robert Yin suggests the use of the case study seemed to fit my situation well:

1. A research question focused on the 'how' and 'why'. (I am interested in *how* organizations organize for social housing and *why* they choose particular roles and strategies.)

2. The researcher has little control over events. (I am looking at a movement that is constantly making decisions and taking action, independent of my research project.)

3. The focus is on contemporary phenomenon within a real-life context. (My study was to be based on current activities of the housing movement within a real neighbourhood). (Yin 2003: 5-9)

Yin goes on to define the case study strategy of research as follows: "…an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident" (Yin 2003:13). Given my research interests, the case study strategy seemed an ideal choice.

I therefore designed a single-case case study research project (Yin 2003). The case study method has been defended in recent years as an appropriate approach to understanding community dynamics (Stoecker 1991; Hamel 1993; Hasson and Ley 1997). The goal, however, is to "expand and generalize theories (analytic generalization) and not to enumerate frequencies (statistical

generalization)" (Yin 2003:10). My theoretical framework, therefore, guided my choice of methods and the focus of my inquiries.

The methods selected within the case study framework were qualitative and exploratory. While quantitative facts and figures may underlie some of the decisions taken by actors in the field of social housing, my research supported my initial premonition that political analyses and perceptions – very subjective subjects – played at least an equally important role. Since relatively little is written about the links between community organizations, intermediary organizations and the state in social policy formation, an exploratory approach seemed appropriate. The study would examine the different social housing actors (units of inquiry) taking part in the social housing debates of Cote-des-Neiges (the case) within a wider socio-political and policy environment (the context).

I designed a flexible plan of research that would allow me to adjust if I learned things in the course of research that called into question my initial plan. I was also interested in using a variety of sources of information for data triangulation. The principle methods employed in my research were in-depth interviewing, participant observation and documentary review (both contemporary and archival materials). These methods were concentrated on the local community actors but were also employed with the intermediary and state actors as well.

Perhaps the most notable characteristic of my research process was my status as a relative 'insider', someone who is accepted by those who are at the centre of my study as more or less 'one of them'. This status posed some challenges – such as difficulties in knowing what was meant for a researcher's ears versus a friend or fellow activist's – but they were not insurmountable. There were also advantages to having prior knowledge of the Cote-des-Neiges neighbourhood and the domain of organizing. The qualitative approach to research described by Yegedis et al. fits well what I was trying to achieve:

> In qualitative research, the researcher is really the primary
> instrument for data collection and analysis. The data are processed
> as they are received. There is no pretence that the researcher can
> collect data in an objective, value-free manner. In fact, when

> interviews are used, the relationships between the researcher and those being interviewed may be openly supportive and even therapeutic at times. A lack of detachment on the part of the researcher is believed to facilitate understanding. (Yegidis, Weinbach, and Morrison-Rodriguez 1999:18)

My lack of detachment from the research setting helped me to access certain types of information that would have otherwise been unachievable to a researcher. This 'insider' role is also acceptable in a feminist framework for research:

> ...feminist methods are characterized by relatively open relationships between researchers and research participants. Researchers may get involved with the lives of participants by establishing relationships with them that go beyond simple data collection. They often serve as resources to participants by providing information about community resources or may assist them in bringing about social change... Questions asked often emanate from researchers' own concerns and experiences rather than out of some previously developed interview schedule or agenda. The knowledge acquired through this kind of interpersonal interaction leads logically to an interpretative approach to data analysis that makes no claims of total objectivity. (Yegidis et al. 1999:144)

This was very much my experience in undertaking this thesis.

In the remainder of this section, I will describe and justify my chosen methodology in terms of research tools and sources of information. This thesis used the case study approach to research with a combination of sources of information: what I experienced (my observations as a backdrop to my understanding), what they told me (semi-structured interviews), what they write (organizational documentation), what others write about community groups and the policy process (the academic literature on community organizing, the state and social policy, housing).

Documentary sources of information

At the beginning of the research process, I found it important to seek out documentary sources of background information in a number of different forms: academic literature on housing, community organizing, immigrant neighbourhoods, research methods, etc.; gray literature from the community

organizations and intermediary groups who would form the basis of my study; and official reports and policy papers from the government actors. This initiation to the factual information around my topic, the policy framework in which the struggle around social housing takes place, as well as to the ways in which the different actors choose to portray themselves in writing was helpful as I made my first forays into interviewing. Having some background in the topic helped me to follow discussions, understand some of the history leading up to current positions or actions as well as have some initial exposure to the types of relations between the different actors.

Although this documentary exploration was concentrated at the beginning of my study, it was an ongoing process throughout. I found it important to follow the evolution of housing debates and the different ways in which groups presented the issues. Throughout the process of my research, it was useful to read the documentation developed by the organizations involved in the housing debate. Their flyers, reports, policy papers, policy briefs, action alerts, etc, all contributed to my improved understanding of their work and their relationships to each other.

An additional source of very valuable information was the archives of the Organisation d'éducation et d'informations logement (OEIL), one of the local housing organizations. On the occasion of its 30th anniversary, OEIL invited me to help them prepare a report based on the organization's history, pointing out that this information would also be useful to my thesis. Their archives contained a rich mixture of newspaper clippings, old newsletters, flyers, letters from funders and collaborators, posters, reports and minutes from many coalitions and allied organizations, photographs and many other types of documents. I sifted through all of this information with another staff person and an intern and then wrote a report that was distributed to their members and many others in the neighbourhood. Moreover, I was able to gather the material on which the historical profile of the neighbourhood and its housing organizing are based.

With regard to a review of current social housing policy, I undertook a historical overview of federal, Quebec and Montreal housing policy. I was interested in the trends in housing policy and government ideology and the factors

behind these changes. I wanted to identify ways in which politics influences policy and whether there is evidence of impact by community groups.

I developed files of the documents gathered in the process, as well as a database of references with my notes using the ProCite reference program.

Observation

As mentioned above, I was able to begin this research having already had significant exposure to the housing organizations of the neighbourhood and the way that they work. This previously gained knowledge served as a starting point in clarifying my research approach. In the course of my PhD, I began acting as an observer more formally. I was intensively engaged with these organizations over the course of three years; spending two and a half days per week with local housing organizations or at related activities. I have kept a log of the activities in which I participated along with brief notes about my observations on specific days. My goal in participant observation was to develop a good sense of the context in which the housing organizing takes place in order to better orient my interviews and my final analysis.

The understanding I gained through the time spent participating in CDN organizations was critical in determining how to select the organizations on which I would focus. In addition to the organization being involved in housing issues in immigrant neighbourhoods, my criteria for selection included: being a grassroots membership-based organization; engaging in collective action; participating in struggles for social housing (whether locally or provincially); participating in policy debates (whether directly or via intermediary groups). My prior involvement with housing committees, however, meant that "getting in" (Berg 2001:136), in terms of research, was very easy. Once I had negotiated access to the two principal organizations from which I would branch out, access to the other actors was relatively simple. I was able to attend events, trainings and meetings at other, especially intermediary, organizations as an activist member of my home-base organizations.

I was able to participate in a wide range of activities undertaken by the housing actors: outreach activities, staff meetings, training sessions, strategic planning, community meetings, work sessions, public events, coalition meetings, social events, 'down-time', etc. During these activities, I was able to engage in informal interviews with people involved with the organization, especially the members whom I would not be formally interviewing. My visits to other organizations and institutions in the neighbourhood allowed me to observe how their missions intersected with the housing organization's mission.

Interviews

Semi-structured interviews formed the core of my research design and were done in the last two years of my project. I developed interview guides that covered issues raised by my theoretical framework and my observations as a participant in the housing organizing. Although I was interested in having participants answer similar questions for the purposes of comparison, I allowed myself to remain open to following interesting issues raised during an interview. In the context of a qualitative, single-case case study, sample 'representativeness' was not a concern; I was rather seeking to speak with all those actors directly connected to social housing development and policy issues for Côte-des-Neiges, following more the principle of 'saturation' (Yegidis et al. 1999: 17-8).

I began the interviewing with the members of the Cote-des-Neiges Housing Table as the core of social housing organizing in my case study neighbourhood. Then I followed their relationships up through the different levels of intervention to interview all the actors with whom they had contact in their efforts to achieve their goals, eventually reaching 29 people working for 22 different organizations or agencies (please refer to Annex 1 for a complete list of interview participants).

Based upon my observations, I divided my interview targets into four categories: key informants, community actors, intermediary actors and state actors. For each of these categories, I designed a different interview guide (please refer to Annexes 2-4 for examples of each type of interview). There were certain

questions that were posed to every interview participant, regardless of their category, and I also added a few questions specific to each organization from which I interviewed a representative.

In all cases, the person interviewed was a staff person working directly on questions of social housing and I met with them at their place of work to conduct the interviews. I explained the goals of the study, how the information would be used and their rights as participants. I said that I would not use their names in the report but that the organizations would be identified. I also said that I would send them copies of anything that I intended to publish in which their organizations were named (other than the thesis itself), for their feedback before publication. I then obtained their consent (please refer to Annex 5) and, with their agreement, I tape-recorded the interviews. Afterwards, all interviews were transcribed verbatim.

Key informants

Near the beginning of my interview process, I interviewed three key informants, people who had a long and varied experience in the field of social housing. These people each had 25 to 30 years of experience in Montreal's social housing networks (including in Cote-des-Neiges) and had experience working for non-governmental actors at the neighbourhood, city, provincial and federal levels as well as experience either working for or collaborating closely with state actors, particularly at the municipal level. The key informants offered a historical and contextual view of the domain of social housing, since they were familiar with how policies and actors had changed over the years. These interviews were also very helpful in identifying others for future interviews; these key informants referred me to actors who were more open because of the reference from a trusted colleague.

Talking with community actors

At the community level, I targeted the 9 sitting members of the Housing Table. I sought to document the way in which housing organizing happens in Cote-des-Neiges, the variety of organizations involved and the diversity of

perspectives that might exist at the local level. I also interviewed the director of the local housing OSBL, Habitations communautaires de Cote-des-Neiges, who was not a member of the Housing Table but whose absence on the Table was notable (as discussed later in Chapter 7). The local organizations were important in highlighting with which organizations they were in contact on other levels of housing intervention.

Talking with intermediary actors

The intermediary actors were involved at the municipal, provincial and federal levels, making their perspectives quite diverse. I interviewed intermediary organizations of which Cote-des-Neiges Housing Table participants were members or which my key informants or members of the Housing Table pointed to as significant players in the social housing debate. In all, I interviewed 2 municipal organizations, 3 at the provincial level and 2 at the federal level. These intermediary actors often speak on behalf of the organizations working on the local level and therefore have an important impact on the relationships and outcomes possible in Cote-des-Neiges. My access to these actors was facilitated by my previous participation in many of their activities and the connections developed over the years through my involvement in the social housing movement.

Talking with state actors

Among state actors, I first targeted those responsible for projects or the direct implementation of policies in our case study neighbourhood. This led me to interview 5 representatives at the municipal level. Only the municipal government and its para-public agencies had direct ties to the Cote-des-Neiges housing context, however, so from the municipal interview participants I sought their connections to social housing actors at the provincial and federal level. This led me to conduct one interview with a representative of the Société d'habitation du Québec and three representatives at the federal level (National Secretariat on Homeless and the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation - CMHC). It was much more difficult to reach people working in government and more difficult to

secure their agreement to engage in interviews. In fact, I was refused by several important players, including politicians and staff at the borough level and the Office municipal d'habitation de Montréal (OMHM). The reasons for this were not entirely clear. Interestingly, for state actors at all three levels of government, my connection to the Metropolis research network[24] opened doors as I met many of my research subjects at Metropolis conferences or in meetings prior to approaching them for interviews.

Process of analysis

I used the same basic process of analysis for all my sources of information. I began by defining themes, both those from my theoretical framework and those that emerged in the process of research. I then coded all of my data and arranged the information according to these themes. What came afterwards was a process of analyzing the information that I had collected, developing arguments and reflections, determining whether my initial ideas, arguments and reflections were really supported by the information, and moving forward.

Links to my conceptual framework

My conceptual framework helped me to focus my research inquiries across my participant observation, my semi-structured interviews and my documentary analysis. To begin with, I operated using the concept of a local place and social context being significant to the interpretation, appropriation and implementation of social policy (White 1993; Hasson and Ley 1994) Given my interest in the impact of formal state structures on community group actions (Ng et al. 1990), I was sure to draw out the formal structures that exist around social

---

[24] The Metropolis project is a Canada-wide research network that brings together nongovernmental organizations, academics and government representatives in order to examine issues of immigration and cities. There are five Centres of Excellence (Halifax, Montreal, Toronto, Edmonton, Vancouver) as well as an international office in Rotterdam, Netherlands. See www.metropolis.net

housing development and policy, seeking the official descriptions of these structures (in law and rhetoric) as well as community actors' understanding of them. In trying to understand the underlying power dynamics (Muller et al. 1990; Evans and Wekerle 1997; Gutiérrez and Lewis 1998), I paid special attention to situations where reality did not fit the official state structures and then sought out the possible interests that might be at play in a particular situation. I also was attentive to power dynamics around gender and immigration issues, particularly in the community organizing. Community roles in relation to the state (Panet-Raymond 1992; White 1997) were explored in light of numerous factors including official relations, personal relations, funding issues and ideology. I was interested in how community groups positioned themselves in their dealings with the government. I also wanted to document community actions in relation to the state (Dominelli 1989; Shragge 2003), looking for examples of concrete measures taken by community organizations in their efforts to impact government policy or development of new social housing units. My final challenge was to analyze the relations between the various elements.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have shared the experiences that led me to select a qualitative case study as my guiding research method. Within this case study, I have employed participant observation, semi-structured interviews and analysis of both current and archival documents. This research, guided by my conceptual framework discussed in the previous chapter, was focused on the Côte-des-Neiges neighbourhood, the Housing Table which is the hub of social housing development and policy debates, and all the intermediary and state actors with which it interacts. My research design is intended to provide an in-depth look at how social actors within a particular neighbourhood both are influenced by the state and, in turn, influence the state in the realm of social housing.

Chapter 6

Welcome to Côte-des-Neiges

Located at the bottom of the north slope of Mount Royal, Côte-des-Neiges (CDN) is a destination neighbourhood for many new immigrants. Following the original French habitants, the Irish settled into the neighbourhood throughout the 19th century. The Jewish community began establishing itself in the 1930s, slightly ahead of the post-war waves of immigrants who gave the neighbourhood its identity as a"terre d'accueil" or "point of landing" for new immigrants (Bujold 2000). Today, the neighbourhood's 100,000 residents speak 110 different languages and 51 % of the residents were born outside of Canada (Lang 2004). The Côte-des-Neiges CLSC informs us that the district's residents are "multicultural, recent immigrants and predominantly women" (CLSC Côte-des-Neiges 2001). The neighbourhood is one of contrasts, however, as we will see in this chapter. While the neighbourhood is home to important Montreal institutions and a significant upper middle class, it is also home to a significant population of poor and working class immigrants. The two groups are separated both socially and geographically.

The purpose for this chapter is to provide the social and economic background in which CDN community organizing for social housing takes place. Local decision-making around social housing is affected by the physical infrastructure present in the community, the history of the neighbourhood in relation to the rest of the city, current living conditions of local residents, and the socio-economic profile of residents (in terms of strengths and needs). An awareness of these factors helps to clarify the local influences on choices made by CDN housing actors in terms of roles taken on in relation to the state, demands in terms of social housing and community organizing approaches. I will begin this chapter with a historical and geographical description of the neighbourhood

before turning to a socio-economic statistical profile. I will conclude by presenting the current housing conditions of the neighbourhood.

History and Geography of Côte-des-Neiges

In its earliest days, Côte-des-Neiges was the first European rural settlement on the Island of Montreal outside of the original city, established in 1698 (Bujold 2000). For the first two centuries, the parish was essentially agricultural with some leather tanneries. It was not until 1875, when improved transportation allowed easier access to Montreal and there was increased immigration to Canada, that the parish began to take on the characteristics of a small village, becoming a municipality in 1889. Côte-des-Neiges was annexed to the City of Montreal and its growth into an inner suburb increased rapidly after 1920.

Often characterized as a low-income transitional neighbourhood, Côte-des-Neiges, as mentioned above, is also home to many important Montreal institutions. The Université de Montréal anchored the neighbourhood as an educational and institutional area when it followed the Jean-de-Brébeuf and Notre-Dame colleges to Côte-des-Neiges in 1928. The École Polytechnique and the Hautes Études Commerciales came later. Health institutions, including the Ste-Justine, Queen Mary, Jewish General Hospitals as well as the Gerontology Institute are also situated in the neighbourhood. In terms of important religious institutions, Saint Joseph's Oratory continues to be an important landmark. These institutions are the economic motor of the neighbourhood, estimated to generate between 15,000 and 20,000 jobs (Bujold 2000). While people who live outside the neighbourhood may hold many of these jobs, their spending nevertheless supports numerous local businesses.

Geographically, Côte-des-Neiges' determining feature is its position on the north side of Mount Royal. In its early days, this location was enough to make it seem remote from the town of Montreal. Even today, the fact that one has to 'cross the mountain' to reach downtown gives the neighbourhood a psychological

distance from the central city, especially from the bottom of the slope, despite the fact that the two are separated by a mere 10-minute bus ride.

Land-use in the neighbourhood follows the classic Montreal pattern of income and status, declining as one descends the slope (Gilliland and Olson 1998). The prestigious institutions of the neighbourhood are all located at the top of slope, with the view of the skyline from the bottom of the slope defined by the impressive view of the Université de Montréal's stark Art Deco design, as well as the Catholic beacon of Saint Joseph's Oratory. Single-family homes and semi-detached duplexes are concentrated around these institutions. The value of housing declines and its density increases as one descends the slope. This uphill/downhill split also had important repercussions for public health, especially child mortality, in the past (Olson and Thornton 1991). The stream to which the original settlers were drawn, flowing from Mount Royal to the Rivière des Prairies, had to be covered at the beginning of the century due to its transformation into an open sewer (Bujold 2000).

Today, there are several important thoroughfares that help to define the neighbourhood. Côte-des-Neiges Road itself runs through the centre of the neighbourhood. This is the face of Côte-des-Neiges that is known by those who live outside the neighbourhood. Running north/south between downtown and the Town of Mount Royal, this street has heavy traffic and many businesses (mostly retail and services such as restaurants, bakeries, small groceries, etc.) that employ local people. Those businesses at the top of the slope mainly serve the students of the Université de Montréal, the staff of the health institutions and the more wealthy residents who live at the top of the hill. People driving to the local institutions, the local businesses or heading downtown contribute to the very heavy car traffic on Côte-des-Neiges Boulevard. Pedestrian traffic is lighter than on some other streets in the neighbourhood, perhaps in part because the public transportation is quite good along this street. The bus passes every 5 minutes throughout most of the day and there is also a metro station, accounting perhaps for the 44.9% of Cote-des-Neiges residents who get to work using public transit (Lang 2004).

Lower down on the slope, the businesses are more oriented to the local immigrant population with lower incomes: ethnic groceries, dollar stores, and second-tier retail. Many government services and the more established community organizations targeting the lower-income population (ex. Centre local d'emploi, immigrant settlement agencies, community mental health services, etc.) are also located on the bottom part of Côte-des-Neiges.

The community thoroughfare for the neighbourhood's lower-income immigrant population is Victoria Avenue. This is the street where the ethnic groceries and restaurants are concentrated (representing an impressive array of origins). Pedestrian traffic is heavy on this street. This is also where many of the more grassroots community organizations are located, particularly small ethnic associations. Two other important streets serve as community borders: the Decarie autoroute forms the western edge of the neighbourhood and Jean-Talon (in parallel with a set of train tracks) forms the neighbourhood's northern edge. Both of these streets are extremely busy and are difficult to cross on foot. They are more industrial or commercial in their land use and are significant psychological borders.

In terms of the community organizing that occurs within the neighbourhood, the geographic divides that highlight social difference come into play. Local community organizations focus their efforts on the northern sector of the neighbourhood or along Victoria Avenue. The neighbourhood layout also has an impact on people's use of the space with less social and residential mobility north/south (uphill/downhill) than east/west (flat), an important factor in planning community organizing meetings and events. The geographic patterns of Côte-des-Neiges follow an overall historical settlement pattern in Montreal and continue to be helpful in understanding the social dynamics that influence both housing and broader social issues in the neighbourhood today.

Socio-economic statistical profile

Constructing a statistical profile of the CDN neighbourhood is a little more complicated than it might seem. The City of Montreal's statistical measures are aggregated according to the boroughs and Côte-des-Neiges shares its borough with Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, an adjoining neighbourhood with a rather different socio-economic profile (City of Montreal 2004). The CLSC Côte-des-Neiges provides interesting statistics that are specific to the neighbourhood in its annual reports but, there is the complexity of the statistics including both Snowdon (the wealthier part of the neighbourhood) and the southern part of the neighbourhood (CLSC Côte-des-Neiges 2001). The CDN/Snowdon Community Council has taken the 2001 census data and generated statistics that are most useful to understanding the reality of the neighbourhood, making distinctions between different sectors of the neighbourhood (Lang 2004). In this section of the chapter, I will present assorted socio-economic statistics that aid in setting the context in which community organizing in Côte-des-Neiges occurs. The statistics are based on the 2001 Canadian census data for Côte-des-Neiges, drawing heavily on the compilation prepared by the Community Council but also on the 2001 Annual Report of the local CLSC for the 1996 figures.

The characteristics highlighted here were selected because I believe that they have an influence both on community organizing and people's experience of housing issues. Socio-economic factors are important in community organizing since they are indicators (although not determinants) of the issues that will interest people, the types of organizing approaches that might appeal to them, the meaning of 'representativeness' in terms of participation, the forms of communication that might be most relevant, etc. All of these issues intersect as well with housing issues and whether or how social housing might be considered a response.

Population

There were 100,114 people living in Côte-des-Neiges in 2001, a number that has been steadily increasing with every census. Since 1986, for example, the population has increased by 14 %. At 5.5 % of the total population of Montreal

(one of the most populous neighbourhoods), Côte-des-Neiges is also growing at a faster rate than the city overall. Unlike most Montreal neighbourhoods, youth are expected to represent a greater proportion of the CDN population in coming years. Those under 19 years old accounted for 20.4% of the population in 1996 and 22.8 % in 2001. In contrast, the senior population (65 and over) has decreased slightly, from 15.9% in 1996 to 14.2% in 2001 and this trend is expected to continue, although their absolute numbers have increased. Women, who make up 53.9% of the population, outnumber the men in the neighbourhood.

Family composition

Family composition is another area of interest in Cote-des-Neiges. There are 23,890 families in the neighbourhood, and 15,650 of these families have children. Côte-des-Neiges has a rate of single parent families equivalent to the rate for the whole of Montreal (21.9%) but single-parent families, 86.8% of which are headed by women, are concentrated in the northern, low-income sector of the neighbourhood. The rate of families with 3 or more children is almost double in Cote-des-Neiges compared to the rest of Montreal (17.4% versus 9.9%). Large families tend to be headed by couples; Cote-des-Neiges single parents (at 11.2%) have a rate closer to the Montreal average.

Immigration

More than half (51%) of CDN residents were born outside of Canada and, as of 2001, one third (32.4%) of these immigrants had arrived in the past 5 years (16.5% of all CDN residents). Of the total population in 2001, one third has arrived in the last 10 years. Together, Côte-des-Neiges and Snowdon received 14.3% of immigrants arriving in Montreal between 1991 and 1996.

In terms of current immigration status, most Cote-des-Neiges residents are currently Canadian citizens (78.1%) but there is a greater proportion of citizenship in Montreal as a whole (91.3%). The presence of people without permanent residence in Canada is nearly three times that found in Montreal as a whole (5% versus 1.8%).

The top ten countries of birth among CDN immigrants are: Philippines (13.8%), Morocco (5.8%), Sri Lanka (5.7%), Vietnam (5.1%), France (4.5%), Romania (4.4%), China (4.1%), India (3.1%), Bangladesh (2.8%) and Algeria (2.8%). These numbers account for only 52.1% of the neighbourhood's immigrants, an indication of the diversity of the neighbourhood. In the past 5 years, the top 10 countries of origin of new immigrants include the same countries in somewhat different proportions, with Vietnam being replaced by Russia.

Cultural and racial diversity

The ethnic profile of residents of Cote-des-Neiges is markedly different from most Montreal neighbourhoods. Among CDN residents, only 0.6% reported their ethnic origin as 'Quebecois'. 'Canadian' was the most common ethnic origin given (15.8%), followed closely by French (13.4%). The next 8 most common origins given in the 2001 census are Lebanese (10.7%), Jewish (10.3%), Filipino (6.8%), Austrian (4.2%), Chinese (4.1%), British (3.6%), East Indian (3.5%) and English (3.4%).

The proportion of allophone residents (those whose first language is neither French nor English) in Cote-des-Neiges rose from 29.1% in 1991, to 40.7% in 1996, to 45.8% in 2001. This is in comparison to only 9% within the entire city Montreal. French is mother tongue for 20.8% of area residents (compared to 53.4% in Montreal as a whole) and English is mother tongue for 28.7% (compared to Montreal's 17.4%). After these two languages, however, the diversity is striking. The principal "allophone" languages spoken are Tamil, Vietnamese, Russian, Tagalog, Bengali, Spanish and Arabic. In terms of official languages (French & English), a total of 4% of CDN residents speak neither French nor English, while 27% are bilingual, 55% speak only English and 14% speak only French.

Racial diversity is also striking in Cote-des-Neiges, with 45.5% of residents self-identifying as members of a 'visible minority' compared to 21% of all Montrealers. Among these, South Asian, Black and Filipino were each reported by 20% of local residents to be their identity group in terms of visible

minority status. After these groups, Southeast Asians, Arabs, Chinese and Latin Americans were each between 6 and 10% of the visible minorities in the neighbourhood. Many other groups are present in proportions of 2% or less. Most world religions are also represented in CDN, as testified by the great diversity of places of worship and other religious institutions (ex. Catholic, Protestant, Hindu, Muslim, Jewish, Buddhist).

Economic status

Using Statistics Canada's definition of a 'low-income household' (one that spends 55% or more of its income on food, shelter and clothing), the situation in Cote-des-Neiges improved between 1996 and 2001, down to 41% from 47%. This rate of poverty is still much higher than the Montreal average of 29%, however. These low-income households are concentrated in the northern end of the neighbourhood, with the rate going as high in 60%. Overall, the neighbourhood median household income was $33,874 compared to Montreal's $35,910. Interestingly, singles in Cote-des-Neiges have a higher median income ($21,548) than the Montreal average ($20,296). Cote-des-Neiges families have lower incomes, however: $44,550 versus Montreal's average of $47,702. Two-parent families do better than single-parent families, earning an average of $49,080. It is surprising, however, that despite the overall trend of men earning more than women, Cote-des-Neiges single mothers earn significantly more ($29,475) than single fathers ($22,408). This is contrary to the Montreal situation where single mothers earn $27,712 compared to single fathers' $37,722.

Employment

In 2001, unemployment remained higher in Cote-des-Neiges than the Montreal average (12.5% versus 9.2%). These numbers are down from 1996, when they were 19% and 13% respectively. Unemployment is unevenly distributed, however, with rates below the neighbourhood average in the census tracts at the southern extreme of the territory (as low as 6.6%) and rates well above the average at the northern extreme (as high as 20.8%). Men in Cote-des-Neiges suffer more from unemployment (13.1%) than women (11.9%), especially

among youth aged 15 to 24 (16.2% unemployed young men, 12.3% of young women).

Among those employed, only 9.6% are self-employed. The remaining workers are concentrated in the manufacturing (20.6%), health (10.9%), professional (10.4%), educational (9.5%) and retail (8.3%) sectors. Significantly, most workers (54.2%) in the neighbourhood worked only part-time or for part of the year with an average income of only $19,507. Those who worked full-time year-round had much better pay: $39,581. Women (56.9%) are more often in this situation of low paying, part-time or partial-year work, a work profile that earns them a yearly average of $16,913. The lower proportion of men in this situation (51.6%) earn more than the women at $22,278. This earning differential is also present among full-time, year-round workers: men earn an average of $44,417 while women take home an average of $33,831.

Education

Cote-des-Neiges is one of Montreal's most highly educated neighbourhoods. A total of 45% of neighbourhood residents are currently enrolled or have completed a university degree, significantly higher than Montreal's rate of 30.3%. The women of CDN are more likely to have university degrees (52.3%) than their male neighbours (47.7%). Also of interest is that Cote-des-Neiges also has a lower rate of people who have less than a Grade 9 education (8.5% in CDN compared to 14.7%). This high rate of education can be partially explained by the high numbers of students who live in the neighbourhood but the pattern holds even when one looks at specific census tracks in the northern sector of Côte-des-Neiges that is inhabited by immigrant families. The students are concentrated in the southern sector of the neighbourhood.

Housing conditions in Côte-des-Neiges

In Chapter 7, I will describe in more detail the historical development of housing in Cote-des-Neiges, particularly in relation to state intervention. Here I

will offer more of a snap-shot of current conditions, drawing on statistics from the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC 2000 and 2003) the Société d'habitation du Québec (SHQ 1981-2001), and Statistics Canada (StatsCan 2001), as compiled by the Front d'action populaire pour le réaménagement urbain (FRAPRU) and the CDN/Snowdon Community Council (Lang 2004; FRAPRU 2004). The social and economic profile of the neighbourhood's residents intersect here in order to influence resident's ability to secure good quality and affordable housing. The difficult housing situation of many local residents, as evidenced in the statistics below, is a driving force in local organizations' decisions to continue their organizing for social housing.

To begin with, in 2001, Cote-des-Neiges had nearly 20% more renters than Montreal as a whole (82.6% versus Montreal's 64.2%). This proportion has decreased by 1.2% since 1996. During that 5-year period only 550 new housing units were constructed – most of them luxury condominiums – while there were 4165 extra people who live in the neighbourhood. It is unlikely that these new condominium units house an average of 7.6 people so we can safely assume that the density of occupancy has increased somewhat across the neighbourhood. Despite the high proportion of large families in the neighbourhood, there is a lower proportion of large apartments, indicating a problem of overcrowding.

The neighbourhood's apartments are in poor repair, with more of them requiring either major (11.7%) or minor (27.7%) repairs than Montreal's average of 8.5% and 27.3% respectively. Despite the poor conditions, the 2001 average rent (including electricity, heat and municipal taxes) in Cote-des-Neiges was higher than elsewhere in the city: $606 versus $570. Rent increases between 2000 and 2003 have been well above the 0.2-4% that has been recommended by the Rental Board: studios have increased 17.3%, 1-bedrooms 18.6%, 2-bedrooms 11.7%, and 3-bedrooms 10.4%. Vacancy rates remain well below the 3% signaled by the CMHC as the rate of supply and demand equilibrium (Pearsall and Trumble 1996), slightly up from the worst of the housing crisis to reach 1.2% in 2003 (FRAPRU 2004).

With such high rents in a low income neighbourhood, it is not surprising that nearly half of Cote-des-Neiges households are unable to secure what the CMHC defines as 'affordable' housing: paying less than 25% of household income for housing (Rochon 1997). A full fifth of Cote-des-Neiges households spend more than 50% of their income on housing, 40% of households spend 30% of their income on housing and a remarkable 49.6% spend 24% or more on their housing. This burden is more heavily felt among particular segments of the population. Groups with a higher than average representation in each of the categories (25%, 30%, 50% of income spent on housing) are youth aged 15 to 24 years old, seniors (65 and over), women, single-parent mothers and people living alone (Lang 2004; FRAPRU 2004).

Summary

This chapter offers a profile of the neighbourhood that was the backdrop for this thesis' case study. Its history and geography was reviewed, its current socio-economic profile presented and its current housing conditions introduced. This information will be helpful when considering the findings of my research by providing the overall context in which the case study's organizing for social housing takes place. This neighbourhood's most striking characteristics are its immigrant and ethnic diversity, its low household incomes and its difficult housing conditions. The economic and housing difficulties are concentrated in the northern part of Cote-des-Neiges, however, and this is the part of the neighbourhood targeted by those working on social housing issues in the neighbourhood.

Chapter 7

Housing Actors in Côte-des-Neiges: community, intermediary and state

The starting point in understanding community-state dynamics around housing issues in our case study neighbourhood is to determine which actors are involved. As is the case in many Montreal neighbourhoods, the answer to this question in Côte-des-Neiges is complex. Throughout the history of housing organizing in the neighbourhood, there have been a fascinating variety of organizations involved, with a variety of mandates and a variety of constituencies. Over time, intermediary organizations have taken a more important role in the struggle for social housing and the mandates and constituencies of these organizations have evolved. When we consider which state or public actors are involved, we see that they have also changed through time with different levels of government (federal, state and municipal) having varying degrees of prominence depending upon the political era. It is also interesting to note at which level of government each of these actors decide it is appropriate for them to intervene as well as how they come to such decisions.

In this chapter, I will introduce the actors involved in Côte-des-Neiges, describing their mandates, constituencies and where they intervene in the processes of social housing development and policy. Drawing on interviews with people who work with these organizations, the documents they produce and my own observations and experiences within social housing networks, I will begin with local organizations, then turn to intermediary groups before examining state actors. After profiling these actors, I will address the object of their action – social housing – by presenting the varying definitions that underlie their social housing objectives. To conclude, I will provide a summary of the basic findings related to the participants in the social housing struggle, exploring the complexity of their mandates, constituencies and levels of intervention.

Those on the ground: local social housing actors

Côte-des-Neiges is a neighbourhood with a robust history of housing organizing. Housing, in fact, was one of the earliest issues tackled by local, membership-based, community organizations. The early to mid-1970s saw the establishment of two organizations that would address housing, one as its sole mandate (CDN Tenants' Association – which later became the Organisation d'éducation et d'informations logement) and the other as one of its core activities (Project Genesis). These two organizations, somewhat different in their structures and approaches, remain the leaders of CDN housing organizing. Today, however, there is quite a broad range of local organizations involved in housing. Whether involved directly, as members of the CDN Housing Table, or indirectly, giving their support via the Community Council of CDN/Snowdon, the community organizations of the neighbourhood have made housing rights and social housing a priority.

In this section, I will offer a brief history of housing organizing activities in CDN, bringing us up to the creation of the current Housing Table. The creation and mandate of the Housing Table will be described before turning to a profile of the diverse organizations that constitute its membership. I will highlight three particular aspects of these organizations: their origins, their missions and their membership or accountability. In reviewing the interview data, it emerged that these three characteristics appeared to be related to both the relationships groups had with other intermediary and state actors, and the organizing strategies the groups chose in intervening on social housing issues. Interestingly, there are several local actors, deeply involved in housing issues, who do not sit on the Housing Table. This "significant absence" will be explored (McMahon and . 1996).

History of different actors' involvement in housing organizing in CDN

The earliest form of state intervention for affordable housing in Côte-des-Neiges came with the post-war subsidy of the construction of the neighbourhood's many walk-up apartment buildings. In particular, the northern part of the neighbourhood ("at the bottom of the hill") – Plamondon, Barclay, Goyer and Bedford – saw, during the 1950s, the construction of many buildings for which the landlords benefited from CMHC mortgage subsidies (ex. 1948 Rental Insurance Plan and 1954 Mortgage Insurance Plan). These subsidies resulted in much-needed new units but the program provided little incentive for landlords to maintain the buildings once tenants had moved in. While the human-scale buildings (typically three stories high with 6 to 18 units) have the potential for a good neighbourhood environment, early residents reported problems from the start (Godin 1994).

By the early 1970s, conditions for tenants were difficult in the northern part of the neighbourhood. Vermin, poor heating and disrepair were rampant. Housing issues were an obvious choice for the two membership-based organizations that took up the issue in the 1970s. The local Comité d'action politique, composed mainly of University of Montreal student activists, spawned the CDN Tenants' Association in 1971, later to become OEIL (Organisation pour l'éducation et l'information pour les locataires). Project Genesis, created in 1976, also made housing rights one of its core concerns and early tenant organizing focused on collective action to get repairs done, refuse abusive rent increases and educate tenants about their rights. Within a few years, however, OEIL in particular became involved with Montreal-wide coalitions fighting for a freeze on rent hikes, for an enforceable housing code and for citizen-controlled neighbourhood development. OEIL was active in the creation of the Regroupement des comités logement et associations des locataires du Québec (RCLALQ) and, to a lesser extent, the Front d'action populaire pour le réaménagement urbain (FRAPRU) during this period.

The 1970s also saw the creation and expansion of both the federal and provincial social housing programs described in earlier chapters. For the most part, however, these programs were absent from Côte-des-Neiges in their first years. Several factors help to explain this: Côte-des-Neiges' housing stock was comparatively new within the Montreal context, the postwar mortgage subsidies helped to keep rents comparatively low and there just wasn't very much space available for construction. By the late 1970s, however, rents started to rise in the neighbourhood and the private rental market, with its high incidence of problems, made a social alternative look both attractive and necessary to CDN community workers and activists.

The HLM Committee was established in 1981 by local community groups to put pressure on the provincial and municipal governments to construct HLM (habitations à loyer modique) or public housing units, in the neighbourhood. Other Montreal neighbourhoods with similar socio-economic profiles benefited from government construction of public housing before Côte-des-Neiges. The coordinator of OEIL tells the story of the Committee:

> En 1981, on avait fondé un Comité HLM qui a fonctionné jusqu'en 1994-95, jusqu'à ce que le gouvernement cesse de construire des HLM… Je me souviens qu'on a parti ce comité en distribuant des tracts dans le quartier et à plusieurs groupes et en faisant une assemblée un dimanche... Il y avait environ 75 personnes, mais après cela on a fait des assemblées où il y avait environ 125 personnes. Le comité était composé de représentant de l'OEIL, de Genèse – ROMEL est arrivé plus tard – le CLSC (Centre local de services communautaires) et le Golden Age Association. On a fait des pressions. Quand on a commencé, il y avait seulement un HLM pour personnes âgées… Environ deux-trois mois après la création du comité, il y a eu la création d'un autre HLM pour personnes âgées. On a eu un rôle direct et indirect et l'on a mis l'accent pour les HLM pour les familles mais ç'a été difficile. Quand même, au début il y avait 75 logements et quand le comité a cessé de se réunir, on était à 1000 logements.

The extensive work of the HLM Committee in raising awareness about the poor housing conditions in Côte-des-Neiges and organizing tenants to demand improvements may have contributed to the events that led to a significant turning point in the neighbourhood's housing history.

In 1989, Côte-des-Neiges was targeted by the City of Montreal for important social housing investments. In the late 1980s, a progressive city council had been elected that, in 1988, created a new para-public agency dedicated to real estate development, the Société d'habitation de Montréal (SHDM). Robert Cohen, previously a key staff person in the historic Milton Park Cooperative Housing project, was hired as the SHDM's first director. Under his leadership, the City of Montreal, via the SHDM, embarked on an ambitious project to buy and renovate rental housing before turning the management of these buildings over to cooperatives or OSBLs, making use of the Programme d'acquisition de logements locatifs (PALL) that combined provincial and federal subsidies. The HLM Committee, and particularly OEIL's coordinator, played an important role in helping the SHDM target problem buildings, inform tenants of their options and manage the changes on a community level. Throughout the process, the City and several community groups collaborated through a council created specifically for the purposes of the massive SHCM intervention. Today, this intervention is credited with having had a major impact upon the quality of life in the neighbourhood, reversing the neighbourhood's slide into drug and crime problems (Bernèche and Serge 1994; Serge and Monfort 1995).

Despite its relative success, the HLM Committee disbanded once the federal government had terminated its funding of HLMs in 1993__. With no social housing funding available, the raison d'être of the Committee, pressuring the City and province to invest HLM dollars in the neighbourhood, was lost. Project Genesis was the only member of the HLM Committee that lent its active support to FRAPRU's ongoing campaign to insist upon a return to funding for new social housing units. A few years later, when, as described in Chapter 2, the provincial government filled the funding gap with the creation of PARCO, the Program for Acquisition and Renovation by Cooperative or Non-profits (OSBL), local organizations rethought their involvement in social housing issues. According to Project Genesis' former housing organizer, "Quand est arrivé le PARCO et, après, Accès-Logis, on a senti le besoin de regarder ça ensemble, s'impliquer là-dans, alors on a mis sur pied la Table logement." With the

increasing influence and stability of the CDN /Snowdon Community Council, this was chosen as a valuable home base for the committee. Not only were there some minor resources to help with the coordination of the committee but the Council was also recognized by both local community groups and the City as a legitimate representative of community concerns.

The Housing Table today

Today, the Housing Table is a working group of the CDN/Snowdon Community Council. Membership on the Housing Table is open to any member of the CDN Community Council who wants to be directly involved in strategic planning and decision-making about social housing projects in the neighbourhood. The Table meets once a month – more often if necessary – and makes recommendations to the broader Council on which social housing projects to back and when to step up the pressure to help blocked projects move ahead.

The Community Council itself was created in 1985 and incorporated in 1987. According to the current coordinator, at that time,

> Un certain nombre d'intervenants se rencontraient pour voir comment ils pourraient travailler ensemble sur certains dossiers qui ne relèvent pas du mandat d'un organisme en particulier mais qui sont des mandats où il fallait se concerter. Et je pense que la question du manque d'infrastructure collective a été un dossier important là-dans. En se parlant, les intervenants voyaient qu'ils avaient certaines préoccupations en commun mais, certain, aucun d'eux pouvait le porter seul... C'était de se donner une voix commune, d'être plusieurs voix à réfléchir ou de travailler sur les mêmes enjeux.

Project Genesis, OEIL, the Centre communautaire de loisir de CDN and the CLSC, still important actors in the neighbourhood today, were part of the Community Council's creation. In fact, all four of these organizations still have staff members who have been involved from the onset, a rarity among community groups. The Community Council's members must be local organizations with a democratic, membership-based structure. Government agencies and non-membership based charitable organizations are not eligible, although an exception has been made for the CLSC since they were involved in establishing the Council:

> Actuellement, c'est que les groupes communautaires qui
> peuvent être membres. Le CLSC est membre mais c'est la seule
> institution ou organisme publique qui est membre parce que le
> CLSC faisait partie des membres fondateurs du Conseil
> communautaire et c'est la seule institution qui était membre au
> moment où on s'est donné ce mandat, où l'on a passé ce
> règlement-là. Le CLSC était membre à ce moment-là alors : droit
> acquis.

The membership basis for the Community Council is a source of pride for CDN community groups who view their Council as being independent and politically oriented. The terms of membership was raised by organizers in several local organizations who took care to explain the functioning of the Council:

> Le Conseil communautaire CDN/Snowdon, contrairement à
> d'autres Conseils communautaires similaires, nous, c'est seulement
> les organismes communautaires. Il y a le CLSC qui a un statut
> particulier et la CDEC[25], je crois, mais on n'a pas des élus, on n'a
> pas des représentants des fonctionnaires sur le Conseil
> communautaire. Dans d'autres quartiers, comme des Quartiers
> sensibles. Je pense à Parc-Extension, par exemple. Je crois que
> c'est quelque chose de particulier à Côte-des-Neiges. Je ne suis pas
> sûre que les autres auraient ça. Le "Quartier en santé", c'est des
> Conseils communautaires, mais d'un autre type. Ce n'est pas
> pareil, pour avoir connu les deux. On est plus militant ici, d'avoir
> connu aussi des deux parce que j'ai travaillé pour la table de
> concertation de Parc-Extension....

Non-members can attend Council meetings but cannot vote and can be asked to leave during sensitive or strategic discussions. This is quite different from most community councils; charities, police, Centres locaux d'emploi and even local politicians sit on the community councils of some other neighbourhoods.

The Community Council's general objectives lend themselves very well to supporting work for social housing. The Council's coordinator explains it this way:

> L'objectif général, c'est de favoriser la concertation entre les
> groupes communautaires du quartier pour améliorer les conditions,
> la qualité de vie des personnes qui habitent le quartier, plus
> particulièrement les personnes défavorisées... De favoriser la
> concertation entre les groupes communautaires et, éventuellement,

---

[25] Corporation de développement économique communautaire

> si on pense que ça peut être utile, avec d'autres acteurs de l'extérieur du quartier aussi... À travers les priorités qu'on se donne, par exemple, nos deux priorités : la lutte à la pauvreté – Bon ! C'est très large, la lutte à la pauvreté, mais parmi les choses plus précises qu'on s'est dit qu'on ferait, il y a, par exemple, la question d'avoir plus de logements sociaux dans le quartier. C'est clair qu'on veut le faire pour des personnes économiquement défavorisées. Ensuite, il y a une préoccupation très importante parce que plusieurs de nos membres font un travail plus spécifique d'accueil des nouveaux arrivants. Même ceux qui ne travaillent pas spécifiquement à l'accueil des nouveaux arrivants, tous les organismes ont en commun de travailler avec des personnes immigrantes.

A member of the Community Council's Executive Committee (elected by the membership), explains her organization's motivation for investing in the Council, linking the fight against poverty with housing:

> Je souhaite développer le quartier pour le mieux. En tout cas, avoir une concertation de gens qui travaillent dans différents milieux qui peuvent apporter des choses ensemble pour travailler sur des problématiques spécifiques au quartier ou dans le quartier, dont la pauvreté... Il y a la lutte à la pauvreté, le logement, la sécurité alimentaire qui sont les grands dossiers du Conseil communautaire – les luttes pour le bien-être de la population.

Today the HLM Committee's original members – Project Genesis, OEIL, the Côte-des-Neiges CLSC and ROMEL (the Regroupement des organismes du Montréal ethnique pour le logement) – are now joined by other neighbourhood organizations on the Community Council's Housing Table. Not only are there more community groups in Côte-des-Neiges since the HLM Committee's 1981 creation but, according to interviews with current members, more organizations have identified housing as a priority since disinvestment by the federal government and especially now in the context of Montreal's housing crisis. While the Golden Age Association has withdrawn from the Housing Table, new members include PROMIS[26] (immigrant settlement), Société environnementale de CDN (urban environment), Mountain Sights Community Centre (anti-poverty), MultiCaf (community cafeteria). The two technical resource groups (GRTs) who

---

[26] The name PROMIS comes from "Promotion - Integration - Société nouvelle".

serve the neighbourhood, ROMEL and Groupe CDH, also sit on the Table on a consultative basis.

It is interesting to note that the members of the CDN Housing Table are quite diverse in terms of their origins, mandates and dynamics of accountability to a membership. A description of this diversity, especially as it may affect their relationships with other actors, both intermediary and state, and their choices about organizing strategies, will be presented in the following sections.

Organizational missions

It was quite interesting to note the shift in organizational missions within the HLM Committee in the 1980s versus the Housing Table since the late 1990s. Whereas the original HLM Committee's members were all directly concerned with housing issues (either defending tenant rights or developing social housing projects themselves), the members of the Housing Table today have mandates that focus on a variety of issues: housing (development, policy, rights advocacy); general poverty and quality of life; food security; immigration; environment. Each of these organizations, however, came to believe that their mandates warranted involvement on the Housing Table. This diversity is of note for those who wish to broaden support for social housing organizing in general. As discussed in the literature review, housing is closely linked to outcomes in a wide range of social indicators, demonstrating that many organizations' missions are tied to housing, if they care to make the link. In Côte-des-Neiges, increasing numbers of groups have been expressing an issue in housing, mostly as a result of the housing crisis.

The two local organizations with **housing** as either their only mission or part of their principal mission are OEIL and Project Genesis. The two other organizations with housing as their principal missions are ROMEL and the Groupe CDH. As technical resource groups, they will be discussed later in this chapter in the section on intermediary organizations. Both OEIL and Project Genesis focus on the defense of tenants' rights, both through individual advocacy and through organizing related to housing policy. One of OEIL's employees

describes the basic services they offer to tenants, a combination of advocacy and organizing:

> Il y a les services qu'on donne aux locataires qui viennent à certains jours et il y a par ailleurs des autres dossiers qui ont pour but de faire avancer les choses. Donc les gens qui viennent ici ont utilisé les recours qui existent et l'autre partie du travail sert à améliorer ce qui va nous servir comme recours pour ceux qui vont venir dans l'avenir et ceux vers qui l'on va aller parce que, dans le deuxième volet, on ne veut pas que ça se déroule uniquement dans le local mais sur le terrain.

While both of these organizations were, from their inception, concerned with and active on the issue of tenants' rights within private housing (offering both individual rights counseling and building or block collective mobilization around rent increases, repairs, maintenance, harassment –all undeniable problems within Côte-des-Neiges) they were slower to take on social housing as an issue. Initially, they considered themselves organizations of "défense de droits", not development organizations. With no interest in becoming landlords themselves, OEIL and Project Genesis at first felt social housing development to be the concern of GRTs and groups interested in developing social housing projects themselves. With time, however, came the conviction that social housing would solve some of the problems that tenants face in private housing, along with the realization that the funding for such housing would take a lot of pressure from local organizations. A Project Genesis housing organizer describes her organization's activities since deciding to reinvigorate its participation in social housing issues after the demise of the HLM Committee of the 1980s:

> Avant on a eu des "ins and outs" sur la question du logement social... Mais depuis 96-97, on a décidé de mettre sur pied des ateliers de logement social, de recruter des locataires intéressés à participer aux actions en faveur du logement social, faire le suivi de projets Accès-Logis avec la Table logement.

Such activities fit well with Project Genesis' mission as described by another staff member:

> Premièrement de travailler avec les gens du quartier Côte-des-Neiges pour qu'ensemble tous on s'implique dans des actions et des activités qui permettent d'améliorer les conditions de vie dans le

> quartier... C'est important de le faire *avec* les gens, pas juste *pour* les gens. Aussi carrément d'informer les gens sur les programmes sociaux qui existe et les droits qu'ils ont pour recevoir tout l'argent auxquels ils ont droit et qu'ils puissent défendre leur intérêt eux-mêmes quand c'est possible de le faire. Alors c'est un peu les grands objectifs et pour faire ça il y a différents moyens....

Apart from tenant advising offered in Project Genesis' storefront, they also maintain a Housing Committee, a workgroup fighting for social housing. According to the Committee's community organizer:

> Mon travail, c'est d'amener les résidents du quartier à s'impliquer dans le comité logement social pour s'informer de ce que c'est le logement social, pour voir comment ça peut être une solution à long terme pour leurs problèmes individuels de logement et de les permettre de se rendre compte qu'ils ne sont pas les seuls à avoir des problèmes avec leur propriétaire ou à payer trop cher de loyer. Si on travaille tous ensemble quelque part on est capable d'influencer les politiques gouvernementales et d'avoir les budgets pour se donner des logements sociaux. Trouver des solutions collectives à nos problèmes individuels.

> Establishing the housing committee didn't necessarily come easily, however:

> J'ai dû développer mes choses à l'interne pour convaincre mon équipe de mettre sur pied un comité de logement social. Ç'a été long, pénible, difficile, les autres membres de l'équipe ont passé des commentaires très pertinents sur ma compréhension un peu particulière de la démocratie, mais j'ai fini par mettre sur pied un comité. C'est nouveau comme comité en soi.

One of the local members of the Housing Table – Mountain Sights Community Centre– have **general poverty issues and quality of life** as central to its mission, without any specific mention of housing. For this organization, it was not much of a leap to become involved in housing issues. The Mountain Sights neighbourhood is a sub-area of Côte-des-Neiges that is geographically and socially isolated. Squeezed in between the Decarie autoroute and an industrial area, Mountain Sights is a small, densely populated few streets with high poverty and notoriously horrendous housing conditions. There are almost no commercial services in Mountain Sights and the community centre was the first social or

community resource to be located there. The director and main community organizer of the Community Centre describes its mission as follows:

> Basically, to do outreach and to develop a sense of neighbourhood with the residents, to provide the residents with services based on their needs. In its mission it also states to provide specific services to women, to break their isolation and also to build their self-confidence so that they can become more autonomous and more self-assertive. That was one of the problems in this community. There was a lot of violence on this street, family violence. Access to other resources, to promote, to link the residents to services that exist outside of this neighbourhood: referral work with other resources as well. In our mission it doesn't talk about family violence, it talks about helping women become stronger, giving them a place where they can assert themselves and develop their confidence and develop projects. Actually, the first projects with women was the "café-rencontre" that we did here, and through that women got together to start lobbying the city for a community garden and it took them 3 years to get a community garden and now they have it. Now they want to expand the community garden.

OEIL and Project Genesis shared with the Mountain Sights organizers their numerous cases of tenant advocacy in the area and discussions with local residents confirmed that housing conditions were a critical issue for their quality of life. The decision to participate in the Housing Table was seen as a way to encourage the conversion or construction of social housing in Mountain Sights by ensuring that their interests were represented in decision-making instances and as a way to contribute to social housing in the neighbourhood in general through their solidarity.

The MultiCaf community cafeteria has **food security and social isolation** as its main concerns. As with the other members of the Housing Table, they combine direct services with coalition and representation work (with other allied organizations to analyze and address broader social and policy issues) towards their goals. One of their community organizers describes their objectives as follows:

> Le premier objectif c'est vraiment de pallier l'insécurité alimentaire. C'est une façon de lutter contre la pauvreté, mais, nous, le mandat passe par deux canaux. Ça passe par la sécurité

> alimentaire via la banque alimentaire et la cafétéria. L'autre objectif, c'est de lutter contre l'isolement qui génère l'état de pauvreté parce qu'il y a des gens qui s'isolent. Donc ça se veut un lieu où tu pouvais aller chercher ce que tu voulais en tant que nourriture mais aussi un lieu où tu pouvais socialiser. Donc, on organise des activités de loisir qui fait en sorte que, t'essayes de trouver un espace pour les gens, un lieu commun.... Mon travail, je te dirais à 55-60 % c'est d'être avec les gens.... L'autre, c'est de faire de la représentation...

While this may seem removed from housing as a concern, one of the group's organizers reported housing being a concern from the organization's inception. In her opinion,

> C'est sûr que, comme on lutte contre la pauvreté, moi j'ai toujours considéré que le logement social c'était vraiment une façon extraordinaire de faire la lutte à la pauvreté. Sauf qu'on n'est pas dedans à longueur de journée, ce qui fait que, dû à notre débordement, on a à faire des choix.

Although all the organizations in Côte-des-Neiges face the reality of high immigration in the neighbourhood, one of the members of the Housing Table, PROMIS, has **immigrant settlement** as its mission:

> C'est l'accueil et l'intégration des nouveaux arrivants à la société d'accueil et aussi la promotion d'une société nouvelle. De promouvoir une société de justice. Ce n'est donc pas seulement de les accueillir c'est aussi de défendre leurs droits. Quand on parle d'accueil et d'intégration c'est aussi la francisation, c'est donner l'accès à des écoles, les aider à la recherche d'un emploi, les jumeler. Et quand on n'a pas de services qui répondent à leurs besoins alors on les réfère à nos partenaires du Conseil communautaire ou ailleurs.

In recent years, PROMIS has been noting that recent arrivals in the neighbourhood are finding it more and more difficult to find housing that is decent, affordable and adequate for their family needs. The organization decided that it was important to be present at the Table since housing is a basic and fundamental need for new immigrants and social housing is one important way to improve newcomers' chances of attaining proper housing.

Finally, the Société environnementale de CDN brings its **environmental** concerns to the Housing Table.

> La mission de la Société environnementale de CDN est vraiment de contribuer de façon significative au maintien et à l'amélioration de la qualité de l'environnement en milieu urbain et ça en appuyant, en mettant en œuvre des initiatives qui ont un caractère éco-civique…. On a compris que la mission était plus large que seulement le programme Éco-Quartier…. Donc notre mission c'est vraiment d'améliorer l'environnement dans le quartier Côte-des-Neiges, mais on vise l'environnement parce qu'on a toujours le credo d'une vision globale et une action locale, penser globalement et agir localement.

Their concern with housing issues came from their experience in trying to do outreach in local buildings on issues such as recycling and waste management. They found that while residents were often sympathetic to the idea of environmentally responsible actions, their basic housing conditions (price, quality, adequacy) were a higher priority for action. Recycling and proper waste management were nearly impossible so long as local buildings failed to meet even the basic housing code's insistence of space for storage and waste collection. In doing door-to-door outreach on these issues, the Société environnementale's organizers noted that poor insulation and leaky windows meant that reduction of energy use for heating could also only be a distant dream. The organization decided to become involved in housing issues since better-maintained housing uses fewer resources and lets residents consider other forms of environmental action. They are also interested in the Housing Table in order to encourage the inclusion of environmental principles in the design and development of new social housing projects for Côte-des-Neiges.

In this section, we have seen the wide variety of core mandates and missions included among the organizations that are members of the Housing Table. Despite their apparent differences, however, all of these groups came to consider housing as intimately related to their organizational objectives and decided that the Housing Table warranted their support. As I will describe in the following section, the members of the Housing Table also have differing origins

in terms of who took the initiative to get them started and what the impetus was that spurred them to action.

Creation stories

Perhaps some explanation of the differences between the local members of the Housing Table in terms of mission, accountability – and, as we will see in the following chapters, choices about strategy and relationships with intermediary organizations and the state – can be derived from their initial creation stories. Some of the organizations were created due to the initiative of local residents and activists, some due to a need identified by other community groups or professionals and some by a combination of the two.

Interestingly, two members of the Housing Table, the Société environnementale de CDN and OEIL, were begun through the initiative of young local activists who were already active in the neighbourhood when government grants or funding programs provided the opportunity to pay staff people to create something a little more structured. In the case of OEIL, a group of University of Montreal and McGill University students had been organizing in the neighbourhood around political issues and had chosen housing rights as a particular area of focus. In 1971, they were able to obtain a federal youth employment grant that allowed them to hire 10 students for the summer. Using the time to do intense organizing and seek out more funding, this grant allowed the students to get the CDN Tenants' Association on its feet (later to become OEIL) and the organization has never looked back.

The Société environnementale de CDN has a similar origin, albeit at a much later date:

> La Société était créée au départ par deux jeunes étudiants du quartier qui était aussi des animateurs chez les Scouts. Ils avaient à l'époque 22 et 23 ans. Quand ils ont su qu'il y avait le programme Éco-Quartier qui démarrait à l'époque en 1996 – ça a été créé en 1996 – ils ont décidé de monter une proposition pour le district.

Project Genesis was created four years after OEIL, in 1976, and also had a connection to a local university. What began as a research project on poverty among Jewish seniors by a McGill professor evolved into an independent

community organization. The story of Project Genesis' genesis also bears witness to the undeniably multi-cultural character of the neighbourhood:

> La recherche portait spécifiquement sur les besoins des personnes âgées juives en situation de pauvreté dans Côte-des-Neiges. Une des méthodes qu'ils ont utilisée pour faire la recherche c'est de faire du porte-à-porte pour carrément poser des questions aux gens, s'informer de ce qu'ils vivaient. Ils ne savaient pas qui était une personne juive ou pas, alors ils ont frappé à toutes les portes et ils se sont rendu compte que, justement, ce n'était pas que les personnes juives qui avaient des difficultés. C'était tout le monde, peu importent leur origine culturelle ou autre. Après la recherche, les gens qui ont mené ça ont ouvert le premier store-front qui était sur la rue Victoria, un peu plus haut, pour donner de l'information aux gens sur leurs droits. Dès le départ, c'était clair qu'ils n'allaient pas simplement offrir des services à la communauté juive, mais à toute la communauté de Côte-des-Neiges. Leur but était d'informer les gens de leurs droits et des programmes sociaux pour tenter d'améliorer leurs conditions de vie petit à petit et de travailler ensemble aussi à identifier c'est quoi les autres besoins qu'il y a dans Côte-des-Neiges et comment on peut essayer d'y répondre. Donc dans certains cas, ça a amené à des initiatives d'organisation communautaire pour mettre sur pied d'autres ressources ou d'autres organismes.

Another organization created in 1988 due to the initial commitment of a professional is PROMIS.

> Promis a été mis sur pied pour répondre aux besoins de la clientèle. C'est sœur Ménard, qui est arrivée du Japon et était résidente du quartier Côte-des-Neiges. Elle a vu que certains besoins dans le quartier n'étaient pas satisfaits par les groupes qui étaient là à l'époque. Tranquillement, elle a donc formé Promis avec l'aide aux devoirs en premier, et tranquillement ça c'est développé.

The final two members of the Housing Table, MultiCaf and Mountain Sights Community Centre, were actually created due to needs identified by other community organizations or local actors. Concerned activists combined their efforts with the experience of organizers and other professionals in order to put in place the new organizations. When existing organizations were deemed unable to address new or existing needs in the neighbourhood, people came together to try to create alternatives. In the case of Côte-des-Neiges' only community cafeteria,

> C'est Projet Genèse qui a mis MultiCaf sur pied, il y a 12, 13 ans, je pense. Au départ c'est parce qu'il y avait eu un problème avec les jeunes, entre autres, avec l'aide sociale. Les jeunes étaient fortement pénalisés. Je pense qu'ils pouvaient se retrouver avec un chèque d'aide sociale de 100 à 200$. En gros, ils avaient mis cette ressource-là sur pied. C'étaient des dîners pour aider ces jeunes-là. Je ne pense pas me tromper. Ils partageaient à l'époque les locaux avec la maison des jeunes.

In the case of Mountain Sights Community Centre, the area had been recognized for years as being underserved and socially isolated. Over the years, OEIL, Project Genesis and the Éco-Quartier, for example, all undertook specific door-knocking campaigns to try to support Mountain Sights residents in defending their rights and improving their living conditions. What finally spurred action to create a local resource, however, was a local professional's visit overseas and drawing inspiration from the community work she observed there:

> At the CLSC, someone went to South America and they came back with a model of organizing by neighborhood, kind of like Building Links [a Project Genesis organizing project]. They call it 'Approche par quartier'. So the CLSC adopted a philosophy to do outreach, to provide services from a neighborhood perspective, and for me as well. This was the neighborhood that they wanted to reach and they weren't reaching it and so they adopted this model from South America. They kind of implemented it here with changes. That's what I hear. It was a pilot project and it started 10 years ago....

As we can see, members of the Housing Table have differing creation stories, initiated by neighbourhood activists, neighbourhood community groups or local institutions. The impetus for their creations included recognition of a need, availability of new resources or new knowledge. These origins have an influence on how organizations position themselves in relation to other actors as well as what strategies for change seem viable to them.

Constituency and accountability

As the principle concern of this thesis is to better understand the relationships between community, intermediary and state actors on issues of social housing policy and development, it is important to consider the local

organizations' relationships to their own members and the systems of accountability to their constituencies. While all voting members of the Housing Table have to be membership-based as a requirement for inclusion, they have varying degrees of participation of their members. For many of these organizations, membership involvement has also ebbed and flowed over time. Apart from the Community Council itself, by definition an organization of organizations, only the Mountain Sights Community Centre has official places for other organizations on its board of directors and its working committees, perhaps a reflection of its origins:

> Five years ago they held a general meeting with residents of the street and the organizers at the time who were involved and proposed the idea of incorporation. They had a provisionary board and went though the process and developed the mission with the residents, with a lot of support from the community organizers from the CLSC and PROMIS as well. In addition to structuring a board of directors – what you have to do legally – they also set up a permanent committee, the residents' committee. That residents' committee is structured to have representatives from community groups: PROMIS, the CLSC, Éco-Quartier. So you have organizers and then you have about 8 residents, so the majority of the group is residents. That's what it says on paper. In reality, people from community groups come in and out of that committee based on whatever activity we're going to do. If we're doing a street cleaning then Éco-Quartier is going to get involved with the resident's committee at that moment. But they're not there on a permanent basis. And it ends up being like a Building Links project where you have a pool of about 20 residents that identify themselves as being part of the residents' committee but the people that are more involved in it, come regularly to the meetings and do things, that's between 5 and 10 people. They are the ones who define the priorities of the organization and give an orientation to the work that is happening.

All of the organizations have a membership-based structure with membership open to anyone with an interest in the organization, whether or not they are directly involved in the group. Project Genesis is the exception in restricting membership to those who actually work with the organization as a service user, volunteer or activist. All of these organizations hold annual general assemblies in which the membership elects the board of directors, approves the

year's plan of action and reviews financial reports. Most of the organizations also have fairly autonomous working committees addressing different concerns and undertaking different campaigns. While about half of the members of the Housing Table benefit from active, informed and very involved memberships, the other half does not. When asked, the director of one of the organizations with less member involvement explained that,

> Ça fait partie de notre plan d'action, donc, oui, c'est [les objectifs] soumis autant au conseil d'administration qu'aux membres, qu'aussi à notre bailleur de fonds à la Ville de Montréal.... Notre membership est entre 70 et 100 personnes. Oui, on le soumet à l'assemblée publique, mais là aussi on n'a pas une très grande participation. Le geste est là, mais dans les faits il y n'a pas d'énormes consultations.

Again, this question of dynamics of accountability and membership will be raised again in the analysis chapter as it relates to the development of relationships with intermediary and state actors.

Having reviewed the origins, missions and dynamics of accountability of those local organizations that are on the Housing Table, I will now turn to those who are not on the Housing Table.

Who's not on the Housing Table?

There are some interesting "significant absences" from the CDN Housing Table (McMahon and . 1996). Notably absent are the numerous local organizations that have developed social housing projects over the years (ex. Golden Age Association, ethnic-specific organizations, etc.), the housing cooperatives that exist in Côte-des-Neiges after years of development and, most significantly, the local nonprofit housing organization (Habitations communautaires CDN) that manages non-HLM municipal housing in the neighbourhood owned by the Société d'habitation de Montréal (SHDM). So, while all of the members of the current Housing Table see themselves and their missions as intimately related to housing, none of the members are owners or managers of social housing projects. And none of the organizations that are

owners or managers of social housing, perhaps those with the most experience in actually developing and running such projects, have become members. The housing advocates are on the Housing Table while the housing developers are not.

This interesting absence can be explained by a combination of factors. The first is that local members of the Housing Table must be members of the Community Council. Since several of the local social housing owners and managers are not membership-based, they are not eligible for membership on the Council so they cannot sit at the Housing Table. Others among the social housing owners and managers are membership-based, however, and their absence can be explained by other factors. CDN housing cooperatives, for example, are generally on a small scale (12 to 24 units) so they do not have paid staff. Residents of these co-ops may feel that they have enough to do running their own housing project that they do not have time for membership on the Community Council or the Housing Table. Organizers in the neighbourhood also reported that they believe that the co-ops do not tend to identify as community-oriented and, once the needs of their residents are met, members may not concern themselves with the establishment of other social housing projects in the neighbourhood. Many of them rely upon the Fédération des coopératives d'habitation intermunicipale du Montréal métropolitain (FÉCHIMM) to represent their interests in terms of policy, if necessary.

A final factor is that many of the owners and managers of social housing projects have to maintain cordial working relationships with the City of Montreal and with the Société d'habitation Québec (SHQ). Some organizations choose not to become members of the Housing Table because they see it as too confrontational with the different levels of government and feel that they cannot risk their sources of funding or ability to negotiate successfully with authorities. While it is also true that the current members of the Housing Table rely on the city and provincial government for funding, it is usually less directly related to their housing activities.

Among those local housing actors absent from the Housing Table, the Habitations communautaires de CDN is the largest and has the most influence on

neighbourhood social housing. The Habitations communautaires' director describes the organization and its mission:

> Notre mission est la gestion et l'entretien d'immeubles pour les familles moins favorisées du quartier CDN. Maintenant on est propriétaire de deux immeubles. C'est récent. On est à la ville : SHDM [en termes de contrats]. On a au total 517 logements qu'on s'occupe, 39 immeubles… C'était difficile, vraiment difficile. On aide du monde à travers tout ça. Mais on était kamikaze [durant la récession des années 90]. Ce n'était pas n'importe qui l'aurait fait, c'est sûr que le privé ne le faisait pas… Nous autres nos locataires c'est des faibles salariés, il n'y a rien pour eux autres. Rien, pas un maudit programme. Ils ne sont pas éligibles à rien. C'est plate parce qu'ils travaillent, ils rapportent de l'impôt et patati patata ! Et ils n'ont rien pour eux autres….

The creation of the Habitations communautaires is instructive and reflects a pattern that recurred in many Montreal neighbourhoods during the 1990s. The Habitations' director talked about how the OSBL was established in direct response to a socio-economic crisis and the HLM Committee and Community Council's decision to collaborate in government housing programs:

> C'était assez motivé par le Programme d'acquisition de logement locatif dans le quartier. La SHDM a été formée pour ce programme-là, qui était de sortir des logements du marché privé. En fait, la ville cherchait un organisme qui aiderait la SHDM pour intervenir dans les quartiers. Dans les années 90, on vivait la récession. Il y avait beaucoup de piqueries, tout ce que vous voudrez. Alors il fallait que la ville ait un outil d'intervention pour retaper des logements qui étaient laissés aller. Les propriétaires allaient porter les clés aux banques. La ville était carrément toute en reprise alors ça prenait un organisme municipal qui dit "nous, on va être un relais pour éteindre les feux". Alors là-dessus, le Comité HLM et d'autres intervenants de Côte-des-Neiges ont travaillé avec la ville pour identifier des secteurs de Côte-des-Neiges où il fallait que la Ville intervienne. Parce que là, ils étaient en train de perdre contrôle, comme on dit, ici comme d'autres quartiers de Montréal. Ils ont acheté beaucoup de logements pendant cette période-là et, effectivement, il y a des blocs dont plus personne en voulait et il fallait que quelqu'un intervienne. Le job de bras, c'est la Ville qui l'a fait ou c'est nous autres.

The Habitations communautaires became an important player in the neighbourhood but its position is difficult in relation to other community

organizations. Many community organizations and members of the Community Council feel that the Habitations exists as a way for the neighbourhood, represented by residents and community groups on the board of directors, to take advantage of municipal housing programs, bringing their management to a community-controlled level without necessitating that community organizations become owners or managers themselves. It would be very difficult for a community group to evict its members, for example. Other community groups feel, however, that the Habitations should follow their lead in terms of political positioning and action. The management of the Habitations has become a little more business-like than some members of the Community Council find acceptable, however, and the Habitations refuses to play the game of intra-neighbourhood political strategizing in order to gain the maximum units of social housing possible within the neighbourhood, preferring to pursue its own interests. This seems to be a combination of the personality of the director and the board of directors' evaluation of relative risks in taking political stands.

In this section, I have profiled the members of the CDN Housing Table, the first level of intervention for the promotion and development of social housing within the neighbourhood. Out of an interest in developing a better understanding of what underlies these groups' relationships with other actors and their decisions about organizing strategies, I have reviewed the origins, mandates and dynamics of accountability of these organizations. I have also discussed the significant absence of any housing developers or managers on the Housing Table, exploring some of the factors that contribute to this situation.

Together, these local organizations are the ones who inform local residents of the possibilities offered by social housing, organize tenants to demand social housing investment and policy changes and develop and manage new social housing units. Almost without exception, however, these local organizations are in touch with broader organizations whose scale of intervention is at more of a citywide, provincial or federal level, organizations that I have termed "intermediary actors". Often, these intermediary actors serve as 'go-betweens' for

local and state actors. By analyzing policies and offering technical support to local actors, the intermediary help local groups understand, use and, sometimes, oppose state programs. At the same time, these intermediary actors also take the concerns and demands of local actors back to the state through their coalitions. The next section of this chapter will focus on these intermediary actors.

Who backs up the local organizations? Intermediary actors

As mentioned in earlier chapters, the sixties and seventies saw a revival of local-level housing organizing in Montreal and many of today's intermediary actors have their origin in the late seventies and early eighties. Many of them were born of the realization among many local organizations that pooling their efforts and, if possible, their resources would help them to be more effective in action. Today, intermediary actors have a variety of structures and serve a variety of purposes. I would argue that there are three main categories of such intermediary organizations: technical resource groups (GRTs), policy advocacy coalitions and federations representing specific forms of social housing.

Quebec's 27 technical resource groups, located in all urban centres and all rural areas of Quebec, for example, were created to put the experience and expertise acquired in the development of successful and innovative cooperative and non-profit social housing projects to use elsewhere. Rather than each project reinventing the wheel, these 'technical resource groups' would bring exactly that – technical and professional resources: architects, engineers, lawyers, project managers with experience in social housing – to be put towards new projects. The coordinator of the Association des GRT du Québec (AGRTQ), describes the need for GRTs in very human terms, drawing upon his experience in the St-Jean-Baptiste neighbourhood of Quebec City:

> L'histoire des GRT ça a commencé dans les années 70 suite
> principalement au grand débat de revitalisation de quartier comme
> ici à Montréal et aussi à Québec.... À ce moment-là le fédéral avait
> des programmes d'aide pour les coops. Donc, ce qui est arrivé,

> c'est que les gens, de peine et de misère, ont réussi à bloquer
> l'autoroute et à faire leur projet coop. Sauf que ces pionniers-là –
> ce n'est pas unique à Québec, c'est ce qui est arrivé un peu partout
> – une fois qu'ils ont été dans leur logement, il y a d'autre monde
> qui leur demandait : "Nous autres, aussi, on veut faire un projet !
> Comment es-ce qu'on fait ?" Très vite ceux qui avaient fait leurs
> projets, ce n'était pas leur job. Ils n'étaient pas intéressés à faire ça.
> C'est là que l'idée de créer des GRT où il y avait de l'expertise,
> parce que l'immobilier, c'est assez pointu comme connaissances.

GRTs were conceived specifically to help with social housing development, expansion and, now that early projects are aging, renovation. They are independent organizations with a board of directors but no membership base. Again, the coordinator of the AGRTQ describes eloquently the vision of the GRTs:

> Ça a été pensé, "On va créer des groupes de professionnels, des
> gens qui connaissent ça l'immobilier". En plus, ils se sont dits, "Ça
> ne sera pas juste des professionnels dans le sens qu'on l'entend
> d'habitude qui font juste agir sur l'immobilier, mais ils vont le
> faire selon une certaine approche." C'est-à-dire que ce que l'on
> veut c'est de créer des communautés autonomes. Donc, les gens
> qui sont là, les GRTs, vont accompagner les groupes dans
> l'accomplissement de leurs projets et, après ça, quand c'est fini :
> "Merci beaucoup ! Bonjour !" On ne voulait pas créer de
> dépendance, donc c'est vraiment un outil que la communauté se
> donnait.

At first, social housing developers chose GRTs as their project professionals simply out of choice and they were able to work their costs into their development budgets. With the advent of the AccèsLogis program, however, the provincial government built a role for GRTs directly into their procedures. AccèsLogis programs must be attached to a GRT in order to move forward.

In terms of policy advocacy, there are two main provincial organizations. FRAPRU (Front d'action populaire pour le réaménagement urbain) and RCLALQ (Regroupement des comités logement et des associations de locataires du Québec) are coalitions of local housing committees and other interested organizations mandated by their members to co-ordinate policy advocacy campaigns, conduct research and offer technical assistance and training to member organizations.

These organizations do not offer advocacy or information services directly to tenants nor do they become involved in the development of specific social housing projects. FRAPRU focuses on social housing policy while RCLALQ focuses on the rights of tenants in private units. In recent years, these two organizations have been working toward better coordination of their efforts in order to have a greater impact on policy.

Finally, there is the series of federated organizations that engage in both the development and maintenance of specific social housing projects (through technical support) and policy advocacy. The Fédération des coopératives d'habitation intermunicipale du Montréal métropolitain - FÉCHIMM's membership is composed of housing cooperatives on the Montreal Island. The group supports local co-ops in need of technical support for the maintenance of their buildings, financial administration or tenant relations; training sessions are offered regularly for the boards of local co-ops. As a federation, FÉCHIMM sometimes intervenes with the city of Montreal in favour of co-op development or in order to address the City's regulation of co-ops. FÉCHIMM itself is a member of the province-wide CQCH (Confédération québécoise des coopératives d'habitation), a confederation of regional housing co-op federation that acts as a voice at the provincial level for the interests of cooperative housing.

FOHM – Fédération des OSBLs d'habitations de Montréal and the FLHLMQ – Fédération des locataires des HLMs du Québec play similar roles to FÉCHIMM, combining direct services to their member organizations with policy advocacy campaigns and research. FOHM is most similar to FÉCHIMM, representing OSBLs rather than co-ops. It, too, is a member of the provincial organization representing OSBLs. The FLHLMQ is a little different. As the provincial coalition of local HLM tenants' associations, it serves a common role with FOHM and FÉCHIMM in offering technical support to its member groups and coordinating policy advocacy campaigns and research. Since 1993 there has been no new construction of HLMs, the FLHLMQ has not been involved in the development of social housing, although they are currently exploring how they might address development now that the new federal agreement has opened the

door to new, if somewhat altered, HLMs. Additionally, since many HLM buildings or projects do not have tenants' associations (despite their now legally mandated role in the management of HLMs), the FLHLMQ works to help start new tenants' associations and also offers advocacy and information services to tenants in HLM projects without local associations.

Current intermediary actors with links to CDN

All three categories of the intermediary organizations are present in Côte-des-Neiges, with differing degrees of involvement with the Housing Table and with social housing organizing in the neighbourhood.

Technical resource groups (GRTs)

ROMEL and the Groupe CDH represent the GRTs. Both of these organizations manage the development of social housing projects in the neighbourhood. Among Montreal GRTs, there is an agreement (in part due to government pressure to streamline procedures) to divide up the island's territory so as not to have competing GRTs working within the same neighbourhood[27]. Groupe CDH and ROMEL, however, overlap in both Côte-des-Neiges and Parc-Extension. Both forms of housing are seen as important in the neighbourhood, as explained by a representative of ROMEL:

> Nous, on favorise la prise en charge. On favorise la
> responsabilisation des gens. C'est pour cela que, nous, on a comme
> priorité d'essayer de convaincre le plus de gens et les aider à
> former des coopératives d'habitation. Maintenant, dans le cas où ce
> ne serait pas très possible, on a une deuxième priorité qui est de
> travailler avec des organismes du milieu et les aider à acquérir des
> bâtiments, à les renouveler ou à construire, pour loger des gens à
> des prix abordables, des prix acceptables, parfois subventionnés
> aussi. Pour les projets que l'on appelle de volet 2, volet 3 pour les
> personnes âgées, pour les personnes itinérantes ou etcetera, ça c'est
> un besoin que lorsqu'il est exprimé, le ROMEL va faire son
> possible de répondre à ce besoin. Et ça, pour nous, c'est aussi

---

[27] The merger of cities on the Island of Montreal has opened up new areas for social housing development and the GRTs are beginning to work in new neighbourhoods. The division of the new territories has not been established and this has led to some competition for work. Many GRTs report at the same time, however, that the City of Montreal's new push for the construction of 5000 units of social housing by 2005 has overloaded their capacities.

valable que les coops, parce qu'il y a des catégories de gens qui,
pour différentes raisons, ne sont pas capables de se prendre en
main. Alors on ne peut pas les forcer non plus, mais il faut les aider
quand même à vivre dans des appartements salubres.

The presence of the two GRTs in the neighbourhood sometimes causes
competitive tension but, for the most part, the two groups collaborate positively.
Both GRTs sit on the Housing Table on a consultative basis since they do not
qualify for membership on the Community Council. Despite their consultative
status, however, they play a pivotal role on the Table and often are the ones
proposing projects to the Table's members.

ROMEL, which has its office situated in the neighbourhood, has a long
history of involvement in Côte-des-Neiges, as mentioned in earlier sections, and
is closely connected to other community groups and immigrant-serving
institutions. As explained by ROMEL's executive director,

ROMEL c'est un regroupement de plusieurs organismes. Il a été
initié par, entre autres, le CLSC, l'OEIL, la Maisonnée et
l'Hirondelle[28] en 1984. L'objectif principal, c'est d'aider les
membres des communautés culturelles à, premièrement, défendre
leurs droits en termes de logement et, deuxièmement, faciliter
l'accessibilité à des logements salubres et bien entretenus.

ROMEL offers one of the only housing bank services in Montreal, taking
referrals from across the city for help in finding apartments. The organization is
also renowned for its production of housing rights pamphlets in many languages.
Housing committees use these pamphlets across the city and other housing
committees sometimes turn to ROMEL for help communicating with tenants who
do not speak French or English fluently. Popular education has been important to
ROMEL's mission since its beginning:

On était plus impliqué, au départ, dans les campagnes de
sensibilisation, la publication de dépliants sur différents thèmes
dans le logement, la salubrité, la sécurité, des choses comme ça, en
différentes langues. On a fait le guide "Comment se loger", on a
fait un guide de participation civique à un moment donné. On allait
visiter des gens dans leur appartement lorsqu'ils sont victimes de

---

[28] La Maisonnée and l'Hirondelle are immigrant settlement agencies based in la Petite-
Patrie and on the Plateau Mont-Royal, respectively.

> discrimination ou des choses comme ça. On a aussi un contrat de service avec le MRCI pour donner des formations pour les nouveaux arrivants sur le bail.

The services and activities of ROMEL have continued to evolve through the years:

> Aujourd'hui on fait des recherches, de la formation, on fait des publications, on développe des projets d'habitation, on gère des immeubles et en même temps on participe dans toutes les activités qui touchent l'habitation. Nous avons été invités à la Commission parlementaire sur la loi de la Régie du logement, on y a présenté un mémoire. On a été sollicité aussi pour la deuxième Commission parlementaire sur l'habitation, l'aménagement, mais malheureusement je n'avais pas le temps de préparer un mémoire et d'y aller.

The turn to offering GRT services came later for ROMEL, in recognition of its specific experience serving immigrant populations. The director's description of the GRTs' beginnings illuminates the tight relations between GRTs themselves and also between GRTs and the provincial government:

> En 1989, sous une recommandation du Ministère de l'immigration à l'époque au Québec, la SHQ a reconnu le ROMEL comme un groupe de ressources techniques. Là, on a commencé la dimension développement pour les membres des communautés culturelles et les gens 'at large'. Mais avant ça c'était la défense de droits et l'organisation, un peu moins tangible comme travail. C'était du travail de préparation. En 1990, le ROMEL a commencé à agir comme GRT. À ce moment-là, moi, j'ai été là. On a été secondé, appuyé par un autre groupe de ressources techniques pour monter notre équipe et commencer à travailler. Maintenant, ça fait plus de 10 ans que l'on développe des OSBL et des coops d'habitation.

ROMEL's experience in developing social housing projects led to the observation that many of the new owners lacked the skills for the proper management of their new buildings. Coupled with the fact that there are economies of scale to be had in managing a series of relatively small projects, ROMEL decided to create a non-profit management service, the Société de gestion Querbes. La Société today manages OSBLs owned both by the city and by local community organizations, particularly the buildings of the Habitations populaires de Parc-Extension (HAPOPEX). In the past, ROMEL has been a

developer itself but gave that up in favour of GRT and management services. Under the new programs put in place with the federal-provincial affordable housing agreement, however, ROMEL is again exploring the possibility of developing its own transitional housing project for newly arrived immigrants.

The Groupe CDH is less present on the community scene in Côte-des-Neiges but is nevertheless an important actor in social housing development. A more traditional GRT, and one of the oldest, the antecedents of Groupe CDH were created in 1970 in an effort to offer architectural, administrative, development and training expertise to the many housing cooperative that were blossoming at the time:

> Tranquillement, des professionnels se sont donc regroupés pour fonder le Groupe CDH. Celui-ci a la fonction de deux groupes de ressources techniques. Au départ, il y avait le Conseil de développement de logements communautaires (CDLC) et le Groupe de ressources techniques des habitations de Montréal (GRTHM). Il y en avait donc un qui fonctionnait dans l'Est et l'autre dans l'Ouest et les deux se sont fusionnés en 1988. La réalité de ces deux ressources fait en sorte qu'il y avait des francophones, des anglophones et des immigrants, ce qui est un avantage et une force pour notre composition. Je dirais donc que le groupe CDH est le plus ancien.

The diversity of CDH's staff is, according to interviews with other housing actors in Côte-des-Neiges, one of the reasons that the GRT has been able to work so effectively in the neighbourhood.

Similarly to ROMEL, the Groupe CDH has since the beginning defined itself as principally concerned with local control of housing:

> C'était au départ un groupe de personnes qui étaient intéressées à développer des projets d'habitations contrôlés par les usagers. C'est un groupe qui est né à partir des besoins car il n'y avait pas les ressources pour la population et donc pour le développement de projets coopératifs... Notre mission c'est le développement de projets d'habitations sans but lucratif contrôlés par les usagers. Nous faisons des projets d'habitations communautaires et sociaux. Nous visons l'organisation et la création des coopératives d'habitations, ainsi qu'à répondre à des clientèles particulières, comme les personnes âgées... Nos objectifs sont de répondre aux attentes de la population. Dans la problématique du logement, on est une ressource pour ces personnes qui s'organisent en

coopérative. Nous pensons que les gens ont la possibilité de s'organiser et de se prendre en charge. C'est pour cela que nous parlons de logements communautaires.

In recent years, the Groupe CDH has been actively involved in the development of cooperatives in CDN, a form of social housing that experienced a lull for a number of years. They are active on the Housing Table and are well respected by community groups in the area. Groupe CDH's project manager for Côte-des-Neiges describes his role in the neighbourhood as follows:

> Mes fonctions sont d'essayer de dépister de nouveaux projets avec l'équipe d'ici, de travailler avec les groupes, de participer aux rencontres avec la Ville et de regarder avec le chargé de projet toute la problématique de chaque dossier. Je siège aussi dans les instances de quartier, dans les comités de Côte-des-Neiges. Cela fait longtemps que je travaille dans le quartier et je suis le seul à y travailler. Les autres chargés de projets s'occupent des autres quartiers.

Both ROMEL and the Groupe CDH are members of the Association des GRT du Quebec, the AGRTQ, in order to both receive information on technical and policy issues and to join together with other GRTs to have an influence on social housing policy. The AGRTQ's current coordinator is a former employee of the Groupe CDH and the two non-profits have their offices in the same building, so the links between the two are particularly tight. The AGRTQ coordinator describes his association as follows:

> L'association, c'est le regroupement de 24 GRTs, probablement un 25ième bientôt, sur 27 au Québec. Le membership de l'association, ce sont les GRTs qui se distribuent un peu partout au Québec. L'association, sa mission principale est de regrouper ses membres et de parler à ses membres. On est là pour s'assurer que les programmes d'aide au logement collectif soient destinés aux ménages à revenu faible et modeste et principalement selon les formules coopératives et sans but lucratif, mais ce n'est pas nécessairement exclusif. Nous on travaille pour les ménages à revenu modeste.

Unlike the GRTs, themselves, the AGRTQ does not engage in concrete social housing project development. Rather, they offer services to their members and serve as a tool for policy advocacy at the provincial level, and sometimes at

the municipal level, particularly in Montreal and Quebec City where there is more than one GRT. The AGRTQ has significant access to government decision-makers. In the words of their coordinator:

> On a un rôle de représentation, de revendication, de programme, de concertation, etc. On offre certains services à nos membres, mais la fonction principale, naturellement, est un rôle de représentation. Moi, comme coordonnateur, je suis un peu le porte-parole, le représentant. Je siège sur différents comités au niveau du Québec. Je suis au conseil d'administration du Fonds québécois d'habitation communautaire, dont je suis le vice-président. Je siège aussi au Chantier d'économie sociale, je suis membre du CA, de l'exécutif. Je siège dans un certain nombre de choses comme ça. Je rencontre régulièrement les gens de la SHQ, les partenaires, un peu tout ça. Ça c'est mon travail.

Over the years, the AGRTQ has been quite influential in its policy advocacy and other coalitions, such as RCLALQ and, FRAPRU especially, view them as extremely valuable allies in policy fights.

Policy advocacy coalitions

The two policy coalitions, FRAPRU and RCLALQ, are also present in the neighbourhood and are key sources of information, training and political analysis for CDN housing organizations. Since it is only FRAPRU, however, that currently deals with social housing, we will discuss them in more detail.

Some of the conditions leading to the creation of FRAPRU are similar to those that led to the regrouping of the GRTs within the AGRTQ. The urban renewal movement of the late 1960s to early seventies had engendered a lot of local organizing around housing issues, as described in earlier chapters. For the most part, local organizing was able to block the worst of urban renewal in Montreal, although certain neighbourhoods saw major (even entire) demolition. As explained by the coordinator of FRAPRU, however, the late 1970s saw the creation of a softer version of urban renewal that encouraged renovations and urban improvements with joint funding from the federal, provincial and municipal governments:

> On améliorait les quartiers de toutes sortes de façons, comme l'amélioration d'un lampadaire, des façades de commerces, etc. Ce

que l'on a constaté, cependant, c'est que cela avait comme effet l'augmentation des loyers et de chasser en partie les gens de leurs logements, de changer la population – ce qu'on appelle aujourd'hui le phénomène de gentrification. Cela existait un peu partout à travers la province et chaque groupe intervenait de façon isolée et intervenait plus sur les conséquences.

As was the case for many other types of organizations, the housing committees working on the problems related to this renovation program began to think that it would be helpful to share insights with others facing the same challenges:

Un moment donné, un groupe à Centre-Sud s'est dit qu'il serait intéressant de rencontrer d'autres groupes qui vivaient un peu les mêmes problèmes à travers le Québec et ils ont eu l'idée d'organiser, en octobre 1978, un colloque populaire sur ces programmes-là. Il y a eu un an d'organisation pour mettre sur pied ce colloque et une fois celui-ci, les gens se sont dit que ce serait intéressant de non plus seulement se rencontrer mais d'avoir un regroupement qui permette qu'on améliore notre rapport de force face au gouvernement sur ces enjeux.

From its beginning, FRAPRU has had a very political orientation, aiming to build power in order to be able to confront government policy and also to be able to eventually exercise control – or at least have an influence – over local development. While the initial focus was on urban development in general (a concern still embodied in the organization's name), over the years FRAPRU became known as the coalition that defended and promoted all forms of social housing. Once the original *raison d'être* of the coalition (the tri-level government renovation subsidy program) was terminated, FRAPRU had to refocus its action:

Le programme en question [Programme québécois de rénovation des immeubles locatifs - PRIL] s'est terminé, mais le regroupement a continué et à un moment donné nous avons eu à faire des choix sur quoi l'on travaillait en priorité. Et nous avons choisi la question du logement social de façon primordiale... C'est certain que nous parlons des grands enjeux. Le premier est celui du logement social, et plus particulièrement du grand chantier de 8000 logements sociaux, dont la moitié en HLM... Cette revendication prend beaucoup de place selon les périodes, comme par exemple celle où il y a eu les menaces de hausse des loyers dans les logements sociaux et donc c'était notre priorité de combattre ce phénomène. Aussi, il y a la question de protection des locataires sur le marché privé, du contrôle du marché privé d'habitation.

While neither of the two policy advocacy organizations denies the importance of the focus of its counterpart (as evidenced at the end of the last quotation from the coordinator of FRAPRU), for many years in Côte-des-Neiges, an affiliation with FRAPRU versus RCLALQ represented a political affirmation of the relative importance of the fight for more social housing versus the fight for the protection of tenants' rights within private housing.

Up until 2000, Project Genesis and MultiCaf were the sole active members of FRAPRU in Côte-des-Neiges, arguing that the development of social housing was the only way to divorce access to decent housing from income within an economic system that is unjust. FRAPRU's members would bring their petitions and requests for support to the Community Council and, on many occasions, the Council was receptive and supportive. Project Genesis and MultiCaf would often share the cost of buses for FRAPRU events, aiding the success of CDN mobilizations. In 2000, they were joined by OEIL as a member of FRAPRU and more recently the Mountain Sights Community Centre and a local alternative mental health organization have joined. Genesis and MultiCaf were not members of RCLALQ due to political disagreements regarding goals and tactics.

OEIL, on the other hand, has been a leading member of RCLALQ for many years. OEIL has taken the stance that the majority of CDN residents still live in private housing and argues that this is likely to be the case for many years to come. OEIL's presentations of RCLALQ petitions and requests for support were also well received by Community Council members who recognized the need to protect the rights of tenants. Until recently, RCLALQ's tactics – focused on documentation, research and advocacy – were much less mobilization-oriented than FRAPRU's so the neighbourhood's involvement was more through support of OEIL's policy briefs. In 2000, Project Genesis joined RCLACQ.

The expanding membership of local groups in these two intermediary organizations can be explained by a variety of factors. All four of the housing organizations concerned (FRAPRU, RCLALQ, OEIL and Project Genesis) have hired new staff who were perhaps more open to cooperation across old lines of division. As well, the housing crisis heightened the need for collaboration

between groups and created new openness on the part of the government to hear ideas for solutions. This political context was such that the social housing/private housing dichotomy was hard to maintain: the crisis both clarified the need for more social housing and highlighted the difficulties tenants face in private rental housing.

Federations of specific forms of social housing

The three social housing federations, FÉCHIMM, FOHM and the FLHLMQ, all have members in Côte-des-Neiges among the numerous local co-ops, OSBLs and HLM tenants' associations. Local social housing projects belong to these federations in order to benefit from their services and in order to support their work at the policy level. The CDN membership in all of these organizations is rather weak, however, for reasons we will discuss below.

The FÉCHIMM was created in 1983 when 22 of Montreal's housing cooperatives decided to join forces to "defend their positions, defend their existence". The Federation's Director General explains the context that led to the organization's creation:

> À cette époque-là, il y avait peut-être une soixantaine de coopératives à Montréal, alors ces 22 coopératives-là sentaient le besoin d'avoir un représentant politique capable de défendre les dossiers, capable d'assurer la consolidation des coopératives, capable d'assurer la représentation, capable d'assurer le développement aussi, dont des négociations pour des nouveaux programmes fédéraux et provinciaux qui subventionneraient les coopératives.

The goal of the Federation's founders was to ensure a continued evolution of housing cooperatives, not only a consolidation of their current situation. Toward this end, the Federation combines its policy advocacy work with a number of concrete services that help not only to consolidate existing coops but also to make it easier for new ones to get off the ground:

> Il s'est développé aussi l'idée que la fédération pouvait aussi être une fédération d'achat. C'est-à-dire que l'on pouvait négocier en groupe les services ou des produits plus accessibles aux membres parce que l'on constituait un pouvoir d'achat beaucoup plus important : assurance immobilière, assurance locataire, les achats

de peinture, l'Internet, un service regroupé de frais bancaires qui
sont très avantageux. On offre aussi des services d'aide à la
gestion. Les services d'intervention, c'est quand la coopérative
souhaite une intervention soit ponctuelle, soit prolongée en aide au
CA ou en tenue de livre, en animation d'assemblées. On peut alors
offrir un service de formation… On a toutes sortes de formations
qui sont directement reliées aux besoins de compétence qui
existent dans les coopératives.

The relevance of these services is evidenced today by FÉCHIMM's 330
members among Montreal's 500 cooperative housing projects, making
FÉCHIMM the most commonly known of the social housing federations in Côte-
des-Neiges. Although the unusual form of housing cooperative in Côte-des-
Neiges means that few of the local cooperatives are actually members of
FÉCHIMM[29], several of them have turned to the Federation for technical help in
recent years. The rate of membership in Côte-des-Neiges will undoubtedly rise,
however, as new cooperatives are built under the AccèsLogis program. Not only
will these new co-ops lack benefits and support from the City of Montreal but
they are also now obligated by law to become a member of the Federation.[30]

When it comes to provincial level policy engagement, the FÉCHIMM
most often participates via its membership in the Confédération québécoise des
coopératives d'habitations (CQCH). The CQCH is composed of all the co-op
federations from the province of Quebec.

The Fédération des OSBL d'habitation de Montréal (FOHM) was created
in June 1987 by housing OSBLs concentrated in inner city Montreal and their
initial concern was with the state of rooming houses. Often serving as housing of
last resort, and including tenants with an overrepresentation of social problems

---

[29] Many of the cooperatives in southern Côte-des-Neiges (Plamondon, Barclay, Goyer,
Bedford) are not actually owners of their buildings. Created during the City of Montreal's massive
intervention in the early 1990s, they are residents' cooperatives which rent their buildings from the
SHDM. Therefore, many of the economic advantages other coops derive from membership in
FÉCHIMM are accorded to these coops through their affiliation with the City of Montreal.

[30] While this requirement may seem odd at first glance, it follows the same logic as
obligatory union membership in an organized shop. Any cooperative created under the
AccèsLogis program is benefiting from the work of FÉCHIMM to shape the program and will be
able to turn to the FÉCHIMM for technical or political support if necessary in the future.

such as addictions or instable mental health, rooming houses were seen by
FOHM's founders as precarious and even dangerous. They decided to join their
forces into what would eventually become the FOHM in order to promote the
development of rooming houses that were "clean, safe and affordable", offering
complementary social services to serve tenants (FOHM 2004).

Among the three organizations related to specific forms of housing, it is
the FOHM that promotes the need for housing with community supports for
tenants with specific problems. The FOHM is also unique among the three
organizations in its role as both an owner and a manager of its own housing
projects.

Similar to FÉCHIMM, the FOHM offers its members training and
technical services and support for the management of their projects as well as on
broader policy issues, such as representing Montreal housing OSBLs in their
collective dealings with the city. Today there are 70 core members of FOHM,
with the associated members representing 3700 units of housing (FOHM 2004).
When addressing provincial level policy issues, the FOHM acts through the
Réseau québécois des OSBL d'habitation (RQOH) that regroups organizations
from all regions of Quebec.

The creation of the Fédération des locataires des HLM du Québec is an
example of the tight interrelations between housing actors. The predecessor of the
FLHLMQ, despite what is described by others as "great moments" in the late
1970s, folded in 1988 after major problems (i.e. corruption) on its board of
directors. This was highly unfortunate timing as this was the time that the
provincial government decided to try to increase HLM rents to 30 rather than 25
percent of tenants' income. Several HLM tenants' associations became involved
in FRAPRU as a way to address this issue and FRAPRU took on the battle. The
current coordinator of the FLHLMQ was an organizer with FRAPRU at that time.
As he describes it:

> C'est à l'intérieur du travail que l'on faisait au FRAPRU que j'ai
> reçu le mandat de mettre sur pied la Fédération des locataires de
> HLM. C'est un mandat d'un des congrès du FRAPRU et lorsque je
> l'ai mise sur pied, j'ai suivi mon bébé.

He is still with the organization 10 years later and today the FLHLMQ's offices are directly across the hall from FRAPRU's.

The FLHLMQ has grown significantly in its first ten years, from 8 tenants' associations to 120 associations today. The coordinator emphasizes that, given the voluntary nature of their membership, the high participation contradicts the commonly held belief that HLMs automatically undermine tenants' sense of initiative and solidarity. This point is a source of much friction between the different social housing federations, and will be addressed in later chapters.

Today, the Federation sees its main objective as fairly straightforward:

> Le rôle de la fédération c'est bien sûr de regrouper ensemble des
> HLMs. C'est de favoriser leur implication dans la gestion de leur
> logement – ça a été une bataille parce que ça n'allait pas de soi – et
> c'est aussi de voir à faire la promotion sociale et économique des
> gens qui vivent en HLM. Ces objectifs-là ça mène à des batailles
> spécifiques.

Among the more specific struggles the FLHLMQ has taken on, is the representation of tenants on management boards, their right to be consulted in HLM planning initiatives and debates over rent and other housing conditions. The coordinator reports that much of their work is psychological, convincing both tenants and administrators of residents' capacity to self-manage:

> À notre 3ième congrès notre slogan c'était, "Nos HLMs, on s'en
> occupe, on est capable !" C'est donc de convaincre les gens qui
> faisaient des HLM que l'on était capable nous autre aussi de gérer
> nos logements.

Again, as with the other federations, the FLHLMQ has members in Côte-des-Neiges HLM projects but they are not among the Federation's most active. In general, Côte-des-Neiges HLM developments are relatively small (usually no more than 30 units) and they are more often for seniors and people with disabilities than for families.

While these three federations are active and their work well recognized at the municipal and provincial levels, their CDN members are not very active. CDN organizations benefit indirectly from their policy work but do not contribute directly to its achievement. The housing organizations in the neighbourhood, OEIL and Project Genesis, are aware of these format-specific social housing conditions and may refer residents of specific projects to them for help and support. At times, OEIL and Project Genesis may also turn to them for technical support and policy information if the Housing Table is working on developing new projects in Côte-des-Neiges.

Who's not involved in CDN?

While the Federations may not play an active role in CDN housing struggles, there is at least a membership base in the neighbourhood and members of the Housing Table know these federations and sometimes turn to them for specialized information. There are other intermediary organizations, however, which, despite their central roles in making social housing gains, do not make it onto the radar screen of Côte-des-Neiges. These organizations are chiefly federally oriented, Canada-wide coalitions. The Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM), the Canadian Housing and Renewal Association (CHRA) and the Cooperative Housing Federation of Canada (CHF-Canada) were all absolutely central to the debates that led up to the federal decision to reinvest in 'affordable housing'.

The FCM, with a membership composed exclusively of municipal governments, is the oldest of the three organizations. Its precursor, the Union of Canadian Municipalities was established in 1901 and it became the FCM in 1937. They were involved in the earliest negotiations of federal public housing programs. Their principal mandate today is to "to improv[e] the quality of life in all communities by promoting strong, effective and accountable municipal government", principally by lobbying the federal government in the interest of municipal governments (FCM 2004). The FCM does not have a direct link to

Côte-des-Neiges, given its municipally-based membership, but the City of Montreal is a member and the city counselor responsible for social housing on the City's executive is among those who represent Montreal on FCM's board of directors. At the intermediate level, the FCM has collaborated with FRAPRU on national lobbying strategies.

The CHRA includes municipalities among its membership but its base is much broader, including housing OSBLs, private developers, provincial housing agencies, students and academics. It was created in 1968 in response to the urban renewal programs being promoted across the country and out of a concern for affordable housing within these programs. Its mission remains specifically focused on housing issues. The CHRA bills itself as a national NGO that:

> - promotes access to adequate, affordable housing for low- and modest-income households and
>
> - seeks to heighten awareness of affordable housing issues through research, advocacy, networking and communications. (CHRA 2004)

The organization has played an important role in federal level negotiations for renewed investment in social housing and contributed to bringing together various actors at the federal level. One connection (albeit indirect) of the CHRA to Côte-des-Neiges is that Robert Cohen, director of the SHDM at the time of the renewal of housing in Côte-des-Neiges, is the CHRA's past president. Otherwise, the CHRA only collaborates with FRAPRU for national lobbying purposes.

The final national coalition cited by those interviewed as central to federal-level social housing organizing is the Cooperative Housing Federation of Canada (CHF-Canada). Also created in 1968 (at the time known as the Cooperative Housing Foundation of Canada), the CHF has a membership of over 750 housing cooperatives, plus individuals who live in cooperatives and the organizations that promote or serve housing cooperatives, bringing the total membership close to 1000 (CHF Canada 1998). Although lobbying the federal government is one of its principal mandates, it is more heavily oriented toward technical services for its members than the other two organizations mentioned here, and it has offices in Ottawa, Toronto, Winnipeg, Vancouver and Halifax. In

most provinces, co-ops become members directly in the CHF but in Quebec, via what has been termed by some members as a form of "sovereignty association", membership passes through the regional and provincial federations who are in turn the members of the CHF. The CQCH offers in Quebec the services offered by the CHF in other parts of Canada. The board of the CHF consists of one representative from each province, one for aboriginal communities and four at-large members.

This section has introduced the various intermediary, non-governmental actors who play a role in the development of housing units and social housing policy that affects the work of the local organizations in Côte-des-Neiges. I have been most in-depth with the groups with the most direct links to the neighbourhood. This is also a reflection of the extent to which I was able to observe the organizations' activities, get to know their staff and the depth to which I was able to conduct their interviews. What is clear, however, is a hierarchy of leadership and intervention, from the local up to the national level. In fact, most of the national groups profiled have an international branch or participate directly in international housing forums themselves.

Who are the targets of CDN housing organizing? The State

As discussed at length in earlier chapters, all three levels of government have played an important role in social housing in Quebec since the Second World War. In Côte-des-Neiges, the federal government was the first to have a major impact through the Canada Housing and Mortgage Corporation's mortgage subsidies for the construction of post-war walk-up apartment buildings. This style of housing is a defining feature of Côte-des-Neiges and had much to do with the neighbourhood's status as a place of "first landing" in Montreal. In the 1950s and 1960s, there were many rural Quebecois who came to the neighbourhood, joined in growing proportion by immigrants from other countries ever since.

In the 1970s, federal funding for cooperatives and non-profit housing led to its establishment in the neighbourhood but, compared to other neighbourhoods that had housing stock in need of replacement or with significant amounts of vacant land (neither scenario being the case in Côte-des-Neiges), third sector housing was less a phenomenon here than elsewhere. In the 1980s, when the provincial government began to increase its funding of social housing and its collaboration with municipalities to create HLMs, there was another phase of social housing development in the neighbourhood, spurred on in large part by the pressures brought to bear by the HLM Committee.

Côte-des-Neiges received an unusual amount of municipal attention in the late 1980s and the early 1990s when the director of the SHDM at the time, himself a veteran of community-based social housing development, decided that investment in social housing would be an effective response to southern Côte-des-Neiges' problems with housing disrepair, drug infestation and community insecurity. At the time of the SHDM's intervention, Côte-des-Neiges was receiving high media attention for these drug and crime problems and local organizations (especially the HLM Committee) were putting heavy pressure on the City to step in. In response, the SHDM bought up problem buildings and established social housing to be managed by cooperatives or the newly created OSBL, Habitations communautaires CDN.

In 1993, when the federal government withdrawal from the funding of new social housing construction and long-term responsibility led to the province's freeze of HLM construction, the AccèsLogis program returned the focus to community-initiated and owned cooperatives and OSBLs. In recent years, the emphasis in Côte-des-Neiges has been on the "recovery" of severely neglected apartment blocks for conversion to social housing.

Over the years, there have been different configurations of state actors involved in Côte-des-Neiges. From the 1950s through to the end of the 1970s, the federal government, via the CMHC, acted pretty much on its own in funding and developing social housing in the neighbourhood. With the introduction of HLMs to the neighbourhood in the 1980s, the municipal government, via the Office

municipal d'habitations de Montréal (OMHM), and the Société d'habitation du Quebec as the OMHM's major funder, became a focus for organizing. The federal withdrawal erased any meaningful role for the federal government in Côte-des-Neiges and also changed the role of the OMHM to a manager rather than a developer.

When the federal government pulled out of social housing construction, the new Bourque Administration of the City of Montreal, seeing the slowed funding from the SHQ at the same time, decided to do likewise, changing the SHDM, to a manager of housing rather than developer. Since this time, the Société d'habitation du Quebec has remained involved in social housing through AccèsLogis and its predecessors but all responsibility for the implementation of this program has been given to the City of Montreal's Direction de l'habitation.

Local community groups in the process of developing social housing do all their dealings with the City. Only in cases where there is a conflict with the City or where they feel that the SHQ may be blocking funds, do community groups intervene with the SHQ. In recent years, the City's commitment to build 5000 units of social housing by the end of 2005 is a task given to the special task force "Solidarité 5000 logements", a unit of the Direction de l'habitation. This objective is quite ambitious and the City's desire to produce this housing has made them increasingly present on the local scene.

Current state actors with links to CDN

Today, it is only the City of Montreal that has direct links to social housing operations in Côte-des-Neiges. As described in Chapter 2, the Société d'habitation de Quebec has delegated all responsibility for the development of new units and the implementation of the AccèsLogis program to the City via its Direction de l'habitation. The local Borough is responsible for basic approval and any necessary zoning changes. Another city presence of some importance is the para-public Société d'habitation de Montréal that, as described above, is the owner of many of the neighbourhood's cooperatives as well as most of the buildings managed by the Habitations communautaires.

The SHDM is most present in Côte-des-Neiges, as owner of 724 units of housing that is either managed as an OSBL by the Habitations communautaires de CDN or by residents' cooperatives (City of Montreal 2003b). Created in 1988, the SHDM was intended to serve as a para-public developer for the City of Montreal, with the mandate of "acquiring, renovating, constructing, selling, renting or managing residential, industrial or commercial buildings" (City of Montreal 2001). The SHDM was mandated, at its inception, to use its interventions to revitalize troubled neighbourhoods and create affordable, high quality housing alternatives. Such was the case in the northern sector of Côte-des-Neiges, where the SHDM intervened massively in the late 1980s.

When the federal funding for new construction dried up in 1993, the SHDM lost its mandate to acquire new properties and, ever since, has been occupied with the management and upkeep of the buildings acquired earlier as its mandate. In 1995, it became a unit within the Service de développement de Montréal (SDM) that has a wider mandate to manage all of the City's real estate holdings, in the particular interest of privatizing them. Today, however, there is an SHDM project officer assigned to Côte-des-Neiges who is in frequent communication with the Habitations communautaires CDN as well as the individual housing cooperatives that are owned by the SHDM.

The other key state actor present in Côte-des-Neiges is the City's Direction de l'habitation, an office within the larger Service du développement économique et du développement urbain. The Direction's mandate is wide, concerned with the quality of housing in Montreal via both private and non-profit routes. The City articulates the mission of the Direction de l'habitation as follows:

> Pour répondre aux enjeux de développement durable et de mixité sociale, la Ville de Montréal insiste sur la nécessité d'une approche intégrée en matière d'habitation. Elle travaille donc à mettre en place un ensemble de stratégies complémentaires - incluant notamment la création de logements privés, sociaux et communautaires, la construction de logements à prix abordables, ainsi que des mesures d'aide à l'accession à la propriété et à la revitalisation des quartiers. (City of Montreal 2003a)

In terms of social housing, the Direction is involved on both a policy and a development level. As mentioned earlier, the Direction de l'habitation is responsible for the implementation of the AccèsLogis, and now the Affordable Housing Program as regulated by the SHQ. Their policy and research department, therefore, is involved with "negotiating – or at least lobbying – to have Montreal's needs taken into account" by housing funding programs at both the provincial and federal levels.

When it comes to building social housing units, all CDN AccèsLogis projects must be approved by the Direction de l'habitation. In February of 2002, the City gave the Direction de l'habitation the mandate to respond to Montreal's housing crisis by increasing the pace of construction of social housing. This led to the initiative of Solidarité 5000 logements, described above, and increased social housing development in the neighbourhood.

Who's not directly involved in CDN?

The provincial and federal social housing actors were not mentioned by the CDN community organizations as being present in the neighbourhood, mostly because the structure for social housing development and policy keeps them removed from the local level.

For example, the Société d'habitation du Québec (SHQ) is the provincial government's para-public agency responsible for housing policy and programs, falling under the Ministry of Municipal Affairs, Sports and Leisure. Since 1967, the SHQ has had a similar mandate to the City's Direction de l'habitation, aiming to improve Quebec's housing stock through both private and non-profit means. The Immobilière SHQ, for instance, is the largest residential landlord in Quebec (owner of all the HLMs managed by Offices municipaux d'habitation). It is the SHQ that develops and regulates social housing policy such as AccèsLogis and the Affordable Housing Program, then transferring responsibility for implementation to the municipalities. Therefore, they do not have direct contact with local organizations.

Somewhat related to the SHQ is the Fonds québécois d'habitation communautaire (FQHC), a council at the provincial level that brings together representatives from intermediary organizations, municipalities, the provincial government and financial interests.[31] It was created after the 1996 Summit on the Economy and Employment and was intended to serve as a fund that could offer start-up or bridging loans for community housing (i.e. OSBL and co-op) development. The FQHC mission is to:

> ...mettre en commun les efforts de tous les acteurs du monde de l'habitation, notamment les pouvoirs publics, les organismes du milieu et l'entreprise privée, afin de favoriser la réalisation de logements communautaires de qualité à coût abordable. (FQHC 2003)

Although independent of the SHQ, the FQHC is closely linked, with its president having been from the SHQ between its inception in 1997 and November 2003. The FQHC is the recipient of contributions from all AccèsLogis and Affordable Housing projects, so the expectation is that it will begin to have enough money to make significant loans to community housing projects by 2007. Up until now, however, the FQHC has acted more as a policy body, critiquing Quebec housing policy and suggesting alternatives. They have also intervened with the City of Montreal in order to improve the delivery of the Solidarité 5000 logements program.

At the federal level, there is the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC), a crown corporation that reports directly to the Treasury Council but with policy ties to the Ministry of the Environment and Human Resources and Social Development (HRSD) Canada. The CMHC can act independently of the federal government in terms of its activities but is at the same time dependent on the federal government's funding for housing projects

---

[31] The members of the FQHC include community representatives (AGRTQ, CQCH, FRAPRU, RQOH), muncipal representatives (Regroupement des offices d'habitation du Québec – ROHQ, Fédération québécoise des municipalities – FQM, Union des Municipalités du Québec – UMQ, City of Montreal and City of Quebec), financial representatives (Banque Nationale du Canada. Mouvement des caisses Desjardins) in addition to representatives from the SHQ.

targeting low income or special needs populations. As told by a project officer with ties to Côte-des-Neiges, the CMHC's mission is to:

> …improve the housing conditions of Canadians through direct programs (mortgage guarantees, renovation subsidies, ongoing support to existing social housing projects, etc.), research, environmental housing development and promotion, and international collaborations.

The CMHC has not been involved in new construction of social housing since 1993. Their commitments to preexisting projects continue, however. For this reason, the CMHC continues to have relationships with several cooperatives in Côte-des-Neiges and may fund renovations or expansions of these cooperatives. It collaborates with intermediary organizations as well as provincial governments on policy issues but does not see itself as in a position to lobby the federal government very directly.

Interestingly, the federal government's recent return to subsidizing housing projects has been accomplished by establishing National Secretariats outside of the CMHC. The first of these was the National Secretariat on Homelessness, under the HRSD, created in 1998 in reaction to the public uproar over the homelessness crisis (FCM 1998). This was the federal government's first return into programming that resembled social housing. The Homelessness Secretariat funded the construction or expansion of homeless shelters or transitional housing to get people off the streets. The Homelessness Secretariat's agreement with Quebec meant that, in Montreal, this money was funneled through the Régie régionale de santé et services sociaux and a council of local homelessness organizations. This led to several innovative housing projects but they were concentrated in the downtown area and had little impact in Côte-des-Neiges.

While the homelessness funding was much-needed, the program came under heavy criticism for being short-sighted in terms of one of the primary causes of homelessness: the lack of affordable housing. Intermediary organizations and municipal and provincial governments stepped up their pressure to demand the expansion of the program. This eventually led to the creation of the

National Secretariat on Affordable Housing, under the Ministry of the Environment, in 2000. This Secretariat is responsible for the negotiation and implementation of Affordable Housing agreements with the provinces. In Quebec, the counterpart is the SHQ. This Secretariat, therefore, is not present on the ground in Quebec, with all of its funds being channeled via the SHQ's funding programs and, finally, the City of Montreal.

The first part of this chapter has profiled all of the organizations (community, intermediate and state) that are involved in the social housing development and policies that shape the housing debate in Côte-des-Neiges. I have highlighted their similarities and differences in terms of origins, missions and accountability, all of which influence their choices in the struggle around social housing. So far, however, I have not discussed exactly what these groups mean when they say that they are working for social housing. In Chapter 2, I offered an academic definition of social housing but, in practice, actors use a variety of definitions that cluster around the traditional definition offered in my literature review. Some seek to promote social housing, others community housing and still others affordable housing. In the following section, I will explore these differences and reflect upon the implications of these varying views.

How do community groups see the state?

I argued, in my conceptual framework, that the liberal and the Marxist theoretical views of the western state, and specifically the welfare state, were useful in trying to understand how community groups see the state and the way in which this view might impact their choices in organizing. An awareness of the ways in which community groups perceive the state and analyse its actions is very important in trying to analyse the relationships which are possible between a given community group and the state. My fieldwork suggests that these two theoretical viewpoints coexist among community groups. There are groups on either side of this theoretical divide but most live with ideological contradictions –

and the reasons for this are complex. Here, I examine the analyses of the community organizations in order to add to an understanding of how they arrive at their organizing decisions and their relationships with other groups.

Distinctions must be made between official organizational positions on the state versus the positions of their organizers and their members. The positions of all three of these (official, organizer or member analysis of the state) may differ within the same organization. The existence of this diversity of views of the state both within and between organizations, with its related suggestions of what actions are appropriate and/or effective towards reaching organizing goals, can sometimes be a source of tension.

To begin with, organizations' official positions, as observed in their mission statements, mandates, communiqués and interviews, show near unanimous support for a liberal view of the state. The CDN community housing actors generally have formal missions to improve access to government services, improve government policy, offer alternative services and contribute to individual 'empowerment'. They do not formally hold a radical or Marxist analysis of the state and they do not challenge – or even raise – the role of capital within society. This assessment will be supported by the discussion below on choices of organizing models and the roles played by community groups in relation to the state.

The fact that the organizations' official positions on the state are unanimously liberal is surprising when we consider the views of their organizers. Among the organizers, there was a little more diversity in opinions. Most organizers, however, used a rhetoric that was more Marxist in character, explaining their views of housing and the state in a way that revealed a conviction that the socio-economic and political system itself was basically unjust. Most rejected that housing should be a for-profit commodity but expressed doubt that the government would ever willingly challenge capital on this point. It is interesting to note that many organizers had a long background in more radical activist movements and that many continue to engage in such activism outside of their current jobs. Several of the organizers in their 40s and 50s mentioned being

influenced by the Marxist-Leninist movement of the 1970s. These experiences and Marxist beliefs came through in their rhetoric and analyses of policy and political conjunctures. Class was a central factor in their analysis of the housing situation. They felt that seeing the state as neutral was naïve at best and opportunistic or a manifestation of class privilege at worst.

A smaller number of organizers, however, did argue for the liberal analysis of the policy arena. These organizers usually had more technical work experience before coming to the community movement and, if involved in activism outside of their jobs, it was more mainstream, charitable and liberal in nature. These workers felt that starting out with a distrust of the state or possible allies among the elite class was overly dogmatic and counterproductive in reaching common goals around social housing.

It was observed in activities and discussions with members that, among members of the local organizations, there was also diversity in views although they tend to group themselves around organizers with similar views. Members who come to activism with a developed reflection upon the nature of the state are drawn to organizers with a similar view. In Côte-des-Neiges, there is such a diversity of housing groups that an activist can usually find an organizer who shares his or her point of view. For members who begin developing their critique of the state after they became involved, they tend to be influenced by the rhetoric and popular education of the organizer and older members. If they find, with time, that they do not agree with the analysis, they may leave the organization.

Immigrant members of the organizations brought a particular variation of an analysis of the state. Some members compared the Canadian state to the state in their country of origin and concluded that the Canadian state is benevolent or at least a neutral mediator. Others, especially those who were involved in organizing before coming to Canada, analyzed the Canadian state according to the framework developed in the social movements with which they have experience. This resulted in a critical viewpoint that saw the Canadian state on a continuum with more repressive regimes, especially when seen as part of the international capitalist system.

The organizers who supported the liberal view of the state were all employed by the organizations with origins, mandates and accountabilities closest to the state. Those organizations whose origins were in citizen initiatives tended to have mandates and forms of accountability that helped to ensure the hiring of more critical or Marxist organizers due to a number of factors. More criticial organizers were drawn to work at groups with more critical mandates, members on hiring committees sought organizers who shared their political ideas and the expectation for the organizer to be involved in social action was a deterrent to those uncomfortable with this prospect. In several cases, however, groups with more liberal origins were transformed to become more critical due to the hiring of a more radical organizer and/or the participation of more critical or radical members. Another phenomenon is groups being pushed to the left by their frustrating experiences in working with the system in trying to address their needs. This is something that was observed in the recent revitalization of the Housing Table and its renewed memberships (to be discussed in the next chapter).

A basic observation on organizations' analysis of the state is that it is very complex, a combination of official, organizer and member viewpoints. Each of these different viewpoints both influences the others and constrains them. So, an organization's official mission may be liberal but critical organizers and members will prevent it from becoming more so. As well, there are organizational and legal constraints to direct social actions that challenge the legitimacy of the state (such as civil disobedience or, in terms of charity status (CRA 2002), engaging in any political action other than fairly passive advocacy) within the framework of a liberal organization. This discussion of community groups' views of the state begins to highlight the ways that analysis of the state might affect the ways in which a group might interact with the state. As we will discuss, however, the role that groups take on is also affected by other factors.

What it's all about: definitions of social housing

While strategies and tactics vary quite widely there is a notable degree of concurrence among actors when it comes to defining social housing itself. There is a basic, traditional definition of social housing that is widely accepted within the field. There was nearly unanimous agreement among the actors interviewed – the dissenters' points of view will be highlighted below – that social housing entails government subsidies for non-profit, collectively owned housing that is rented at affordable rates. Cooperative, non-profit and municipal (HLM) housing were all included by the vast majority of those interviewed. What varies among the actors is how strictly they interpret this definition and the political meaning they attach to it. For example, what level of government should subsidize social housing? Does 'collectively owned' mean the government, cooperatives or nonprofits? Should 'affordable' be defined in relation to market rents or in relation to people's income? What if a unit of housing is government-*subsidized* and sold at an *affordable* price to an income-tested *private* owner? Would that be social housing? All of these questions and more are at the core of the debates surrounding social housing. An actor's answer to these questions may stem in part from its origin and mandate (an indication of its underlying ideological bases) and will have an impact on its strategic and tactical choices as well as on its relationships with other actors.

In the following sections, we will learn how the housing actors interviewed define social housing, allowing us to consider the differences between them and the implications of these differences.

Traditional definitions of social housing

When asked to share her definition of social housing, the coordinator of the Mountain Sights Community Centre was the most succinct and to-the-point in her answer, laying out the essential elements raised by her colleagues in Côte-des-Neiges: "Affordable housing that offers fairly decent living conditions and that is subsidized, of course." While this simple definition of social housing is shared in

the neighbourhood, the coordinator of OEIL feels it is important to be open, not necessarily limiting the definition to include projects where every tenant pays only 25 percent of their income in rent:

> Moi, je considère que tout ce qui est sans but lucratif, c'est du logement social, donc les HLM et les coops. Mais aussi les logements qui appartiennent à une corporation (les OSBL) qui ont des loyers proches de celui de marché, où les locataires ne reçoivent pas de subventions au loyer. Ils sont administrés avec un objectif social et non de rentabilité ou de spéculation, avec des coûts moins élevés que dans le privé. Ce sont des logements pour lesquels des subventions ont été données pour les rénover et continuer à les entretenir.

Several actors were also critical of the shift of the definition of social housing to apply only for housing targeted at those with low incomes:

> Le logement social ce n'est pas que du logement à 25 % du revenu, et ce n'est pas du logement que pour très faible revenu. Là-dessus je ne suis pas en accord. Ça été une perversion du logement social qui est venue des gouvernements qui a fait en sorte que le logement social sert juste les plus démunis des démunis. Et à l'époque on s'est battu contre cela, on avait dit, et on a eu raison, que si le logement social devient qu'une solution pour les démunis, c'est quelque chose qui devient fragile et facile à défaire. (FRAPRU)

The idea of collective ownership, in clear opposition to the private market, was an important feature for many community actors. An organizer from Project Genesis puts it well:

> Le logement social, d'abord, on l'oppose au logement privé, donc c'est un logement qui est sans but lucratif. C'est un logement qui n'appartient pas à une personne en particulier, ça appartient à la collectivité, le propriétaire officiel est soit un organisme sans but lucratif ou une coopérative ou c'est l'état ou la ville, mais c'est jamais un individu privé ou une compagnie qui possède le logement social... Le marché privé c'est chacun dans son appartement – "Je paye mon loyer" – et la plupart du temps on ne connaît pas nos voisins. Il y en a quelques-uns pour qui c'est un investissement, le logement privé, donc il veut faire du profit ou rentabiliser son investissement. Il y a toute une logique du marché, de l'offre et de la demande, qui joue là-dedans. Alors que dans le logement social on essaye de sortir de cette logique-là, du marché privé, pour offrir le logement à tout le monde, sans exception. Mais

> évidemment on va tenter de l'offrir à ceux qui ont le moins la
> capacité de s'en trouver sur le marché privé d'abord.

The coordinator of FRAPRU described another way that social housing differs
from market housing:

> …Une autre chose que j'ajoute maintenant à la définition, et qui
> prend de plus en plus d'importance, c'est le fait que les locataires
> ont la possibilité de dire leur mot. Pour moi c'est une exigence
> maintenant du logement social. Ça a été une bataille parce qu'au
> départ ce n'était pas le cas en HLM et c'était très peu le cas en
> OSBL et en coop. Mais maintenant, cette question de prise en
> charge des locataires pénètrent dans l'ensemble des formules et ça
> les différencient carrément du marché privé.

Overall, the influence of FRAPRU in defining social housing is quite
strong in the neighbourhood. One long-time organizer, used to seeing me in the
neighbourhood and attending various housing rallies, responded to my question
about the definition of social housing in this way:

> [En blague] De la merde, de la merde! Tu vois, je n'ai pas honte de
> parler de ça ! [Sérieux] De toute façon, tu la connais, la cassette du
> FRAPRU. Je suis une FRAPRU presque convaincue. (Project
> Genesis)

For local actors, social housing was seen as an important way of
addressing the broader social problems present among CDN residents. The
organizer from MultiCaf, for example, explained the relationship between access
to social housing and other issues of quality of life that are adversely affected by
poverty:

> Pour moi le logement social, ça s'inscrit vraiment dans la lutte à la
> pauvreté… Tu peux au moins bien te loger parce que les
> conditions sont relativement bonnes dans les logements sociaux et
> tu peux aussi participer à la vie parce que ça laisse un petit peu de
> place pour t'impliquer, pour te positionner en quelque part au
> niveau social. Je vois des gens ici qui viennent puis qui prennent
> 50-60-70% de leur revenu [pour le loyer]. Si tu mets ça dans ton
> logement, ben, il ne reste pas grandes choses pour le reste. Ils ne
> peuvent pas socialiser. Il n'y a pas de stabilité. Puis, au niveau de
> l'estime de soi c'est ben maudit ! T'es obligé de fréquenter des
> endroits comme ici!

The organizer from Project Genesis expands upon this more global view of social housing, indicating an interest in quality of life in the building and the broader community that was common among many members of the Housing Table:

> Pour moi le logement social c'est du logement qui se veut de bonne qualité, qui se veut abordable pour les gens qui ont le moins d'argent et qui se veut intéressant en terme de dynamique communautaire et que ça puisse amener les gens à se recréer un milieu de vie qu'on ne trouve généralement pas dans le marché privé.

The organizer at PROMIS shared this political conception of social housing:

> Je pense que c'est la réponse solidaire que doit donner la société à des groupes les plus démunis de la société pourqu'ils aient accès à un endroit digne d'y vivre. Ce n'est pas paternaliste. C'est un réseau nécessaire pour une société à développer. Le concept de logement social devrait être élargi pour tout le monde dans une société idéale. C'est aberrant que même ceux qui travaillent, qui ont des salaires acceptables, doivent débourser au moins 40 à 50% de leur salaire juste pour vivre. C'est énorme.

Fundamental to the traditional definitions of social housing used by CDN housing actors, however, is the idea of access to housing as a basic human right:

> Le logement social, ça part du principe d'un logement décent digne. On peut utiliser le mot "dignité". C'est que c'est un droit fondamental comme l'eau, l'air, les choses de base. Alors, pour moi le logement social c'est ça, c'est un peu un outil qui nous permet de tendre vers cet idéal autant que possible, de pallier, de contrebalancer certaines forces qui peuvent faire que ce droit peut être menacé. (Société environnementale de CDN)

This is one of the most important motivating factors for many of the housing actors of the neighbourhood. All local members of the Housing Table shared the opinion that 'social housing' should include all three traditional options: HLMs, OSBLs and cooperative housing. In their view, there is a place for each type of housing.

Community housing

Despite the agreement on what constitutes 'social' housing as a broad category, several actors – especially the GRTs and the intermediary organizations representing OSBLs and cooperative housing – made the political choice to focus

their efforts on 'community housing'. In using this term, they are indicating a support for nonprofit, subsidized housing that is owned and managed by community actors such as OSBLs or tenants' cooperatives:

> Avant le logement social était beaucoup associé au logement public. Avec le temps cette définition-là a tendance à s'élargir et de plus en plus on fait une distinction entre logement public et logement communautaire. Le logement communautaire étant du logement coopératif ou sans but lucratif, c'est-à-dire sous propriété indépendante du gouvernement. (AGRTQ)

The feeling is that HLMs and other possible forms of state owned and managed housing are paternalistic and fail to address local conditions. The GRTs, for example, are strong supporters of the community housing approach:

> Les personnes parlent beaucoup de logements sociaux, mais ceux-ci sont gérés par l'État tandis que les logements communautaires sont gérés par les usagers. C'est évident que notre expertise est en développement immobilier communautaire et social. (Groupe CDH)

The community housing definition puts a premium on the empowerment of tenants, something they do not believe can happen within HLMs:

> Nous on fait partie de la forme la moins sociale du logement social, même que l'on se définit comme n'étant pas du logement social, les coopératives d'habitations. C'est plutôt du logement à la rigueur communautaire, mais plutôt du logement autogéré, coopératif. La question de l'autogestion se distingue totalement d'autres modes de logements sociaux, ce sont des modes plus clientélistes tandis que nous on est un mode actif, un mode participatif, fondamentalement. (FÉCHIMM)

Separation from state control, however, is as important as separation from control by the private market:

> Il y a des personnes qui, pour se loger, doivent payer des montants très importants mais aussi qui ne contrôlent pas leur habitat car ils sont locataires et sont vraiment à la merci de leurs propriétaires. Par contre, dans une coopérative d'habitation, ou dans un projet social, on retire ces logements du marché spéculatif. Cela est le premier élément. Le fait de participer à la gestion, ça permet d'économiser et ces gens-là sont favorisés par la ristourne car de plus en plus, les coûts de loyer baissent en comparaison avec le marché privé. Donc, c'est un bénéfice direct pour les personnes.

This refusal to include HLMs as a valid form of social housing is a definitional difference that has caused friction among housing actors since the withdrawal of federal money from new construction and the Quebec government's decision to cease HLM construction in favour of AccèsLogis support for OSBLs and cooperatives. At the Quebec level, for example, CQCH, RQOH and the AGRTQ lobby only in favour of OSBL and cooperative housing whereas FRAPRU and the FLHLMQ argue fiercely that HLMs remain an important element of social housing, not only because they feel its format remains attractive and appropriate for many tenants but also because it is seen as a way to maintain long-term state funding for social housing.

For many years, the SHQ and the Fonds québécois d'habitation communautaire have functioned using the 'community housing' definition. This is shifting at present, however, as the federal government has introduced the concept of 'affordable housing'.

Affordable housing

The federal government kept its word that it would never return to funding social housing and instead instituted a program to fund 'affordable housing'. As opposed to social or community housing, 'affordable' housing is not necessarily nonprofit or collectively owned. The federal Affordable Housing program opens the door for private developers to receive subsidies in order to construct rental units to be leased at slightly below market rates. The SHQ has taken this program and adapted it to be used either by the nonprofit or private sectors. In either case, however, the final rents are above what is possible under AccèsLogis.

Affordable housing is now the concept promoted by all federal agencies (CMHC and the National Secretariats on Homelessness and on Affordable Housing) but it is a definition which most community and intermediary housing actors are careful to keep distinct from the more traditional forms of 'social housing'. Many criticize the program as offering subsidies for private profit without guaranteeing long-term benefits for tenants.

Affordable housing is now also being promoted by the SHQ and the City of Montreal is starting to use the term to cover a range of types of housing interventions. A project officer from the SHDM explains why her agency is moving away from using the term 'social housing':

> Le terme est un peu péjoratif parce que la plupart de la population pense que du logement social c'est seulement pour les assistés sociaux, alors que c'est faux. Ce n'est pas ça. On parle de plus en plus de logement abordable ou bien les gens pense que le logement social ce n'est que du HLM.

Part of this move away from the more strict definition of social housing towards using the broader 'affordable housing' is the desire to include other forms of housing support under this broad rubric. As explained by the director of the AGRTQ, "Il y a une mutation qui est en traîne de se faire dans le logement: communautaire, public, social. Il y a un repositionnement, une mutation importante qui est en train de s'établir."

Emerging definitions

There are several important shifts occurring in the definition of social housing. The first is the increasing openness to private ownership. There is also the targeting of housing to vulnerable populations as well as the inclusion of other housing measures such as shelter allowances and rent supplements.

The inclusion of private developers and landlords in definitions of social housing is increasing. Both the City of Montreal and the SHQ are increasingly including any form of housing subsidy within social housing. For example, below market rental housing owned by private landlords and subsidized private homeownership are both being implemented as new forms of social housing (or at least affordable housing) in the Montreal area.

Another trend in defining social housing is an increased emphasis accorded to special-needs populations. Whereas in the past, many groups preferred a universal approach, there is now a push to meet the needs of particular populations with particular difficulty being housed in the private market. Many see this move as positive:

> C'est évident qu'il y a une clientèle qui n'est pas capable ou intéressée à gérer pour différentes causes, et nous l'avons vu. Il y a donc des OSBL qui gèrent des logements. Ce sont des clientèles fragilisées par la vie, qui ont besoin de quelqu'un pour gérer ces immeubles, comme le cas des personnes âgées à Côte-des-Neiges. (Groupe CDH)

Without particular consideration for special needs, social housing was as unlikely as private market housing to offer possibilities to specific populations. This move is appreciated, therefore, but simultaneously looked upon with suspicion as a possible precursor to cuts to more universal forms of social housing, as has been seen in the past in limiting access to some forms of social housing according to households with extremely low income.

Finally, there is the increasing tendency of the provincial government in particular to include any form of housing support within social housing discussions. The Shelter Allowance (offering low-income families and seniors up to $80 a month towards their rent) and the Rent Supplement (paid directly to landlords to make up the difference between 25 percent of a tenants' income and the market rent) are the most often alluded to. The coordinator of FRAPRU explains why he rejects this approach:

> La Société d'habitation du Québec, quand elle parle de logement social elle va mettre là-dedans l'Allocation-logement ou le Supplément au loyer. Pour nous ce n'est pas du logement social car les notions de profit, de propriété privée, sont toujours là et ainsi que sur le fait que les locataires n'ont pas plus leur mot à dire. Le fait que le loyer est plus bas répond à une des caractéristiques du logement social mais ça ne répond pas à l'ensemble des caractéristiques. (FRAPRU)

Overall, however, most actors agreed on the general definition of social housing with the major point of dispute being the relative merit of the HLM formula. Among government representatives, almost none of them agreed with their agency's official definitions of social, community or affordable housing, preferring instead to refer back to the more traditional definitions mentioned above. The new trends in definitions were widely acknowledged, however:

> Le logement social est une définition qui est en mouvement actuellement, qui bouge. Mais c'est certainement un logement qui

> est soutenu par la société, qui est soutenu socialement parce que, principalement, le système actuel n'est pas en mesure de produire du logement accessible à tout le monde. Alors il y a une part de la population qui n'aurait pas accès au logement s'il n'y avait pas des politiques de logements sociaux. (FÉCHIMM)

This last point was at the heart of the concern of most of those interviewed.

Summary

The most striking thing in profiling the actors involved in the development of social housing units and policy in Côte-des-Neiges is their incredible diversity. In terms of level of intervention, types of organizations, their origins, accountability and mandates, there is a wide variation. I felt that an exploration of this aspect of groups' identities would be useful in understanding the context in which groups make decisions about actions (i.e. organizing) and the types of relationships they feel are appropriate with state actors.

In terms of **level of intervention**, there are both non-governmental and state actors at all levels: local, municipal, regional, provincial and federal. The further removed from the local level, the more likely it is for actors to contribute more in terms of policy or funding through their lower-level counterparts than through their own presence or actions. This is particularly true of the federal level in its entirety as well as the provincial state actors. The fact that there are actors intervening at all levels of government contributes to the complexity in trying to understand the impact the actors have on each other and, ultimately, on the development of social housing units or policy. In general, however, local and municipal level actors have more say in the development of social housing units whereas provincial and federal actors are more involved in the development of social housing policy.

There were also many different **types of organizations**. Grassroots community organizations play a key role at the local level but so do nonprofit professional organizations in the form of the technical resource groups (GRTs) and the nonprofit housing corporations (OSBLs). The local-level housing actors

were regrouped under provincial-level coalitions representing a variety of interests and putting emphasis on different types of social housing. Again, most of the provincial level coalitions had federal level counterparts. These provincial and federal nongovernmental coalitions play an intermediary role between the state and local actors, often leading advocacy and social action efforts. There were also different forms of state actors. With parallels at all three levels of government, there were politicians, government departments responsible for housing and para-public agencies usually more involved in the actual construction and/or management of social housing units.

There is also great diversity in terms of the **origins** of actors, especially at the local level. In my examination of this point, I was interested in where the impetus came from for the creation of the various housing actors. Interestingly, almost all of the non-governmental actors where created at the impetus of other groups interested in pooling their resources in order to have an impact on another level of intervention or in order to address a new issue. Among the local groups that were started due to citizen initiative, about half of the citizen initiatives were in response to a government funding opportunity. The origins of the government actors were harder to discern since their histories are not well documented and the civil servants I interviewed were not present in the early days of the agencies. While all the actors had government mandates, it was not possible to distinguish to what point this mandate arose due to government interest versus arising due to citizen pressure. In many cases, both situations, intersecting with the political and social context, seem to have played a role in their creation.

An organization's origin is usually linked to its concept of **accountability** since those involved at the beginning of an organization aimed to ensure that their interests were met by the organization. Those that were the result of citizen initiative tended to consider themselves accountable only to their members and perhaps the wider constituency affected by their work. The accountability of those created at the initiative of other groups was usually to their member organizations. Among nongovernmental organizations, some felt accountable to their funders, depending upon the stability of their funding and their political strength. State

actors usually had a complex accountability to voters (via politicians), government hierarchy and/or higher levels of government, particularly if there was a funding relationship between the two.

Finally, although beyond the local level actors were focused on housing or, at the least, community development, there was quite a diversity of **mandates** at the community level. Only two of the members of the Housing Table had housing as a principal mandate. The other participants felt that housing had a serious impact on their organization's mandates relating to a connected issue (ex. housing, food security) or to a specific population (ex. immigrants). Table 7.1 on the following page summarizes these findings.

In terms of definitions of social housing – which everyone was working towards – I found general convergence in definitions that included public subsidy for nonprofit and collectively owned rental housing. Some actors preferred to focus their efforts on 'community' housing (OSBLs and cooperatives) to the exclusion of HLMs. The focus on 'community' housing among certain intermediary actors caused some friction, but less so than the federal government's 'affordable' housing which opens the door to subsidies for profit-oriented housing. The SHQ and City of Montreal's inclusion of other forms of housing supports within the definition is not widely accepted at all, even among the staff of these agencies.

Conclusion

This chapter has reviewed the profiles of housing actors at the community, intermediary and state levels, in terms of their origins, mandates and accountability. The diversity of these organizations is striking yet their definitions of social housing are nevertheless quite similar. The information offered in this chapter will be a useful baseline in understanding the following chapters on roles and tactics. The identities of the different housing actors come into play when it comes time for them to make decisions about how best to intervene in the social housing debate.

Table 7.1: Summarized profile of social housing actors

Level of intervention	Type of organization	Origins	Accountability	Mandate
Local	Community organizations	Citizen initiative Citizen response to funding opportunity Initiative of other groups	To membership To general constituency To allied organizations To funders To government	Specific to housing Specific to related issue Specific population
	GRTs & Habitations communautaires de CDN	Initiative of other groups	To clients To allies (esp. Hsg Table)	Specific to housing
Municipal	Comités logement montréalais, FÉCHIM, FOHM	Initiative of other groups	To member organizations To allied organizations To funders	Specific to housing
	SHDM, Service de l'habitation, Borough Council	Government mandate Government response to citizen pressure	To municipal bureaucracy To municipal politicians To SHQ	Specific to housing General community development
Provincial	Intermediary organizations (FRAPRU, FLHLMQ, AGRTQ, CQCH)	Initiative of other groups	To member organizations To allied organizations To funders	Specific to housing
	SHQ, Fonds d'habitation	Government mandate Government response to citizen pressure	To provincial bureaucracy To provincial politicians	Specific to housing
Federal	Intermediary organizations (FCM, CHRA)	Initiative of other groups & municipalities	To member organizations To municipal politicians	General community development and policy issues
	CMHC, Canada Lands, Secretariat on Homelessness	Government mandate Government response to citizen pressure	To federal bureaucracy To federal politicians	Specific to housing

Chapter 8

Organizing for Social Housing:
community groups in action

In the previous chapter, I reviewed the community, intermediary and state actors involved in the social housing debate by examining their mandates, origins and basic forms of accountability as well as the types of relationships that exist between the different actors. All of these elements influence, in turn, these organizations' choices about the most effective (or sometimes the most feasible) ways to intervene in the social housing debate. This chapter will discuss the variety of tactics used by these different organizations, aiming to raise questions about the contextual factors (social, political and organizational) that lead to these choices. The research revealed that there is a wide range of tactics employed by the actors involved in Côte-des-Neiges. Each actor has its regular activities (strategy) and also a sense of how far along the spectrum of possible tactics that they are either willing or able to go. Organizations' strategic analyses usually lead them to choose a variety of tactics, some of which are found in unlikely combinations within the same organization.

In this chapter, I will review the range of social housing-related tactics that take place in Côte-des-Neiges. Before a discussion of the diversity of tactics used within their strategies, I will take a step back to review the definitions of social housing employed by the different actors. As we will see, there is a traditional definition that is widely accepted but some of the actors involved in Côte-des-Neiges are beginning to amend this definition to include new types of housing intervention. Once it is clear what the organizations are trying to achieve, I will discuss the two major strategies that actors use to achieve their social housing objectives in Côte-des-Neiges – developing social housing units and influencing state policy on social housing, before turning to the three main categories of tactics used within these strategies (partnership, advocacy, confrontational). At

the end of the chapter, a summary analysis of the differences between groups as they relate to their choices of strategies and tactics will be developed.

So many ways to intervene in social housing...

As has been raised in less detail in previous chapters, the housing actors of Côte-des-Neiges are involved in two main social housing strategies in their efforts to improve the housing conditions and quality of life of local residents. Some organizations focus their energies on the development of social housing units within the neighbourhood and some on developing state social housing policy. Within each of these strategies, there are also many different tactics that can be brought to bear.

As discussed in Chapter 4's conceptual framework (Panet-Raymond 1992; Wharf 1997; White 1997), where there is a collaborative relationship between the state and non-governmental organizations and some degree of mutual interest, a partnership approach can be used. An advocacy approach can be used when there is some degree of mutual confidence between the state and community actors and each side is able to influence the other with arguments, facts and a background of a power base. Finally, when relationships are tense or there is little sense of mutual interest, a confrontational approach may be used in order to force a desired reaction from the other party. Some organizations are involved in all three types of tactics or a combination thereof, as is the case, perhaps more surprisingly, as sometimes their tactical choices go against what we would expect given their usual relationship with the state. The choice of strategies and tactics, discussed in more detail below, reflects an analysis of social, political and organizational contextual factors in order to choose the most effective and/or feasible course of action.

Over the course of interviews, observing the activities of local organizations and reviewing the documentation of the different actors involved in the social housing debate in Côte-des-Neiges, some very interesting principles and reflections regarding appropriate ways to intervene overall on housing issues

were raised. A variety of tactics were used in order to obtain the local development of social housing units and to influence housing policy at the three levels of government. Partnership with the state, community advocacy and confrontational tactics were all used towards both of these housing goals.

The need to remain rooted in quality of life and the "real needs" of neighbourhood residents was often raised. The housing organizer of Project Genesis puts it well:

> C'est claire que d'une part, le Projet Genèse a comme mission de travailler avec les gens du quartier pour améliorer les conditions de vie. Si on s'implique tant dans le logement social et dans les questions de logements en général aussi, parce qu'on le fait, c'est parce que ça répond à un besoin. Effectivement, à Côte-des-Neiges, c'est une très forte proportion de la population qui est locataire, qui paye trop cher de loyer comparativement à leurs revenus et il y a aussi beaucoup d'immeubles qui sont en mauvais état. Ça explique en partie pourquoi on s'implique dans ce dossier-là.

Poverty was another consideration that drove organizations to become involved in housing issues:

> Le logement c'est un facteur assez important dans la pauvreté en général, donc de s'attaquer au problème du logement, ça nous permet aussi de s'attaquer au problème plus général de la pauvreté. Il faut quand même le prendre par un bout ce problème-là, la pauvreté ça peut être très vague et l'on peut le définir de différentes façons, le logement c'est une façon concrète d'aller, en tout cas en partie, chercher des solutions à la pauvreté. (Project Genesis)

In terms of choosing specific issues or actions, the coordinator of OEIL raised a long-standing maxim in community organizing:

> Si on veut encourager les gens, il faut avoir des résultats. Même si ce sont de petits gains, c'est important et c'est ça qui encourage, à la fois, ceux qui travaillent dans les groupes et les résidents qui viennent utiliser les services des groupes. Les groupes qui n'obtiennent jamais rien ne vont pas créer de l'espoir et de l'adhésion.

Local organizations were quite open to using a combination of tactics – from popular education to cooperation with state agencies to representational

advocacy to lobbying to demonstrations – when intervening on housing issues. One of the organizers with the most experience in the domain of social housing explained her openness to a form of "diversity of tactics" this way:

> Il y a un gars à un moment donné en assemblée générale du FRAPRU qui a sorti cette expression – je l'ai gardé depuis – qui est : « de tout avec ben de la sauce », comme quand tu vas chez ta mère au souper de Noël. « Je veux un peu de tout avec ben de la sauce ! » C'est notre façon de travailler. Tous nos dossiers, c'est « de tout avec ben de la sauce. » Alors, oui, on est présent à toutes les instances du conseil d'arrondissement. C'est important d'être là pour avoir l'information, pour faire valoir notre point de vue, pour soutenir les résidents du quartier avec lesquels on va là. C'est important pour maintenir la visibilité et la crédibilité du Projet Genèse. On intervient sur une affaire ou sur une autre, tout aussi bien prendre le téléphone et appeler quelqu'un à la ville que l'on connaît bien que d'envoyer des communiqués de presse dans les journaux. On utilise l'ensemble des moyens, des contacts lobby, aux pressions directes et tout ce qu'il y a entre les deux. Je pense que sur n'importe quelle question c'est les stratégies qui incluent toutes ces dimensions-là qui risquent d'avoir des chances de gagner. Le problème que je pense que l'on a souvent dans le mouvement communautaire, c'est de les opposer l'un à l'autre. Il y a les têteux qui ne font que juste du lobby, les manifestants qui font juste des manifs. Ce n'est pas opposé, c'est complémentaire. On est un des organismes qui comprend que c'est complémentaire et qui intervient de toutes les façons.

Although the intermediary organizations all used a diversity of tactics in their policy and development interventions, they used a more limited range of tactics. FRAPRU was the only organization whose self-definition was firmly linked to its use of a variety of tactics:

> Une particularité du FRAPRU, c'est que nous ne sommes pas qu'un groupe de lobby. Nous allons aussi jusqu'aux actions directes, désobéissance civile, manifestations plus larges. Au FRAPRU, et j'espère que ça restera comme ça, on ne s'est jamais défendu d'agir d'un sens ou d'un autre mais évidemment en autant que ça respecte nos principes… Et bien si les ministres acceptent de nous rencontrer, c'est qu'il y a une expertise mais aussi qu'on représente du monde et qu'on est capable de mobiliser, de bouger, de déranger. Par exemple, on a rencontré Mario Dumont la semaine passée et on va rencontrer Jean Charest lundi. Ils savent que ça ne nous fait pas plaisir de les rencontrer et qu'ils risquent d'y perdre des plumes plus que d'autres choses.

Apart from this basic variety of approaches, creativity in tactics and strategies, within the framework of their organizational values, was also seen as essential:

> Une autre chose qui est importante c'est d'avoir de la créativité, utiliser son imagination sociale. Les groupes communautaires, comme beaucoup d'organismes, ont tendance à se bureaucratiser. C'est pour ça que, quand je dis "coordonner", je ne suis pas trop directif pour donner de la place à l'initiative et à la créativité de chacun. (OEIL)

The idea of collaboration among allies was also key to most actors, believing that this would lead to greater efficiency, access to information and cooperation. The director of the Société environnementale explains how his organization decides to become involved in different issues outside its immediate mandate:

> On a une approche basée sur l'engagement et la collaboration. Donc, à partir du moment où l'on a une cause, entre guillemets, qui ne rentre pas en conflit avec notre mission ou nos valeurs, et à partir du moment que cet engagement-là ne se fait pas au détriment de notre mission première. Nous, on espère que l'on est proactif si on veut s'engager dans certains gestes de solidarité dans le quartier, par rapport aux organismes du quartier.

Nearly every member of the CDN Housing Table raised the idea of empowerment, increasing the capacity of individuals and collectives to control local projects and participate fully in decision-making. Projects that were resident-initiated were generally seen as very positive:

> Nous, on croit beaucoup, dans le cadre de notre travail, qu'un projet a beaucoup plus de chance de réussir quand il émane de la population plutôt que si ça soit nous qui, plus ou moins, l'imposions. On peut donner l'information aux gens qui ne savent pas que certains outils existent ou que certains projets ou programmes sont disponibles. Ils cherchent un véhicule pour réaliser leur projet, mais ils ne connaissent pas les différents outils possibles... À long terme, le projet a plus de chance de continuer. (Société environnementale de CDN)

The housing organizer at Project Genesis also raised the possibility of empowerment of those involved in fighting for social housing:

> En tant qu'organisme, on se bat pour avoir des logements sociaux et on en gagne plusieurs. Ce n'est pas la même chose que si tu sais que c'est l'État qui a construit des HLM et que tu as appliqué et tu as eu un HLM. Tu peux être content parce que tu as trouvé des solutions à ton problème de logement mais quand, en plus, tu t'es battu pour avoir un HLM ou pour avoir une coop ou un logement sans but lucratif et tu as vu qu'après tous les efforts de toi et ton comité, ton organisme, ça l'a apporté des résultats. Ça n'a pas juste répondu à ton besoin. Ça t'a aussi fait te sentir fier, ça t'a aussi fait apprendre des choses sur le travail fait en équipe et la solidarité et ça te sensibilise encore plus à ceux qui n'ont pas encore leur logement social. Alors ça fait ouvrir un peu les portes de l'esprit pour se rendre compte que ce n'est pas juste un problème individuel : « Bon, moi chu pas chanceux. J'ai un propriétaire qui abuse de moi et qui augmente tout le temps mon loyer et qui ne répare pas mon logement. Enfin j'obtiens un logement social. Chu bien content. » Et ça fini là. Mais là : « Je me suis créé un réseau de personnes avec qui j'ai travaillé, j'ai appris des choses et je vais garder contact avec ces gens-là. » Pour moi le comité joue tout ce rôle-type en même temps et essaye d'atteindre ses objectifs-là.

Achieving empowerment or control of projects by local residents was not seen as an easy task, however, as explained by the coordinator of the FLHLMQ:

> C'est une démarche qui est longue [atteindre l'autogestion/ autonomie] parce qu'il faut que les gens développent la confiance en eux-mêmes. Ces talents-là, pour des gens qui sont sur l'aide sociale, des gens qui se sont toujours fait dire "Vous êtes des bons à rien ; on vous laisse dans les HLM parce que vous êtes les plus pauvres de la société", c'est une démarche d'appropriation qui prend du temps. Il faut prendre confiance en nos moyens. Ça prend de la formation.

The importance of taking into account the cultural diversity of the neighbourhood was also widespread. This topic is discussed in more length later in this chapter.

Areas of controversy among the groups included the proper preponderance of one type of action versus another, particularly around the degree to which community groups should cooperate with the state (both in terms of analysis of the state as an entity and in terms of effectiveness in achieving their goals) as well as the degree to which they should use the methods of the private market in order to achieve their social housing goals. The GRTs were especially conscious of this

debate, as they are usually the ones having to take the actions relating to the private market:

> On travaille dans un milieu qui est terriblement compétitif dans le sens où pour acheter des terrains ou des immeubles, on agit sur un marché qui est en compétition. Donc, il faut en même temps agir avec les outils et avec les méthodes d'un marché privé lucratif et prendre ça et agir dans une forme communautaire et collective. Il n'y a pas beaucoup d'organisations au Québec qui le font. L'économie sociale, on commence à encadrer, de connaître comment ça agit, mais ce n'est pas évident. (AGRTQ)

I have presented in this section the guiding principles that shape the choices non-governmental social housing actors make about how to organize in order to achieve their social housing goals and objectives. As I will illustrate in the following sections, the tactics used by groups are determined more by organizational, social and political context than by a pre-determined strategy to achieve their goals. Pragmatism seems to be the over-riding framework for decision-making around organizing for social housing, a significant idea if one is trying to understand what is driving their decision-making and their possibilities for influencing government action.

Tactics for the development of social housing units

The social housing activity in which CDN organizations have the most direct implication is the development of social housing units within the neighbourhood. This is the principal goal of the Housing Table and the reason for which most of its members became active on the issue. There was a feeling that there is a need for more social housing in Côte-des-Neiges and that the constituencies of local organizations stand to benefit substantially from such units. Members do not have identical goals for social housing production, however. A review of some of their different analyses is instructive.

Objectives of the Housing Table

The basic goal of the Housing Table is to provide good quality, affordable housing to low-income neighbourhood residents. The director of the Habitations communautaires (manager of most of the OSBL housing in the neighbourhood), although not a member of the Housing Table himself, shares their basic orientation:

> On veut donner le meilleur produit possible. On a beaucoup sécurisé, on a personnalisé notre service. Quand on a ouvert notre bureau ici, moi j'ai été étonné du nombre de gens qui ont téléphoné et qui avaient dit : « C'est le fun là, au lieu d'être downtown et on ne sait pas qui est là, vous êtes dans le quartier ! » Ça s'est beaucoup personnalisé depuis 8 ans. C'est évident que, là, on connaît assez bien notre monde...

The organizer from MultiCaf was also very straightforward about their motivations for being involved in the Housing Table: "On essaye d'aider à la construction de plus de logements sociaux."

Urban planning considerations were also present in the overall goals of the Housing Table members, showing a concern for already existing but run-down buildings in the neighbourhood. The project officer from Groupe CDH tells us that "Notre stratégie dans le cas de l'achat-rénovation, c'est de cibler des immeubles qui demandent notre intervention et qui constituent une nuisance pour le quartier ».

One of the most common desires of the members of the Housing Table is to see more apartments in the neighbourhood that are appropriate for large families. While the average family size in Côte-des-Neiges is larger than that of Montreal (Lang 2004), there are few large apartments at affordable prices (FRAPRU 2004). An organizer from MultiCaf describes this shortage:

> Dans le quartier, on se bat beaucoup pour faire en sorte qu'il y ait des logements sociaux avec plus de chambres à coucher, plus grand pour recevoir ces familles-là qui des fois s'entassent. J'ai vu 12 personnes dans un $4^{1/2}$. J'exagère, peut-être, mais pas tant que cela. Il n'y en a plus de $4^{1/2}$, $5^{1/2}$ de toute façon. Le taux d'inoccupation est nul dans le quartier pour les $4^{1/2}$ et plus. Ou bien quand il y en a un qui se libère, il vaut une fortune.

The Mountain Sights Community Centre sees overcrowding as relating to immigration issues, both cultural (in terms of norms about household composition) and political (in terms of immigration policies):

> Most of the apartments here on the street are bachelors, $2^{1/2}$, $3^{1/2}$ and a few $4^{1/2}$. Not that many. Most families have several children. It's a minority that has 2 children. Most of them have 3 or 4 children and more. And because of the high immigrant and refugee population, there's a lot of sponsorship happening as well. So people are coming from other countries and, with the sponsorship, the rest of the family is coming and they're staying with the family that sponsored them. So there's the extended family that lives with the main family. There is an overcrowding problem.

Residents of Mountain Sights who are organized through the Community Centre see social housing as one response to the problem of overcrowding:

> The neighborhood, here, one of their projects is to have a co-op... and the other idea is that they would just want more social housing units on the street. There are not very many at the moment. There're two double buildings that are more of a non-profit organization model [Habitations communautaires CDN]. There are no co-ops. There are some HLMs down the street... This is one of the reasons the residents and the Centre have decided to sit at the Table de logement so that we can, I guess, develop that project and get the support that we need to develop that project.

At the other end of the spectrum are single people living alone on low incomes, a particular concern of the organizer from MultiCaf. While the neighbourhood has a fair supply of small apartments, they have become expensive and these people, if under 65, have little access to social housing: "On a aussi besoin des unités pour les personnes seules parce que quand t'es une personne seule en attente d'un logement social, ça peut prendre 3, 4, 5 ans. T'as le temps de faire une famille et de changer tes besoins!"

Apart from the belief that social housing in itself responds to a basic need for CDN residents, members of the Housing Table also see social housing development as a way to further their own specific missions. This is clear in the comments of the director of the Société environnementale:

> On revient quand même à notre mission dans le sens que nous, on considère qu'il y a toute une clientèle de personnes que l'on peut rejoindre, à qui on peut adresser notre message de conservation,

d'amélioration de la qualité de l'environnement. Et en plus de ça, on considère que le logement est lié à la qualité de l'environnement. Il y a une boucle entre les deux. Un environnement amélioré améliore la qualité des logements, un logement amélioré améliore la qualité de l'environnement. Si des gens sont dans des conditions de logement très difficile, on peut difficilement leur demander de penser au recyclage. Ils ont d'autres priorités. Il faut d'abord qu'ils règlent cette question-là avant de s'intéresser au recyclage, à l'amélioration de la qualité de l'environnement. C'est vraiment le terme d'éco-civisme sur lequel on travaille. Les gestes éco-civiques sont plus difficiles a apporté quand on a l'esprit occupé par d'autres batailles. Ça c'est d'un point de vue de nos intérêts, si on veut.

Several of the members of the Housing Table were quite interested in experimenting with new forms of social housing, addressing the needs of specific populations by going beyond "bricks and mortar":

Nous essayons d'être innovateur dans nos interventions comme, par exemple, le projet de la coopérative *Les Arts*, qui a gagné un prix d'excellence... On essaie aussi de travailler avec les étudiants... Nous sommes aussi en train d'introduire la notion de développement durable pour le respect écologique dans la mesure du possible... Nos objectifs en termes de logement communautaire et social sont de continuer à développer des logements de qualités à des prix accessibles pour la population. Nous essayons de développer des projets là où le besoin est pressant. (Groupe CDH)

At the same time that the members of the Housing Table have goals for the development of social housing units, they have been working on developing their internal capacity and effectiveness as a coalition:

Je pense qu'avec le nouveau plan d'action que l'on va proposer bientôt à la Table logement, on essaye de s'attaquer à des besoins qui ne sont pas comblés. Entre autres, on parle de communication, c'est-à-dire de faire connaître plus la Table, de la promotion. Il y a un manque de ce côté-là, autant auprès des organismes qu'auprès de la population et les bailleurs de fond. Ensuite, toujours dans la même idée, le réseautage. Tisser des liens, ça aussi c'est important. Par exemple, on travaille sur l'idée d'un réseau de coopératives, de relier les coopératives entre elles, pour qu'elles communiquent et qu'elles puissent avoir des économies d'échelle ou bien la synergie. Finalement, le point important c'est la communication : améliorer les réseaux de communication, faciliter, les augmenter. (Société environnementale de CDN)

While the underlying motivations for working for social housing development in Côte-des-Neiges were diverse, the end result was that all the members of the Housing Table were willing to collaborate towards this end. The next few sections will review the range of tactics that they were willing to use in order to secure the development of social housing units in their neighbourhood.

Partnership activities for housing development

From the perspective of local housing actors, they do not, in general, engage in partnership activities in order to develop social housing in the neighbourhood. Most of them see themselves as distinct from the state and, while they maintain respectful and cooperative relationships with several public servants involved in the process of social housing development, it remains that community groups regard these government employees as instrumental to their goals of housing development and are willing to turn to pressure tactics if need be. This is a scenario of "conflictual cooperation" (Panet-Raymond and Bourque 1991); community actors are willing to engage in occasional tactical alliances with state actors but do not see their interests as interrelated enough to engage in strategic alliances.

A look at the structures in place in order to facilitate government-community communication and collaboration for the development of social housing, and the fact that what used to be a government function has become almost entirely implemented by community actors, raises the question of whether this relationship might be considered a form of partnership. Their interdependence is clear: both sides (community and state) depend entirely upon the other in order to achieve their goals.

Two forms of partnership are clearly recognized by local actors, however. One is very significant, the subcontracting of the management of SHDM-owned housing units to the Habitations communautaires CDN and another example of partnership (or at least cooperation) between the old HLM Committee and the Office municipal d'habitation de Montréal for the mobilization of pro-HLM tenants. In the case of the SHDM-Habitations communautaires partnership, it was

collaboration between the SHDM and local housing organizations (as described in earlier sections) that led to the initial purchase and conversion of local buildings into social housing. The coordinator of OEIL sits on the board of the Habitations communautaires, making an important link between the OSBL and the Housing Table, since the Habitations communautaires itself is not directly a member.

In terms of partnership to further their housing advocacy and education activities, an organizer from Project Genesis describes how CDN housing actors were able in the past to obtain the collaboration of the city's para-public manager of public housing, the OMHM, in order to mobilize citizen support for increased HLM investment in the neighbourhood. This agreement that was later replicated in other neighbourhoods:

> Le Comité HLM de Côte-des-Neiges est le premier à avoir utilisé la liste de l'Office municipal d'habitation pour inviter du monde à une assemblée publique, une grosse assemblée publique à la Maison de la culture, paquetée de monde. Tu n'as pas la liste en fait, ce que tu fais c'est que tu prépares ton envoie, ton trac, ton enveloppe. Tu leur apportes les lettres pour qu'eux autres sortent les étiquettes et ils mettent leur timbre dessus. Côte-des-Neiges a développé ça et par la suite plusieurs comités logement à Montréal ont fait la même chose pour mettre sur pied des comités de mobilisation, des comités de requérants.

In this section, I have discussed the different forms of partnership that exist between community actors and the state, whether in terms of funding relationships or direct contracting, such as the relationship between the Habitations communautaires and the SHDM. There is a high degree of interdependence of the community and state actors; each needs the other in order to achieve its social housing objectives. Community actors do not find the partnership arrangements that exist, however, sufficient in helping them achieve their goals. As I will illustrate in the next section, advocacy is employed by community actors in order to address their interests with the state.

Advocacy activities for housing development

Advocacy was the tactic most commonly used by local organizations in order to develop social housing in the neighbourhood. The basic mandate of the

Housing Table, which meets every six weeks or so, according to need, is to work together in order to have a unified approach in dealing with the City and also in order to have a power base from which to derive legitimacy in presenting their positions. The coordinator of the Mountain Sights Community Centre described how difficult it was to move forward on the organization's housing agenda when they attempted to do so on their own:

> Until we became involved in the Table de logement, things were not moving for us. If there was no Table de logement, I don't know what we would do because we had contacted the Technical Resource Groups, through the CLSC. We even went to City Hall because we had identified a property and we wanted to know exactly the zoning of that property. I think the group of residents certainly needs an organization that is connected to them, that is prepared to lobby for them, with them, to pave the way. The Centre connects them to a stronger resource and that would be the Table. I think the fact that we're there (Mountain Sights Community Centre) and that we come regularly, we're willing to contribute to the overall issue of social housing in exchange for greater support and focus on us. So there's a give and take that is happening, and residents understand that, too.

Among the groups who participate in the Housing Table, there was quite a range in the level of technical knowledge regarding the actual process required in order to develop social housing units. Apart from those organizations that have housing as one of their specific mandates (i.e. OEIL, Project Genesis and, of course, the GRTs), most of the organizations concerned themselves with the more social or community aspects of housing projects. What was clear, however, was that the GRTs played an essential leadership role and their technical capacities far outweighed their non-official status on the Housing Table in terms of establishing influence in decision-making and planning. Even the housing committees on the Housing Table recognize the preponderance of the GRTs in the process, as expressed in this comment by the coordinator of OEIL that outlines the most basic aspects of developing social housing units:

> On est actif à l'intérieur de la Table, mais c'est très circonscrit. On joue à peu près le même rôle que tous les autres groupes, c'est-à-dire qu'on discute des projets. Donc il s'agit de trouver des

immeubles, faire avancer des projets et faire de la sensibilisation auprès des bailleurs de fonds, des gouvernements.

The housing organizer from Project Genesis confirms this supporter role:

On va s'impliquer un peu indirectement dans le développement de logements sociaux dans le sens où ce n'est pas nous qui allons acheter des buildings et les rénover…

In terms of the details of the process itself, the director of the Société environnementale described how it begins:

Donc, première étape, aller chercher les fonds que l'on veut, on commence par là. Ensuite, il y a des décisions à prendre. Il y a des projets qui ne demandent qu'à être décidé parce que les gens sont déjà organisés. Ils savent qu'il y a un financement qui est disponible, qu'ils peuvent monter ce type de projet. Ils se sont regroupés. Ils sont prêts. Il y a des situations comme ça où on ne peut presque pas exclure ce type de projet-là. Et en même temps il y a l'autre idée de développer dans l'ensemble du quartier. Est-ce qu'on va faire un projet d'itinérants, des gens qui vivent seuls, des familles monoparentales ou bien est-ce que ce serait des grandes familles avec de grands logements ?

The organizer from MultiCaf gave the most straightforward description of what happens once a building or particular population is targeted by the Housing Table, yet one whose basic content was shared in the comments of most members:

D'abord il faut déposer un projet à la Ville de Montréal. Ce sont les GRT qui sont mandatés avec l'accord du Conseil communautaire, évidemment, parce que la Table est une instance du Conseil. Donc, les propositions d'achats sont prises par les GRT, ils préparent un dossier, le soumettent à la Ville avec un CA provisoire. Dans le cas d'une coop d'habitation, on demande que ce soit des organisations du quartier, une implication du quartier. Ensuite vient la période d'attente de quelques semaines. Ou quelques mois car c'est maintenant plus compliqué avec la nouvelle Ville. À partir du moment où le OK est donné par la Ville, les travaux commencent car souvent les logements achetés sont insalubres. Tu n'achètes pas quelque chose qui est sain parce que ça coûte trop cher et il doit y avoir un besoin majeur. Les plans aussi doivent être retouchés, par exemple « mixer » deux logements pour avoir des logements avec 4 chambres à coucher, car c'est ce qui manque. Ensuite les résidents des logements sont avisés et eux aussi doivent faire une espèce de comité. Ils sont ensuite relocalisés le temps des travaux et ça finit par l'inauguration en général.

Non-housing organizations felt that they brought important, non-housing perspectives to the process of social housing development. PROMIS, for example, aimed to bring the perspective of immigrant settlement to the Table, a crucial process in the neighbourhood:

> Par exemple, si la Table de logement de CDN a présenté des logements à développer – ou l'OEIL ou ROMEL – on a toujours été là pour les appuyer ou les changer. Mais aussi, on est là pour amener des idées dans ces projets. On a une approche qu'eux ne connaissent pas nécessairement, car leur expertise est juste le logement et à PROMIS on a une expertise plus large donc cela fait des échanges positifs.

The Société environnementale brings its concern for urban environment as it relates to urban planning:

> C'est sûr que le leadership est assumé par les Groupes de ressources techniques mais on va jusqu'au bout de notre engagement, si on veut, dans le sens où l'on veut analyser, par exemple, quand il s'agit de faire des choix en fonction des budgets dont on dispose. S'il faut choisir entre trois projets, on va donner notre avis. Par exemple, on a eu à déterminer s'il fallait privilégier un projet qui semblait déjà avoir une clientèle – une demande ou un besoin – ou s'il fallait s'assurer de couvrir l'ensemble du territoire, ne pas privilégier un secteur du quartier, donc de chercher à développer des projets dans d'autres secteurs du quartier. C'est le genre de décision qu'il faut prendre, donc nous on a participé à cette réflexion-là.

Even the housing specific organizations, however, felt that their direct contact with tenants allowed them to make important contributions to the development of projects:

> Alors on va évidemment contribuer à ce développement-là en questionnant positivement les projets qui sont présentés en donnant des idées toujours en tentant de ramener les besoins des gens, on travaille avec eux tout le temps alors on finit par comprendre un peu qu'est-ce qui peut répondre à leurs besoins et mettre ces besoins-là de l'avant comme des priorités quand les gens proposent des projets. C'est un exemple de comment on va contribuer au développement même si ce n'est pas nous qui allons faire le travail de construction comme tel. (Project Genesis)

The contribution of local citizens was also seen as very important to the functioning of the Housing Table:

> C'est sûr que quand il y a des idées concrètes qui viennent des
> citoyens, moi, je leur accorde beaucoup d'importance et je vais
> m'en servir à la Table. Des fois, c'est juste une information, mais je
> trouve que c'est intéressant quand quelqu'un du quartier a apporté
> une information. Les experts, il faudrait qu'ils s'en occupent.
> Récemment c'est une personne qui m'a dit : « J'ai vu un terrain qui
> est vide quelque part, est-ce que tu penses que ça pourrait faire du
> logement ? » Je vais vérifier, auprès de la Table : « Vous qui êtes
> des experts en logement, pouvez-vous envoyer une personne et
> voir ce terrain-là, s'il est assez grand, et est-ce que vous pouvez
> faire un logement. » Si jamais ils bâtissent un logement-là, je
> pense que la personne qui va l'avoir vu va être très fière et avec
> raison... Mes stratégies, c'est de fonder ce que je vais dire sur les
> besoins que les gens peuvent exprimer. (Project Genesis)

Besides their central preoccupation with the process of actually developing social housing units, the members of the Housing Table also engage in other forms of advocacy in order to further their goals. Some examples observed over the past several years include research and reports to document housing needs in the neighbourhood and media work to raise awareness of the need for social housing without necessarily criticizing or otherwise putting pressure on the government.

The most common form of advocacy, however, has been regular interactions with elected officials. Since the creation of the Borough Councils, different members of the Housing Table have been taking advantage of the monthly meetings in order to raise their issues:

> We go to the arrondissement and talk about social housing when
> we're there. We talk about the need to enforce the housing code,
> make them more cohesive. And they talked about the co-ops.
> (Mountain Sights Community Centre)

In order to effectively communicate their interests to city councilors, members of the Housing Table assure a constant presence at the Borough Council. Each month, Housing Table representatives raise questions about the latest projects. Backed by a delegation of community members, Housing Table representatives make sure that municipal counselors remember the need for social housing. As explained by the coordinator of the Community Council, who helps coordinate this presence at the Arrondissement meetings, "Nous, si on fait un travail de

représentation – par exemple, si on parle à un conseiller municipal ou si on parle avec un ministre – on représente nos membres. On parle pour tout le quartier..."

Assuring that Côte-des-Neiges receives a fair share of the government's social housing budget requires advocacy and representation with the central City as well as at the provincial level. The director of the Société environnementale explains how this is done:

> On connaît l'importance des programmes de logements sociaux pour l'ensemble du Québec et de la Ville de Montréal et l'on veut aller chercher la juste part en fonction des besoins du quartier, des fonds qui sont disponibles, sans pour autant vouloir remplir nos poches en en enlevant de quelqu'un d'autre. Il y a quand même une solidarité importante dans ce sens-là. Donc s'il s'agit de demander plus, de faire comprendre au bailleur de fonds qu'il faut plus de financement, on va le faire. Nous, (la Société environnementale) ce n'est pas le genre de démarche que l'on fait vraiment, on peut signer s'il y a des lettres. Notre engagement peut aller jusque-là, mais pour ça on laisse le leadership pour ceux qui sont dans le domaine. Il y a beaucoup de représentations qui se font au niveau politique et au niveau administratif aussi.

Occasionally, intermediary organizations may support local organizations in their community-specific representations. Usually, intermediary organizations restrict their interactions with the government to general policy issues, but upon the request of local organizations, they will intervene on their behalf. In the case of cooperative housing projects, FÉCHIMM will sometimes get involved:

> On a fait des représentations auprès de la Ville, auprès de la SHDM. On participe aussi sur le plan local... On va être sollicité par un membre ou un futur membre et on va s'associer à ce membre-là et là on va faire la représentation en lieu et place... Nous ne jouons pas normalement ce rôle-là, par contre. Je vais te donner un autre exemple. Si une coopérative existante a un problème de contamination de sol, la fédération peut être appelée à représenter la coopérative auprès des instances de la Ville de Montréal pour obtenir l'aide spécifique à cette décontamination-là. Donc, on va travailler aussi au niveau de la consolidation des coopératives, en réalité c'est le gros de notre travail, on travaille auprès des coopératives existantes.

Specifically in Côte-des-Neiges,

> Les interventions que nous avons eu à faire à Côte-des-Neiges étaient des coopératives qui étaient en difficulté et pour lesquelles

> nous avons dû négocier avec la SCHL les conditions acceptables de relance d'une coopérative. Nous on a participé beaucoup au travail de représentation de ces coopératives-là auprès de la SCHL pour faciliter l'obtention du programme de relance qui soit plus facile à absorber. (FÉCHIMM)

Several other intermediary organizations, including the AGRTQ, FRAPRU and the FLHLMQ, reported occasionally intervening in the case of a local development project, but always at the request of its local counterpart.

Advocacy was usually the first approach used by local housing organizations in trying to influence the social housing process but, when this approach failed to offer results, many community and intermediary actors are willing to 'up the ante' and make use of confrontational actions.

Confrontational activities for housing development

For most local housing projects, the process proceeds as set out in the AccèsLogis and City of Montréal regulations. When things go well, the Housing Table does not resort to confrontational tactics. Confrontation is seen as counterproductive if cooperation or advocacy can do the job. Occasionally, however, specific housing projects encounter unexpected delays that are judged by the Housing Table to be due to lack of political will (or negative political will) on the part of state authorities. The obstacle sometimes also comes from private landlords or developers who seek to obtain buildings for condominium conversion or construction and who also seek the support of the Borough Council. The Housing Table will also make a target of them if it is judged to be useful. In such cases, the Housing Table will engage in confrontational tactics, often with the support of intermediary organizations.

In the advocacy section, it was described how members of the Housing Table maintained a monthly presence at the Borough Council meeting. The effectiveness of their constant reminders is in part due to the unspoken (usually!) threat that instead of making polite reminders, members of the Housing Table could mobilize their members to come and disrupt the meeting, embarrass the politicians or attract negative media attention to the meeting. Going over the

authority of the borough to complain at the central city administration is another possibility. All of these tactics have been used by the Housing Table for such reasons as blocked social housing funds, obstacles to changing zoning or a painfully slow borough process to approve social housing projects and pass them along for the further attention of the Service d'habitation.

Confrontational media work is another popular tactic, one that is well mastered by OEIL and Project Genesis in particular. When the Housing Table feels that the City is being unjust in its treatment of a particular project, negative press conferences are frequently used. The press conference with theatrical content is a tried and true approach for CDN actors. The coordinator of OEIL describes how this was used in the 1980s to encourage the construction of HLMs in the neighbourhood:

> On a fait des conférences de presse et à deux reprises, environ, on a fait des inaugurations fictives d'HLM... S'il s'est construit des logements derrière le Centre hospitalier de CDN, c'est à cause du Comité où l'on a réussi à obtenir le terrain et s'il y a un HLM qui s'est construit sur Goyer au coin de Darlington, c'est suite aux pressions du Comité. La même chose pour le HLM construit sur Mountain Sights. On a fait pas mal de démarches.

Demonstrations have also been used in the neighbourhood, but this is a tactic that is more often seen as useful in collaboration with other members of the intermediary organizations. The Blue Bonnets Racetrack, however, long a source of debate in the neighbourhood over its proper future use, was the object of several demonstrations in the past:

> Le Comité HLM avait notamment organisé des manifs à Blue Bonnets. On parle dans les années 80. Il y a eu une autre intervention à Blue Bonnets dans les années 90. Je travaillais au FRAPRU à cet époque et j'étais allée faire un tour à la manif et on leur a apporté un mégaphone. (Project Genesis)

Other pressure tactics used by members of the Housing Table include organizational or residents' delegations to the offices of elected officials, confrontational petition or letter-writing campaigns and highly publicized popular education on the shortfalls of the government's commitments and/or actions. And,

if necessary, the members of the Housing Table are ready to combine all of these tactics!

> On est allé à des Conseils de quartier, on a écrit des lettres, on a
> fait des manifs, on a fait de la pression. On a fait toutes sortes de
> choses, toutes sortes de travail de pressions. (OEIL)

Again, we see the willingness of local organizations to be guided by pragmatism, making use of the tactics they believe will be most effective in helping them meet their goals in terms of social housing development. In the following section, I will illustrate the way that this is also the case when it comes to organizing around social housing policy.

Tactics to influence social housing policy

Although the development of social housing units is the social housing activity that has the most immediate results for the constituencies of Côte-des-Neiges organizations, it is not the only way that they intervene on social housing issues. Their tactics for doing this – attempting to have an influence on policy outcomes – are diverse and, as with their social housing development tactics, can be categorized according to partnership, advocacy and conflictual approaches.

Members of the Housing Table were very aware that, in order to obtain new social housing units in the neighbourhood, they required favourable social housing policy at the municipal, provincial and – in the best of scenarios – federal level:

> Il y a toute l'étape avant que l'on aie un projet concret qui est celle
> de se battre pour avoir des programmes de logements sociaux.
> Pour ça, on ne le fait pas tout seul. On le fait avec une coalition,
> tout le travail de mobilisation, d'éducation et d'implication des gens
> et toute l'action socio-politique qui va avec.

In general, it was believed that working on policy was something quite difficult to do from the local level, creating among some members of the Housing Table an interest in working with intermediary organizations. For the local housing committees, working on policy created quite a passion and the organizers

and members felt they were making important contributions to the common good by participating in policy debates. The housing organizer from Project Genesis describes the links between policy debates at different levels and his local organizing work:

> Les débats qui se font à l'intérieur du FRAPRU sont vraiment intéressants. Ça permet de confronter des visions, différentes des fois, du logement social. Il y a d'autres débats qui vont se faire au niveau montréalais entre les comités logement de Montréal. Ces débats-là, ça nous oblige à quelque part à définir quelle est notre position et comment on voit les choses et, évidemment, quand on définit plus clairement nos positions, là on est capable de défendre notre vision auprès des politiciens de notre quartier, de nos députés, et dire « Nous, on trouve que c'est important tel élément, il ne faut pas bloquer telle chose ou il faut encourager telle chose. »

In Côte-des-Neiges, the role of policy in contributing to the quality of life is an idea that is current in local debates. The Community Council has this as a guiding principle and the Housing Table follows in a similar vein, often turning to the intermediary organizations for more in-depth analyses. Many examples of weaknesses of housing policy were given, as in this example from the FLHLMQ about the turn in the early 1990s to make HLMs focused on only the "most needy" among the poor:

> Ça l'a eu pour effet que même si les gens qui travaillaient étaient sur les listes des HLM, ils ne rentraient jamais. C'était toujours non seulement les plus pauvres, sans travail, sur l'aide sociale, mais aussi ceux qui ont d'autres problèmes psychosociaux qui rentrent dans les HLM. Tout ça, mis ensemble dans des grandes tours. Sur 20 ans, ça l'a eu l'effet de créer des ghettos. On ne le crierait pas sur la place publique parce que ce n'est pas une bonne façon de promouvoir les HLM, mais à l'interne, dans nos congrès, on disait « C'est un énorme problème. » Nous on veut que les HLM, ça soit des milieux de vie intéressants et, pour ça, il faut changer ces politiques-là. Il faut ramener une certaine mixité sociale dans les HLMs. C'est un autre combat de la fédération de se battre pour la mixité sociale.

CDN organizations who do not work directly on housing felt that, without the time or the resources to engage in policy analysis and with their own policy issues to address, working on housing policy was a little too far removed from

their mandates and left this work to be done more directly by those groups with a housing-oriented mandate.

Weak links to housing policy

While most members of the Housing Table did not become directly involved in social housing policy, it was not for a lack of importance accorded the issue. When asked whether MultiCaf participated in social housing policy debates, their organizer responded:

> Pas assez. On s'implique, mais au niveau de pousser une réflexion, là je suis toute seule à assumer ce rôle-là donc c'est très difficile pour moi de m'asseoir, de réfléchir sur des choses, de monter des mémoires et d'assimiler vraiment parfaitement ce dossier-là. Parfois j'ai l'impression de survoler les choses puis rien faire à fond. Mais là je suis très dure envers moi-même. On me l'a déjà dit mais, compte tenu de la somme de travail qu'on a à faire, on ne peut pas non plus. Ça va de faire la ligne le midi, consoler quelqu'un, essayer de trouver un logement. C'est à travers notre implication avec le FRAPRU qu'on participe.

Others shared this fear of not having a deep enough understanding of housing policy issues to intervene in a credible fashion. The members of the Housing Table were very conscientious about taking positions, as illustrated in this remark by the director of the Société environnementale:

> Ça demande d'être bien informé – ça c'est mon point de vue – pour pouvoir prendre position. Moi, j'ai tendance à croire qu'il faut que l'on fasse une autocritique de temps en temps et qu'on se pose des questions. Est-ce que l'on n'est pas un peu cantonné dans des positions, sans se demander si elles ne peuvent pas évoluer. Nous, on n'est pas en mesure de le faire parce qu'il faut vraiment bien connaître la situation, aller chercher les informations. Alors on se fie beaucoup sur les prises de positions de ceux qui sont impliqués, qui ont plus ça comme mission. Tout en se disant que peut-être eux sont cantonnés et qu'ils n'ont pas nécessairement fait cet exercice-là. C'est normal, il y a une passion, on veut aider les choses, mais des fois, c'est difficile de se remettre en question.

Although most of the organizations were not directly involved, they did participate in wide campaigns in support of favourable of social housing policy. And, in general, as expressed here by the coordinator of the Community Council,

CDN Housing Table activists try not to miss an opportunity to emphasize the importance of good social housing policy:

> On participe beaucoup à des manifs, on va faire partie souvent de comités. Comme au Sommet de Montréal[32], le Conseil communautaire était représenté. Des choses comme ça. Des mémoires aussi. On y va poser des questions des fois aux élus, mais ça dépend à quel niveau que ça se passe. Si c'est un sujet qui est défendu par un groupe dans les membres du Conseil, ça va souvent être le groupe qui va porter la demande avec l'appui du Conseil.

As I will illustrate below, although the level of involvement in housing policy debates is varied among local actors, there remains a wide variety of tactics put to use. Again, the partnership, advocacy and confrontation categorizations can be applied.

Partnership activities for housing policy

In terms of housing policy, there were few examples of local organizations engaging in partnership activities such as the permanent participation on para-public policy councils or the subcontracting of management of buildings or applications to HLMs. In fact, the utility of a partnership approach with the city on social housing issues is the subject of some debate. Some members of the Housing Table feel that a closer relationship with the city would help them to develop more housing in the neighbourhood, while others are politically opposed to this possibility, seeing it as a sure way of being co-opted.

This debate also existed among the intermediary organizations. The GRTs, for example, often blurred the line between being partners of the City, participating on working groups and councils, and being in tension with the City when specific projects were blocked. FRAPRU, on the other hand, is clear that it is not interested in partnership with the government, preferring to retain its

---

[32] The Sommet de Montréal was held June 4 – 6th, 2002, a consultation held in each Borough of the newly merged City of Montreal on issues of community and economic development, municipal democracy and social policy. The City described the Summit as follows: "Cette démarche vise à mobiliser tous les citoyens et groupes qui ont à cœur la réussite de cette nouvelle ville afin qu'ils mettent en commun leurs attentes, priorisent leurs actions et leurs projets et définissent un plan d'action réaliste" (City of Montreal 2002)

identity as a pressure group. The project officer of the Groupe CDH offers his
view of this situation:

> Le FRAPRU parle de logement social (incluant les HLM). Nous
> on parle de logement communautaire (OSBL et coops). Il y a tout
> un débat là-dessus. Les groupes de ressources techniques
> participent au débat. On enrichit la réflexion parce qu'on a
> l'expertise. C'est une question très théorique de définir mais la
> réalisation de projets c'est une autre chose. Parfois, on fait face à
> des obstacles qui ne correspondent pas nécessairement au
> programme. L'AGRTQ fait partie du Fond québécois de
> l'habitation sociale et communautaire. On participe avec la Ville et
> aux instances de quartiers à des discussions. Les groupes de
> ressources techniques, comme nous, interviennent.

Such partnership activities, however, do not preclude other tactical choices,
according to the political context in which groups find themselves.

Advocacy activities for housing policy

Advocacy activities in support of particular housing policies were the
types of tactics most widely used by members of the Housing Table. Public
assemblies to discuss policy issues and get community members' reactions and
ideas to new policies were used to inform the advocacy work undertaken by local
organizations, as well as to apply pressure by raising the public profile of policies
when deemed necessary.

As with the work to develop social housing units in the neighbourhood,
local organizations were interested in producing research and reports to document
the need to change social housing policy. Participation in government
commissions or hearings for policy or law development through the presentation
of briefs is a popular way for local groups to intervene in policy debates:

> Nous nous sommes présentés à des commissions parlementaires.
> On fait valoir notre point de vue. Et puis dans les réunions au
> Sommet de Montréal on a été très présent et même, actuellement,
> je fais partie du Comité de suivi du Sommet de Montréal au nom
> du ROMEL. Nous participons à l'élaboration de la politique, à
> l'application du programme, on participe à ces forums-là très
> activement...

For some actors, presenting briefs is another way for their members to exercise power and directly influence government officials. The FLHLMQ, for example, has a policy that members speak for themselves at such meetings:

> Lorsque l'on fait des représentations politiques, on prépare un mémoire, on le discute au conseil d'administration, on le fait approuver, mais c'est les membres du conseil d'administration qui vont le défendre en commission parlementaire. Ils sont très importants et c'est leur affaire à eux autres. Ce ne sont pas les miennes. C'est à eux autres de parler.

Meetings with provincial politicians and public servants are used by local groups to advocate specific policy choices, although they are usually advocated through participation with intermediary groups. Below, are several examples of the way in which intermediate groups intervene at the provincial level on policies related to social housing such as cooperative housing policy...

> Nous, comme fédération régionale, on intervient en concert avec tout le mouvement au Québec. On est tous regroupés dans la Confédération québécoise des coopératives d'habitation. Nous orchestrons nos représentations ensemble, on fait des réunions, on traite des dossiers ensemble et on s'entend pour se partager les tâches. On s'entend pour déterminer quel type d'investissement on va mettre pour faire une campagne ou une autre... Justement, demain on va passer en audition à la Commission parlementaire sur l'aménagement du territoire. C'est le président de la Fédération et un administrateur qui vont défendre le mémoire. (FÉCHIMM)

... municipal fusions...

> Lors du débat sur les fusions municipales, on est intervenu en faveur des fusions municipales en se disant : « Si on crée des plus grandes villes ça va regrouper les HLM »... On disait aussi qu'avec ces nouveaux offices-là qui vont se créer avec les fusions municipales, c'est important que le pouvoir ne s'éloigne pas des résidents... Donc, la position stratégique que l'on avait prise, c'est qu'on se prononce pour les fusions en demandant au gouvernement de nous assurer qu'il va y avoir une place claire pour la consultation des résidents. (FLHLMQ)

... and the regulations governing social housing:

> Nous on négocie avec la SHQ les normes et les programmes mais la SHQ, ils ont confié à Montréal la gestion du programme donc nous, on a intérêt à savoir ce qui se dit, comme : « Est-ce que Montréal interprète les normes ? » Dans ce sens-là, on est présent,

> pour s'assurer que l'arrimage entre Québec et Montréal se fait bien pour nos membres... Des fois, on peut aussi faire une représentation politique, mais c'est vraiment plus rare, quand on le fait c'est vraiment sur une demande expresse de nos membres... C'est généralement ça et quand on envoie des lettres généralement c'est à la demande de nos membres. C'est une situation un peu délicate, on n'est pas comme le FRAPRU, on n'a pas la même approche.

Although links to the federal government are less common, due in part to the comparatively small role the federal plays in housing and in part due to a Quebec-centric view of politics, there are some groups that maintain an interest in advocating for renewed and significant federal funding of social housing. The housing organizer of Project Genesis gave this description of the role of advocacy with federal politicians:

> Nos deux députés fédéraux nous appuient sur l'importance que le fédéral investisse dans le logement social. Les deux ont été très sensibles. On mettait plus d'attention sur Cauchon parce qu'il était ministre. Mais ils s'en n'occupent pas. Ça leur donne une espèce de légitimité à gauche, c'est tout. Ce n'est rien qu'à ça qu'ils [les députés] servent. Pour le reste, personne l'écoute. On a utilisé toute une série d'interventions pour aller chercher son appui et on l'a finalement convaincu, Cauchon, que c'est une bonne chose d'investir au logement social. On a fait toutes sortes de rencontres, on a amené toutes sortes de monde témoigner de leur situation, on a écrit des lettres. On lui a expliqué, présenté toutes sortes de dossiers d'argumentation sur les avantages, combien ça coûte...

For its part, FÉCHIMM intervenes directly with the CMHC:

> On participe, sur le plan régional, à des négociations avec la SCHL pour des questions techniques quant à l'application des conventions qui lient les coopératives soit à la SHDM ou à la SHQ, c'est la même chose, pour s'assurer que l'application des conventions se fera tout en respectant la nature spécifique de la coopérative.

Like social housing development, engagement in partnership or advocacy activities does not preclude recourse to confrontation if necessary.

Table 8.1: Models of community organizing

Type of organization	Alternative services	Advocacy	Community development	Social action
LOCAL: Community organizations	Offered by all local organizations as central activity	All groups present briefs & petitions, meet with public servants & politicians and do individual advocacy	No local groups undertake housing development themselves but support it through Housing Table	Some groups have this as central activity. Others more likely to participate in 'soft' actions
LOCAL: GRTs & Habitations communautaires de CDN	Technical services offered to clients only	Will meet with public servants & politicians	Their principal mandate, although usually do not become landlord themselves	Avoided, although there is openness to social action by the Housing Table in support of projects
MUNICIPAL: Comités logement montréalais, FÉCHIMM, FOHM	Technical services offered to member organizations only	All groups present briefs & petitions, meet with public servants & politicians	No, although they support local projects politically and/or technically	Yes, for Comités de logement. Avoided by FÉCHIMM & FOHM
PROVINCIAL: FRAPRU, FLHLMQ, AGRTQ, CQCH	Technical services offered to member organizations only	All groups present briefs & petitions, meet with public servants & politicians	No, although they support local projects politically and/or technically	Yes, for FRAPRU & FLHLMQ. Avoided by AGRTQ & CQCH
FEDERAL: FCM, CHRA	Technical services offered to member organizations only	Both groups present briefs, meet with public servants & politicians	No.	Avoided by both groups, although there is openness to social action by others

Confrontational activities for housing policy

Finally, as with social housing development, the members of the Housing Table do sometimes turn to confrontational activities in order to make their point with government officials. Perhaps because they are a little more removed from the powers that make policy, or perhaps because government seems more intransigent in terms of policy changes, confrontational activities are more often resorted to when policy is concerned. The need for confrontational tactics and FRAPRU's leadership in this domain is widely accepted among CDN housing activists:

> The problem that I understand is that there's a lot of commitment to develop social housing from more of a rhetorical perspective and how it actually materializes is through pressure. I think the role of FRAPRU is a necessary role because a commitment doesn't mean it will actually happen, so you need to put pressure to make sure it actually happens. I don't know what else to propose because that's part of reality. It would be in an ideal world that money would be set aside and that the projects are actually built within a certain timeline.

For its part, FRAPRU is firm in defending the need for confrontational tactics:

> Pour faire en sorte de changer les politiques, ça prend de la mobilisation et c'est là qu'on parle de stratégies. Cela prend de la mobilisation des principaux concernés, ce qu'on appelle la mobilisation des mal-logés, et l'appel de l'opinion publique pour que ça devienne un enjeu public.

At the same time, some organizations define themselves in opposition to the tactical positions taken by FRAPRU. The director of the AGRTQ expresses it this way:

> On n'est pas revendicateur dans le sens du FRAPRU qui, lui, va faire une revendication punchée. Les fédérations peuvent aussi avoir un discours plus revendicateur. Nous on ne peut pas se permettre ça. Ce qu'on demande, il faut l'appuyer, expliquer pourquoi ce qu'on présente a de l'allure. Il faut prouver tout le temps ce qu'on dit. Le ton qu'on utilise doit être un ton de

discussion, de proposition et il doit toujours être appuyé d'arguments crédibles.

Unlike in some other Montreal neighbourhoods, demonstrations, sit-ins and even occupations of provincial and federal government offices are tactics that are rather run-of-the-mill for CDN housing activists. Sometimes, they are locally organized, as described here by Project Genesis' housing organizer...

> On a fait des petites manifs devant le bureau de Cauchon [député fédéral]. Il l'a trouvé presque drôle ! Il m'a dit : « Franchement ! T'étais-tu obligé de me faire ça ? » J'ai dit : « Non, mais il ne faut pas manquer une occasion, Martin, de te rappeler que c'est important ! »

...and sometimes the intermediary groups are the principal organizers:

> On aide, on mobilise pour des manifs. Ça peut être pour demander au fédéral de réinvestir dans le logement social. L'affaire c'est qu'on ne fait pas un débat de fond, contrairement à certains groupes logements qui, avec leurs membres, vont vraiment faire des débats de fonds là-dessus. Nous on s'organise pour que les gens soient au courant de pourquoi ils vont manifester ou pourquoi ce besoin-là versus d'autres besoins. Mais de faire vraiment des gros débats de fonds là-dessus, on n'a pas le temps. On suit le FRAPRU.

The coordinator of the Mountain Sights Community Centre also expressed a confidence in FRAPRU's strategizing around confrontational actions:

> We participate in some of the actions organized by FRAPRU and we're going to become a member of FRAPRU. Overall the need for social housing is something that residents see as a plus for them; it's something positive if there's more social housing. They're aware in general that it's a good thing...

Confrontational petitions and letter-writing campaigns have also been seen as effective, as in this example offered by FÉCHIMM:

> Le type de mobilisation qu'on fait c'est qu'on demande aux coopératives de signer un projet de lettre et de l'acheminer à tel ministre. Ç'a très bien fonctionné... C'est pour dire que, les coopératives, on leur a demandé de faire pression auprès des Ministres : « Envoyer telle lettre si vous êtes d'accord avec la lettre. » Ç'a été très efficace parce que la Ministre ne voulait rien savoir de ça. C'est pour dire qu'on peut mobiliser, mais ça prend du temps. Moi, je me souviens, 6 mois après qu'on a lancé la

campagne, l'attaché de presse de la Ministre m'avait appelé pour me dire : « Ça va-tu finir vos lettres ? » Il y en avait encore ! Les coops, ça leur prend du temps pour prendre des décisions mais c'est efficace pareille.

Apart from demonstrations and letter-writing, other forms of pressure tactics observed in use by CDN housing activists over the past several years include confrontational media campaigns, well-publicized popular education on shortfalls of government policies as well as boycotts of policy processes deemed unjust or pointless.

Community actors' perspectives on immigration as a consideration in strategy and approach

For the organizations of Côte-des-Neiges, immigration is a defining feature of the neighbourhood, an idea support by census data (Lang 2004). The presence of immigrants cannot be ignored and, in fact, many organizations identify as immigrant serving. What this reality represents to organizations in terms of strategy and approach varies, however. There are two main ways in which the factor of immigration affects housing organizing: cultural or structural factors that influence housing needs or organizing approaches.

Housing needs

Although most of the participants of the Housing Table felt that the housing issues facing immigrants were more or less the same as those facing other Montrealers - « Je pense que les besoin sont les mêmes entre ces quartiers et un quartier comme Centre-sud par exemple, mais c'est la question de la langue qui fait la différence. » - there are some considerations that are more important, or which are seen with more frequency among immigrants than among the general population. Principal among these are family size and composition, use of space (especially to accommodate cooking styles) and access to decent and appropriate housing as central to the process of settlement.

In the context of the housing crisis, family-size apartments are extremely difficult to find. Regardless of national origin, families in Montreal are often forced to pay more than they can afford to have a big enough apartment or, more commonly, live in overcrowded conditions. Immigrant families, though, tend on average to be larger than Canadian-born families and they are also more likely to have extended family or multiple generations within one household. The community organizer from MultiCaf describes the situation in Côte-des-Neiges:

> Côtes-des-Neiges est un endroit avec de nombreuses familles, comme on peut le voir avec la banque alimentaire. Ce n'est pas rare des paniers pour 7, 8, 9 personnes puis ça, c'est bien spécifique dans Côtes-des-Neiges, particulièrement les familles immigrantes qui viennent avec pleins d'enfants ou le papa, la maman, la grand-mère et tout.

The coordinator of the Mountain Sights Community Centre echoes the need for larger apartments but also raises the issue of the importance of extended families and friends being able to stay in the same neighbourhood in order to offer social support, something that can be difficult when people are offered apartments under the current rules of social housing:

> One of the fears in terms of social housing is the rules of the game. Because it's by points and place on the waiting list, it can be hard if residents want to stay in the neighborhood. If we develop any kind of social housing other then a co-op, we would like to have priority so that people from this neighborhood would be able to stay in the neighborhood. They don't want to have more units and have people coming into their neighborhood. They want to be able to stay here and have affordable housing.

Under current rules, HLM and OSBL housing is not supposed to be reserved for neighbourhood residents and people on the waiting list for an HLM and who refuse to take an apartment offered to them in another neighbourhood will be moved to the bottom of the waiting list.

The use of housing space is something that is widely recognized as culturally influenced, although not necessarily as something that is of major concern for housing organizing:

> On a une vague idée comment une famille bengalie va vivre dans le logement par rapport à une famille juive orthodoxe, par

exemple, ça on peut avoir une idée, quand on fait du porte-à-porte, mais au-delà de ça on n'est pas vraiment informé sur ces différences-là. (Société environnementale de CDN)

The GRTs raised several important aspects of housing design that could be better adapted to housing immigrant families from different origins:

Un des éléments qu'il faudrait pendre en considération dans l'avenir c'est le style de vie des gens. Par exemple, pour certain type de cuisson, l'humidité qui se génère est un élément à prendre en considération. La réalité c'est que les gens qui viennent d'arriver ne comprennent pas qu'il faut faire fonctionner le ventilateur car l'humidité reste emprisonnée dans le logement et ça peut causer des problèmes de moisissure. Il va falloir que certains travaux de constructions correspondent aux particularités des communautés. Je suis conscient de cela et je l'ai vécu quand j'étais responsable de certains projets. J'ai essayé de l'expliquer et les gens parfois ne me croyaient pas mais, avec le temps, ils finissent par comprendre, à force de répéter... (Groupe CDH)

Access to decent, affordable and appropriate housing is also widely recognized in the literature as central to the process of immigrant settlement. Housing of new arrivals influences social networks, employment and educational opportunities, the sense of safety and belonging, physical and mental health, among other things. For PROMIS, this is their principal reason for becoming involved in the Housing Table:

Quand on parle du premier accueil des immigrants, la chose la plus importante c'est son logement. Donc ça va de soi que la question du logement nous a toujours préoccupée, qu'ils puissent avoir des logements convenables.

ROMEL shares this view of housing as central to settlement and even to social cohesion, as the director explained in detail:

Nous on a une philosophie qui dit qu'aider les nouveaux arrivants dans la question du logement, c'est leur ouvrir la porte pour une meilleure intégration dans un nouveau pays. On croit toujours que la question du logement ce n'est pas un luxe, c'est un besoin. Si on ajoute à ça un problème dans le logement, ça décourage beaucoup les gens, ça les démotive et ça crée un gap de confiance entre ce qu'eux ont rêvé de faire ici et ce qu'ils vivent vraiment. Alors ce bris de confiance aide beaucoup à les isoler et à devenir dépendant au lieu de se prendre en main dans un nouveau contexte... Lorsqu'ils trouvent un logement, ceux qui ont un revenu modeste,

> moyen, ils payent plus que 50 % de leur revenu pour se loger. Imaginez-vous à la place d'une personne qui immigre, qui laisse son pays d'origine pour venir s'installer avec un nouvel espoir et tout d'un coup, il est pris par toutes sortes de problèmes et il ne peut pas s'en sortir... C'est très grave, parce que là ça va vraiment créer toutes sortes de tensions et le pays a besoin de la productivité de tous ses citoyens et citoyennes.

Apart from the simple availability of decent and affordable housing, there is the issue of discrimination in housing. Historically, racial discrimination was a major organizing issue in Côte-des-Neiges. With time, people of colour became a more and more important proportion of the neighbourhood's population, not to mention of landlords, lessening in some ways this effect. In fact, many people of colour moved to the neighbourhood to avoid racial discrimination. Today, housing committees report that family composition (especially with children) and source of income (especially welfare) are the two most common forms of discrimination. With the housing crisis, however, many feel that racial discrimination is making a comeback:

> Nous voyons aujourd'hui la recrudescence de la question de discrimination parce que la demande est plus grande que l'offre et les gens se permettent des abus qui sont intolérables mais qui existent et nous sommes là pour dénoncer ces abus. Donc la question du logement est une constante, mais qui aujourd'hui est plus accentuée à cause de la crise du logement.

This issue is one that housing groups tackled in the 1980s but for which they have never developed fully satisfying responses. All of the legal recourses take so much time that the tenant must move on and look for another apartment regardless of the discrimination.

Organizing approaches

In terms of community organizing, the high proportion of immigrants in the neighbourhood (Lang 2004) means that communication between the mostly Quebecois organizers and the mostly immigrant residents can be difficult in terms of language and social norms. For some organizers, it also means that mainstream social issues are experienced differently and for others it raises the issues of

racism, both inherent to our social and political system and between individuals. The coordinator of the Community Council explains how this basic fact of the presence of many immigrants comes into play in all aspects of community organizing:

> Presque 20 % de la population est ici depuis 5 ans et moins... Ça, il faut en tenir compte en terme d'information. Ça veut dire qu'il y a une centaine de langues différentes parlées à Côte-des-Neiges alors il faut en tenir compte en terme d'activités. Chacun des groupes qui travaille avec ces personnes-là doit être aussi une ressource qui tient compte de ça... Maintenant, si on pense à la question de la démocratie, de la participation au conseil d'arrondissement, il y a des gens pour qui ça va être une première expérience de participation à une instance de démocratie officielle. Ça veut dire qu'il faut préparer ces personnes-là, leur expliquer un peu les pouvoirs de ces lieux.

The housing organizer from Project Genesis also poses this all-permeating issue in a reflective manner:

> Le fait que ça soit des immigrants dans la majorité des cas qui sont dans Côte-des-Neiges, il y a tout un historique de l'immigration. Ce n'est pas nécessairement que l'on va venir en parler comme sujet dans notre comité, mais moi je trouve qu'il reste toujours comme une sorte d'influence, que les gens sont portés à comparer leur expérience d'ici avec ce qui se fait là-bas. Ou des fois, c'est difficile de savoir si les gens ont bien compris ce que moi je voulais dire. Est-ce que ce que je dis ça fait du sens pour eux ou pas?

As I will discuss in more detail below, the principal cultural considerations in approaches to community organizing raised in interviews were: language of communication; level of comfort with different forms of community action; and gender issues.

As a starting point, many local organizations struggle with language as a potential barrier to communication. Even before considering immigrants, the neighbourhood is bilingual. As described in the chapter profiling Côte-des-Neiges, English and French are commonly spoken, creating one level of complexity in terms of language of communication and activity. Add to that the high level of recent immigrants, many of whom speak neither French nor English fluently. As explained by the housing organizer of Project Genesis:

> Si je compare avec plusieurs autres quartiers, nous, on peut
> difficilement se permettre de fonctionner toujours dans une seule
> langue or que la majorité des autres comités logement fonctionnent
> en français... Alors que, pour nous, ce n'est vraiment pas uniforme
> et dans le quartier il y a environ 40 % de francophones et 60 %
> d'anglophones, donc tout notre travail, il faut qu'il soit bilingue.
> Dans le comité, lui-même, on passe notre temps à parler dans les
> deux langues, à redire ce que quelqu'un a dit, à poser des questions
> dans les deux langues et à récolter les commentaires. Alors ça
> complique beaucoup le travail d'animation et de communication de
> l'information.

Or as described by the coordinator of the Mountain Sights Community Centre,
"You definitely have to always speak in both languages. You have to speak
slowly and I think the need for translation is becoming more and more obvious to
me if we want to reach more people."

The GRTs raised the complication of organizing cooperative housing
when there is such a linguistic diversity among the members. Without staff people
dedicated to facilitating communication and seeking translation when really
necessary, CDN co-ops sometimes find it a challenge to manage:

> Dans Côte-des-Neiges, on travaille avec des communautés
> ethniques différentes... Il y a des coopératives qui fonctionnent
> mieux que d'autres... Parfois la question de la langue peut être une
> difficulté. On peut avoir des groupes où il y a sept, huit langues
> différentes. (Groupe CDH)

It is noteworthy that almost all of the community workers were cautious to
link the challenges of immigration to positive attributes such as we see here in the
director of the Société environnementale's comments on language:

> Je dirais que plus que la barrière linguistique, c'est plus la barrière
> culturelle dont il faut tenir compte. Je parle de barrière – ça peut
> sembler un terme négatif – mais ça peut être positif aussi. Quand je
> parle de barrières culturelles, je parle de la relation citoyen à
> citoyen et aussi la relation citoyen et organisme, citoyen et Société
> environnementale de CDN. Dans le cas de citoyen à citoyen, à
> partir de nos observations, on a souvent des visiteurs de l'étranger
> par exemple et on leur fait faire un tour du quartier et ils sont
> souvent impressionnés par l'harmonie entre les différents groupes,
> les différentes cultures, les différents pays d'origine qu'il y a un
> peu partout...

Perhaps even more difficult to address than language issues is the social and cultural interpretation of community or political action. Actions that may seem mainstream or expected to people brought up in Canada, or even just people who have been politicized in Canada, may seem the opposite to people from other social contexts – and vice versa:

> Côte-des-Neiges, c'est un quartier d'immigrants donc des gens qui ont une expérience différente de l'action politique. Des fois, ils n'ont pas d'expérience mais en tous cas, ils ont une perception différente de la politique, des structures sociales et de l'action politique. Même juste la notion de droit, ce n'est pas nécessairement compris de la même façon. Ils n'ont pas baigné dans la notion des droits de la Charte canadienne depuis qu'ils sont petits alors il y a tout un processus d'apprentissage qui doit être fait et qui se fait au fur et à mesure qu'on s'implique dans ce genre d'action-là. Donc nous on doit en tenir compte dans notre travail... Une manifestation, ça veut dire quoi pour eux? Est-ce que c'est l'armée qui va nous attendre avec des mitraillettes? Est-ce que l'action politique est toujours réprimée? C'est quoi les limites des normes sociales par rapport à la politique? Je pense qu'il faut les apprivoiser pour les connaître. Il y a toute cette dimension-là dont il faut tenir compte tout le temps. (Project Genesis)

Another observation related to differing perceptions of political action is that some people arrive in Canada as a result of their political action: as refugees. Those with previous experience can bring different forms of organizing and leadership skills to CDN organizations, something that many local organizers seek out in new arrivals. Several of the immigrant leaders within Housing Table members fit this profile. Finally, there is the issue of being careful to not endanger the immigration status of those who are not Canadian citizens. This translates into a real caution about engaging in civil disobedience but also a caution about even using rhetoric that is too confrontational due to a fear of alienating neighbourhood residents with precarious status.

Gender issues are also quite present in organizations' decisions about organizing approaches. Women are more often the active members of community groups yet, as documented in many studies on gender and community organizing (Feldman, Stall, and Wright 1998; Stall and Stoecker 1998), men remain dominant in leadership positions. With the added factor of immigration, however,

groups struggle to understand the differences which culture may bring to the interpretation and experience of gender. The coordinator of Mountain Sights Community Centre offers her experience:

> We deal more with women. And also the whole need for daycare and stuff like that. You have to look at it from a family perspective. In essence, the men are invisible. More and more men are beginning to participate in neighborhood kind of issues but they're still a minority. A lot of the men are working two jobs. They're the providers and they're working in factories at minimum wage to make ends meet. I think they have more traditional values, wanting the women at home. I know we've had cases where men will accept that the women come to the center if it's for the benefit of the family at large.

Interestingly, there is a common opinion in Côte-des-Neiges that immigrants living with low incomes have certain advantages over poor Canadians in terms of education, cultural values and motivation to help them get out of poverty. While this opinion may be just as much a reflection of prejudices against low-income families as actual differences, it does affect the ways in which local groups, many of whose staff have worked in other low-income neighbourhoods of Montreal, perceive their organizing work. As explained by the coordinator of OEIL:

> On est dans un quartier où il n'y a pas de culture de la pauvreté comme il y en a dans Hochelaga-Maisonneuve ou Pointe-St-Charles où il y a des gens qui sont sur l'aide sociale de génération en génération. Donc ces personnes ne pensent pas pouvoir s'en sortir et on a pas cela à Côte-des-Neiges. Les immigrants sont des personnes qui viennent pour améliorer leur sort et sont temporairement à faible ou très faible revenus. La plupart ne vont pas rester à des aussi faibles revenus que ce qu'on rencontre maintenant. D'ailleurs je suis certain que bien des immigrants qu'on a rencontrés, il y a 10 ou 15 ans, ont amélioré leur situation financière, ce qui fait qu'on est en face d'une population que, même si elle est à faible revenu, et qu'ils sont obligés d'habiter dans des immeubles où les personnes qui y habitent sont à faible revenu, c'est une population qui ne va pas se satisfaire dans la situation dans laquelle elle est et avec qui c'est facile de travailler. Cela est un élément important. Ce sont des gens qui ont un dynamisme plus grand que les gens qui habitent dans un quartier où il y a une culture de pauvreté et cela fait une différence quand on intervient. J'ai cela en tête quand on fait du travail dans un

immeuble et je constate que si on sollicite, on réussit à faire bouger
des choses. Les actions auxquelles j'ai été mêlé dans le passé, dans
des autres quartiers de francophones et de culture de pauvreté,
c'était un peu plus difficile.

Together, these issues of housing needs and organizing particularities
colour the work of the members of the CDN Housing Table. Overall, however,
immigration is seen as a contextual issue, rather than one that is absolutely central
to their work. They consider themselves to be working on housing for
neighbourhood residents who happen to be immigrants. They do not consider
themselves to be working for immigrant housing.

Relationships between community groups and the state

Among the community actors studied in this thesis, there were examples
of groups taking on opponent, advocacy and partnership roles in relation to the
state. Of great interest here, though, were the ways in which groups play with
these roles, taking them on at different times for different reasons. Generally
speaking, groups will have one role that forms part of their organizational identity
but they may take on another role if deemed necessary or helpful. Some groups
reject one or another of these roles but most will nevertheless collaborate with
others in that role if there is sufficient 'basis of unity' and it is assessed to serve
the group's interest.

Opponent

The opponent role, a role that challenges the government's legitimacy – at
least in rhetoric – was the least common way that non-state housing actors
identified. At the local level, only the two housing committees readily identified
as opponents. Two other members of the Housing Table, the two with the most
active membership, were willing to act as opponents but it was not their principal
identity. Interestingly, these four organizations have the most grassroots
membership participation. The final two members of the Housing Table were
uncomfortable with the opponent role but they were willing to take it on under
certain circumstances, particularly if part of a wide mobilization. At the provincial

level, the Front d'action populaire pour le réaménagement urbain (FRAPRU) and the Fédération des locataires des HLMs du Québec (FLHLMQ) see themselves as opponents in relation to the state. Again, these are the provincial organizations with the most active grassroots memberships.

There are several things to note among opponents. In terms of membership and constituencies, they are the most grassroots among the housing actors. These organizations are usually focused on the struggle to defend social rights and believe the state has a role in ensuring access to these rights. All of these groups frequently act as advocates, whether on an individual basis for their members or on broader policy issues. They also all tended to reject the partnership role, seeing it as cooptation by the state, but they willingly work with groups in partnership roles if it is felt to contribute to their overall goals, whether in the short or long term.

Advocate

The advocate role, a role that represents the interests of a particular social group to government, is the most common way that non-state actors define themselves. In fact, a majority of the non-state housing actors saw themselves as advocates, albeit for somewhat different constituencies. At the local level, there were community groups advocating for the housing needs of low-income and immigrant populations as well as for the issue of the environment. The technical resource groups (GRTs) advocate on behalf of their clients and the Housing Table. At the municipal level, there are the Fédération des coopératives d'habitation intermunicipale du Montréal métropolitain (FÉCHIMM) and the Fédération des OSBLs de Montréal (FOHM) who advocate on behalf of the non-profit developers of particular forms of social housing. The GRTs, coops and OSBLs all have counterpart coalitions at the provincial level advocating on behalf of their Quebec constituencies (Association des GRT du Québec – AGRTQ, Confédération québécoise des coopératives d'habitations – CQCH, Confédération des OSBL d'habitation du Québec – COHQ). The cooperatives have a federal coalition, the Canadian Federation of Housing Cooperatives (CFHC). At the

federal level, there also exist two important organizations that straddle the community/state divide. The Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) and the Canadian Housing and Renewal Association (CHRA) both act as lobbying groups for municipal interests in relation to the federal government. Both include municipalities as members; the CHRA allows NGO and individual members as well.

Among advocates there are several interesting similarities. In terms of membership and constituencies, advocates tend to be less grassroots in character, representing particular populations or regrouping organizations. These organizations are more focused on service provision at the local level or housing development at other levels. Most of these groups avoid taking on the opponent role, in terms of openly criticizing or challenging the government, but they work regularly with groups that do. They tend to reject the partnership role as a part of their identity but almost all the groups in the advocate category receive state funding for providing specific services, a mutually beneficial, sub-contracting situation which could allow them to be considered partners. Another gray area would be the way that several advocacy groups sit on public/private councils or show willingness to collaborate with municipal, provincial and federal governments on specific projects.

Partner

The role of **partner** was the least common among non-governmental CDN housing actors. In fact, many actors outright rejected the possibility of taking on this role. In fact, the only organization to identify as a partner of the state was the Habitations communautaires de CDN. The coordinator described the organization as a partner of the Société d'habitation de Montréal (SHDM), a position that put him at odds with some of his board members and with several of his fellow organizers in the neighbourhood. The other actors open to partnership with government on specific initiatives were the federal-level coalitions that include municipal representatives among their membership (FCM and CHRA). Other actors indicated a strong preference to remain at arm's length from the state.

Interviews revealed a general disdain for the role of partner, and a belief that the 'partnership' being promoted by the government was a form of cooptation that would have community groups underpaid to provide services for which the state should be responsible. Entering into partnership with the state was seen as a threat to the independence of the organization. In particular, organizers raised the challenge of maintaining a critical stance towards a so-called partner. FLHLMQ example. Nevertheless, current funding trends have resulted in most of the groups involved in social housing are involved in some sort of funding relationship (for sub-contracting of social services or for contributions to the development of social housing within the state-defined framework) that might allow them to be described as partners of the state, although this is the subject of major debate. As well, all of these organizations participate on a regular and ongoing basis in government-defined processes for the development of social housing units or policy. As is highlighted in the literature, there is quite a bit of gray area in defining community-state partnerships (White 1997).

All of the groups that readily identify as partners of the state operate without a grassroots membership and their origins are all to be found in government initiatives. These groups do not take on the opponent role but they all felt that it was important for someone to challenge the state more confrontationally and that they benefited from the outcomes of such conflict. Interestingly, the Habitations communautaires did not directly engage in advocacy on policy issues but rather saw itself as negotiating within a partnership with the SHDM. Also, as mentioned above, the FCM and CHRA identify primarily as advocates, entering only into partnership on specific initiatives.

As we have seen in this section, the literature on community/state roles (Panet-Raymond 1992; Mathieu and Mercier 1994; White 1997) is useful in contributing to an understanding of the ways in which community and intermediary actors form relationships with the state. Community groups take on all three of the roles discussed in the conceptual framework (opponent, advocate and partner) according to their analysis of the context in which they are acting and

the organization, organizer or membership's parameters for action. Usually, a group's identity is tied to a position within one of these roles but most take on the other two either explicitly or indirectly at one time or another.

Approaches to community organizing used in Côte-des-Neiges

The ideal models of community organizing discussed in Chapter 3's literature review have parallels in the practice approaches found in CDN social housing organizing. The use of these approaches is as diverse as the analyses of the state and the roles taken on by community groups in relation to the state. In terms of the different models discussed in the conceptual chapter, all the different possibilities are seen, both on the public and the private levels. On the macro level, alternative service provision, community development, advocacy and social action are all used by local organizations. On the private level, the 'Open-Door Policy', 'Differences are Fundamental' and 'Cross-Cultural' approaches to organizing discussed in the conceptual framework were all used among CDN organizations.[33] Whereas the early Rothman models of community organizing suggest that the model chosen reflects the orientation of the group (Rothman 1974), he was later more clear about the "interweaving of intervention approaches" in practice (Rothman 2001:47). My fieldwork supports a similar idea put forward by Shragge that the same basic models can be put towards the ends of either social integration or social opposition (Shragge 2003). It is also important to note that my fieldwork documented examples of the same organization using a range of actions, often the result of a pragmatic assessment of the political context. In this section, I will review the ways in which the social housing actors involved in Côte-des-Neiges have employed the different organizing models.

---

[33] While the research revealed interesting information about the internal models of community organizing applied in Côte-des-Neiges, I will not discuss it indepth for the purposes of this thesis, focusing, rather, on the public approaches used to influence social housing development and policy. I have, however, discussed the internal models in two conference

The CDN Housing Table has members who have varying degrees of comfort with the different public organizing models. In the previous section, we discussed the fact that, although all the organizations have liberal mandates and tend to take liberal public positions, the organizers and members are not so unanimous in their views of the state. The groups also position themselves differently in relation to the state, a combination of political analysis, personal and professional factors, a legal/regulatory framework defined by the state and a socio-political context. This diversity of views of the state and possible roles comes into organizers and activists' assessments of the relative merits of different forms of action, as well as their interpretation of the meanings and underlying goals of different forms of action.

Alternative services

As was summarized in Table 8.1, members of the Housing Table, both individually and as a Table, use all models of community organizing either directly or indirectly by supporting its use by an ally. Each individual member of the Housing Table offers alternative services in housing, services that are parallel to those offered by the state, from tenants' rights counseling (also offered by the Rental Board) to immigrant settlement (also offered by the Minister for Relations with Citizens and Immigration – MRCI) to popular education (also offered by the OMHM and the City of Montreal), and this is often the activity that takes the most of their time and resources. The alternative services offered, however, are not usually related to social housing development or policy. Rather, they involve such activities as the defense of tenants' rights in private housing or helping with apartment searches. One exception would be the social housing application clinics organized by Project Genesis as a service to community members but also as a way to maintain demand for social housing as a way to put pressure on different levels of the state to further invest in new units. All of the coalition organizations offer a number of technical and analytical services to their constituencies and this is also seen as quite central to their mandates.

---

presentations: (Hanley 2001; Hanley 2004)

Advocacy

All of the housing actors engage in advocacy for social housing issues. For some, it is one of their principal activities; for others, it is secondary. At the local level, for example, advocacy is some members' principal form of involvement in the housing debate, via support for the Housing Table's briefs and meetings with politicians and public servants. Several members of the Housing Table also engage in individual advocacy for people seeking social housing or having trouble with a social housing administration. At the intermediary level, advocacy is the main raison d'être of most of the organizations, with the exception of FRAPRU and the FLHLMQ. In interviews, these intermediary advocates expressed the conviction that it was essential to provide the government with convincing, solid information to back up their policy suggestions. There was a strong interest in developing a reputation as a credible actor whose demands are reasonable and realizable; this was seen as the way to have the most impact on government actions. Presenting policy briefs to government commissions, lobbying politicians, meeting with civil servants and presenting petitions were all common forms of advocacy.

Community development

Very few of the non-governmental actors involved in the social housing debate actually get directly involved in community development activities, in this case, the development of social housing units. At the local level, the Housing Table serves as advocacy support for others to undertake housing development. None of the intermediary actors engage in housing development themselves, either, providing instead resources and support to local level developers. As described earlier, neighbourhood housing OSBLs (such as Habitations communautaires de CDN) and cooperatives tend to operate independently of the community organizations involved in the debate. The GRTs' mandate is closely linked to community development but rather than undertaking it themselves, they limit themselves to offering technical resources to those that do. Community groups who approach the Housing Table in the interest of developing housing

projects are usually not oriented towards political action and, interestingly, are often ethnic-specific (ex. a CDN Vietnamese association seeking to create housing for its senior citizen constituents). Several groups involved in the social housing debate express reluctance to become a landlord themselves, feeling that this would constrain their ability to organize and advocate for social housing.

Social action

Social action was the most controversial of the public organizing models among those interviewed. Very few of the organizations involved in social housing saw this as their principal activity. At the local level, the two housing committees saw this as integral to their mandates, but other groups had a range of levels of comfort with this model. On the Housing Table, it was accepted that social action could be appropriate and effective if the usual, official process failed to bring results. There were also differing levels of comfort with different forms of social action. For example, the housing committees are open to civil disobedience, while the less oppositional members do not consider this option seriously.[34] They may be open to legal forms of social action, for example, such as packing the Borough Council meeting with angry tenants. The GRTs and the Habitations communautaires, with their close links to government in their day-to-day activities, do not engage in social action, although there is recognition of the benefit of such actions by others. At the intermediary level, almost all the actors avoid social action, seeing this as having a negative effect on their ability to have access to government decision-makers. FRAPRU and the FLHLMQ, however, have distinguished themselves from many other provincial-level coalitions through their enduring commitment to social action as a way of influencing the state when many other groups have abandoned the model. As opposed to having closed doors for them, however, after many years FRAPRU in particular has

---

[34] During FRAPRU's May 2002 week of action to highlight the housing crisis, housing committees across the province staged occupations of land or buildings they had targeted for social housing development. Several members and the organizers of the CDN housing committee and other members of FRAPRU participated in the occupations in other neighbourhoods. In Côte-des-Neiges, a street fair was held during this week to highlight housing issues without endangering local activists without secure immigration status and also as a way to avoid alienating potential

developed a strong legitimacy with the media and even with the state. Working in coalition with other intermediary groups, FRAPRU is considered by most of the intermediary groups interviewed, as well as by several state actors, to apply the political pressure that helps other groups inside to dialogue directly with government.

Together, these four models are all applied by non-governmental actors (both community and intermediary) to the work of influencing social housing development and policy. Different actors, however, privilege different models at different times and most groups operate with a notion of the complementarity of different groups using different models.

The development of social housing units and social housing policy: a summary

Another area explored in my fieldwork were the processes followed in order for social housing units to be built in Côte-des-Neiges or for CDN organizations to have an impact on social housing policy. For the actors involved, there is a generally recognized, or habitual, way of arriving at both of these objectives. Although there are clear government guidelines framing both processes, their interpretation differs depending on whom you speak with. Of interest were the different groups' ways of describing the same process and the ways in which they sometimes subvert this process. Actors used a wide range of tactics to achieve their goals, depending upon their assessment of the political and organizational conjuncture.

Developing social housing units

One of my first tasks in coming to understand the process of developing social housing units in Côte-des-Neiges was to clarify the *official* process. This

---

activists who might have been uneasy with civil disobedience tactics.

involved looking at the government guidelines for the AccèsLogis program and then asking housing actors to describe their understanding and experience of the official process. What became clear in this process is that while the official guidelines of AccèsLogis and the mandates of different government agencies provide a widely acknowledged framework for the development of social housing units, actors at all levels – both community and state – occasionally find ways to circumvent the guidelines. Rather than a purely technical exercise (as one might assume from reading the guidelines) the process is at the same time political with the different actors bringing their political weight to bear as they see necessary.

This chapter has described the wide variety of ways in which housing actors intervene in the process of developing social housing units. We saw that, although the official process provides for a community development model of organizing, other models are also employed, depending upon the circumstances. Social action was applied by community and intermediary actors when they felt that the official process was unjust or not working as it should.

Also notable was the degree to which actors differed in their understanding of the official process of developing social housing units. Depending upon their position (both in terms of role and political analysis), their understanding and experience of the process varied. Those organizations that had mandates that directly touched housing issues understood the entire process, the other actors involved and the details of the government programs framing the process. Those for whom housing was a side issue were less informed and tended to follow the lead of the Housing Table.

Developing social housing policy

The situation was a little different in understanding the official process of social housing policy development. While there is a very broad parliamentary framework for legislation and policy development, it is not seen by housing actors as definitive. Policy is developed in many different ways and actors find it difficult to establish who is involved and what factors come into play. The ways in which actors describe the process of policy development seems to vary

according to such things as personal experience, analysis of the state (personal or organizational) and official role within the process.

Lacking a technical framework that is more easily understood, many local actors felt that participating in policy debates was beyond their capacity. Those that felt a need to be involved in some way relied very heavily on intermediary actors. State housing actors also felt that they had little influence over policy, always indicating that it came from further up in the hierarchy. Nevertheless, all actors attempted to influence policy decisions and, as in the case of developing social housing units, used a wide variety of organizing models or tactics. Advocacy is the most common form of involvement but some groups use social action when it is felt that advocacy has not been effective.

Conclusion

This chapter has reviewed the tactics employed by community and intermediary social housing actors in their efforts to organize around social housing development and policy. As we have seen, these can be understood as basically oriented towards partnership, advocacy or confrontation but the community groups tend to use a range of these tactics in accordance with their pragmatic analysis of the political context in which they are acting.

In the following chapter, I turn to an analysis of the ways in which social housing actors interact in order to shape the social housing development and policy which is so important to low income, immigrant neighbourhoods.

Chapter 9

Making sense of it all: an analysis of the relationship between the state and community on social housing issues

In the previous chapters, my principal findings were presented in order to paint a portrait of the world of community organizing for social housing in an immigrant neighbourhood in Montreal, using Côte-des-Neiges between the years 2000 and 2003 as a case study. This study has been grounded in a local neighbourhood but has followed the links of local community groups up through the municipal, provincial and federal levels to facilitate the process of establishing social housing policy or developing social housing units.

Chapter 7 presented a profile of each of the principal organizational actors involved in the struggle around social housing in Côte-des-Neiges, from local community organizations, to intermediary organizations to municipal, provincial and federal government actors. Chapter 8 looked at the process undertaken by local actors to intervene in the social housing debate, whether for social housing development or for social housing policy. The organizing approaches of the community organizations were described, in all their diversity and sometimes their contradictions. My principal observations in the preceding chapters revolve around the existence of a diversity of social housing actors who operate within a relatively rigid framework, all the while finding ways to circumvent the official processes and roles in order to better attain their goals.

In this chapter, the objective is to analyze these findings in relation to the conceptual framework set out in Chapter 4. I will discuss the intersection of the concepts of the state, community roles in relation to the state and models of community organization as they are put into practice in Côte-des-Neiges. I will ultimately arrive at an analysis of the neighbourhood's social housing

interventions in relation to my conceptual framework. Again, my interest is in addressing the two following questions:

How do community groups in immigrant neighbourhoods organise in order to have an impact on government social housing policy?

How do the relationships between community, intermediary and state social housing actors influence the development of social housing projects and policy?

Drawing upon the interviews and academic literature, I will begin by constructing the socio-political context that shaped the decisions of CDN social housing actors. Rather than offering a comprehensive review of the political and economic shifts that occurred between 1993 and 2003, I will draw out the elements that emerged in interviews or that were signaled in the organizations' documentation as significant. Having set out the parameters that I argue are relevant, I will go on to explore the different options I contend that this context presented to social housing actors as possibilities, analyzing them for their strengths and weaknesses. From the possibilities for organizing, I will turn to the actual choices made by CDN actors, referring back to my interviews, before using my conceptual framework to analyze the reasons behind these choices. The final section of this chapter will draw out the most significant elements of my analysis, those concepts that contribute to a better understanding of the relationships that exist between community and state actors in the struggle to bring about social housing investment in an immigrant neighbourhood.

The debates around social housing treated in this thesis can be seen as the struggle to maintain the housing gains won in the context of the welfare state. In order to fight the decline of the welfare state, however, community groups and other housing actors must have an analysis of how the welfare state evolved, whose interests it serves and why it is currently under attack. The housing actors examined in this thesis operate using a variety of interpretations of these ideas and their positions relative to these concepts have a major impact on the decisions they made about how to intervene in the housing debate. Therefore, if we want to

begin to grasp the reality on the ground, we must keep in mind this conceptual diversity since the practices on the ground are shaped by an interaction of this conceptual diversity and the policy context.

The socio-political context for social housing organizing in Côte-des-Neiges 1993-2003

This thesis has so far discussed the various factors that shape CDN community groups' relationship to the state and their choices about community organizing: liberal state structures; underlying power dynamics; community roles in relation to the state; choices about community organizing and the overall social and political context. In this section, I offer my analysis of social housing organizing between 1993 and 2003, telling the story of what happened when all of these factors came together to influence the community groups of Côte-des-Neiges, working for social housing in a particular time and place. I will begin with some background context.

Late 1980s, early 1990s: Quebec social housing organizing as Canadian welfare state retreats

In the late 1980s, Canada became caught up in the international move towards neo-liberalism originally promoted by Reagan in the United States and Thatcher in Great Britain and enforced around the world by the International Monetary Fund (IMF)'s Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) and the World Bank. Within a context of rapidly developing economic globalization, neo-liberal politicians, academics and business leaders were arguing for a scaling back of the welfare state and a reliance on market mechanisms to provide for social needs. In Canada, the Progressive Conservative Mulroney government, elected in 1984, brought many such policies into reality, introducing cutbacks in many social policy domains. Since the early 1970s, the federal government had been funding a variety of forms of social housing, contributing to the construction of new public (habitations à loyer modique – HLM), community (organismes sans buts lucratifs

– OSBL) and cooperative housing units. Mulroney began to scale these programs back. The coordinator of FRAPRU had this analysis to offer:

> Alors le gouvernement Mulroney ce qui a fait c'est qu'il a d'abord réduit l'accès au logement social et ensuite il l'a coupé et là ça n'intéressait plus personne. Les gens, les travailleurs ne se sentaient pas concernés par le logement social et pour moi c'est un drame d'une certaine façon.

Quebec was under a Liberal government in the late 1980s, a government that cannot be qualified as progressive but that had not yet adopted the neo-liberal rhetoric to be found at the federal level. Following, in part, the Keynesian view that housing development can be a significant motor for the economy, the Quebec government was actively investing in social housing construction, supporting the full range of HLMs, OSBLs and coops. The late 1970s and early to mid-1980s had already seen the creation of the intermediary organizations covered in this thesis; Front d'action populaire pour le réaménagement urbain (FRAPRU), Regroupement québécois des OSBL d'habitation (RQOH), Confédération québécoise des coopératives d'habitation (CQCH) and the Association des GRT du Québec (AGRTQ) were all active during this period, lobbying the provincial government to improve social housing programs and increase investment. The Fédération des locataires d'HLM du Québec (FLHLMQ) was created in 1988 and added its perspective to this scene. It is notable, however, that with the exception of the CQCH (whose constituents, housing cooperatives, received most of their subsidies directly from the federal government), no provincial level intermediary organizations had ties with the federal intermediary organizations.

The City of Montreal was already responsible for the implementation of the province's social housing programs, managing HLMs and distributing grants under the Programme d'acquisition de logements locatifs (PALL) program. The municipal counterparts of the provincial intermediary organizations (Fédération des OSBL d'habitation de Montréal – FOHM, Fédération des coopératives d'habitation intermunicipale du Montréal métropolitaine – FÉCHIMM and the local GRTs) addressed their concerns at the municipal level. The late 1980s saw a change in the Montreal administration, however, bringing in a more progressive

city council who created the Société d'habitation de Montréal (SHDM) and gave it the leeway to allow for the heavy intervention in Côte-des-Neiges described in earlier chapters.

On the local level, CDN community groups had very few links to the provincial or municipal-level intermediary organizations. In the late 1980s, no CDN groups were members of FRAPRU and the local OSBLs, co-ops and HLM tenants' associations were passive members of their corresponding intermediary organizations. CDN organizations concerned with social housing issues were involved in the HLM Committee, lobbying government for the construction of HLM units in the neighbourhood. With the arrival of the SHDM on the local scene, many of these groups became involved with the SHDM in targeting buildings for conversion to social housing and working to keep tenants informed. The Organisation d'éducation et d'information logement (OEIL) was especially involved in these efforts. The SHDM also supported the creation of the Habitations communautaires de Côte-des-Neiges at this time, in order to take on the management of SHDM-owned buildings in the area.

The early 1990s brought a serious economic recession to Canada and high interest rates aiming to curb inflation led to surging national and provincial debt. Montreal was especially hard-hit by the recession so the increase in social housing came at a crucial time for Côte-des-Neiges and many consider this intervention to have saved the northern sector of the neighbourhood from severe deterioration. A change in municipal government at this time brought in a more conservative administration that put a hold on repeating the SHDM's Côte-des-Neiges interventions elsewhere. There was also a change of government at the federal level, with the Chrétien Liberals beating out Mulroney's Conservative with a majority government.

Federal withdrawal from social housing

In 1993, a historic federal government decision changed the context of social housing organizing at all levels of intervention. The Liberal 1993 budget eliminated any funding for the construction of new social housing units,

maintaining only its commitments to existing projects. This was quite a drastic move and housing advocates across the country, joined by provincial and municipal governments, vigorously protested the decision. The federal government claimed that in a time of recession, high debt and high deficit, it could no longer justify investing in an area of provincial jurisdiction. If provincial governments wanted to invest in social housing, they were welcome to do so. Federal level intermediary organizations intervened but, in those years of deficit hysteria, it was to no effect. Despite the fact that Paul Martin, finance minister at the time, had declared before the elections that the Liberals were committed to social housing, he equally declared after the 1993 budget that the federal government would never again invest in social housing.

The federal government's announcement of withdrawal had immediate impacts across the country. Every province except for British Columbia and Quebec soon afterwards cut their social housing programs that had hitherto relied on a 50 percent contribution from the federal government. In Quebec, the Liberal provincial government put new investment on hold as they headed into elections. This is when provincial intermediary organizations took on a new strategy.

All of Quebec's intermediary organizations took advantage of the election season to lobby the various parties for a public commitment to continue support for social housing construction despite the federal withdrawal. FRAPRU, supported by the FLHLMQ, was the most public about this, continuing to use demonstrations to attract media attention and attempting to apply pressure on politicians. The other intermediary organizations used a more advocacy type of approach, preparing briefs for politicians explaining the need for social housing and explaining how it could be continued. In the end, the Liberal Party rejected the idea, following the lead of their federal counterpart and the wave of neo-liberalism. The Parti-Québécois (PQ), historically more closely linked to community groups and social movements and with social democratic tendencies within it, committed to the continued support.

The PQ won the election and after a short delay, instituted the Programme d'achat et rénovation pour coopératives et OSBL (PARCO) as a pilot project.

This move created a split among intermediary actors that would take some time to mend. At issue was whether or not the provincial government should continue with the construction of new HLMs. The provincial government argued that the HLM model led to a concentration of poverty and undesirable social environments. The long-term funding commitment was also something the provincial government said it could not longer afford without federal contributions. It preferred to turn to OSBL and co-op housing that would entail a one-time investment and which, they argued, was also more positive in terms of being interspersed within neighbourhoods and which offered empowerment to residents.

This last argument was one that was supported by the CQCH, the RQOH and the AGRTQ who all favoured third sector housing over HLMs. FRAPRU and the FLHLMQ agreed that co-ops and OSBLs allowed for more resident participation, could respond more easily to local concerns and were more easily integrated into a neighbourhood but they argued that HLMs, with certain modifications, remained a viable format of housing for certain people. More important for them, however, was that this represented the government's withdrawal from direct housing responsibilities and a decline in overall funding. This difference of opinion has strained relations between the intermediary organizations ever since and is only recently receding as a sticking point.

At the municipal level, the City of Montreal used the 1993 federal funding withdrawal and the subsequent provincial freeze in investment to remove the SHDM's mandate to develop new housing units. This decision was not reversed when the provincial government instituted PARCO. The SHDM, along with the Office municipal d'habitation de Montréal (OMHM), continued to manage existing buildings but all city-owned residential development was ended. The relatively short period of no funding for social housing had quite a significant impact in Côte-des-Neiges. The HLM Committee was disbanded during this period and many of the previous supporters of social housing, joined by others across the country, judged that social housing was a lost cause to which the federal government (and its provincial counterparts) would never return.

Project Genesis was alone among the previous members of the HLM Committee to decide to proceed with its social housing organizing by joining FRAPRU. They had just hired an organizer who had previously worked for FRAPRU and the rest of the staff agreed that social housing was one of the only long-term solutions to the poverty and poor housing conditions faced by local residents. Project Genesis was soon followed by MultiCaf and the two organizations became actively involved in FRAPRU's campaigns.

The creation of AccèsLogis

In 1997, the PQ made the transition from the PARCO to the AccèsLogis program described earlier in this thesis. This was seen as a victory by housing organizations in terms of securing long-term commitment from the provincial government to continue investing in social housing, albeit at a significantly lower rate than what had been possible when federal funding was there to complement provincial and municipal investment. AccèsLogis also conveyed more of an emphasis on targeted housing for specific needs. This type of housing is undoubtedly necessary but it can lead to a withdrawal from income-based social housing. In the end, the provincial AccèsLogis program was the result of campaigns by intermediary actors to shape the province's involvement in social housing, a commitment of the PQ's designed to respond to a need in Quebec, distinguish itself from the federal government and develop and maintain good relations with the community sector.

AccèsLogis conferred the development of social housing to the community sector, requiring their 'consultation' of community actors before project acceptance. While the form of community consultation was not specified in the AccèsLogis regulations, most neighbourhoods in Montreal saw the benefits of having a local body ready to do the necessary consulting, thereby securing some control over local development. GRTs also consolidated their role through AccèsLogis. Having been so involved in its development (via the AGRTQ) and being the only nonprofit consultants available, the GRTs were the obvious choice for groups aiming to develop AccèsLogis projects. At the same time, GRTs

played an important advocacy role between communities and the City, thereby developing a privileged relationship with the City, increasing their credibility and ability to move projects forward.

Locally, Côte-des-Neiges followed this general trend. While the HLM Committee was disbanded, Project Genesis and MultiCaf continued to raise FRAPRU's social housing issues at the Community Council. When AccèsLogis was created and it was clear there was a role for community groups, the Community Council was chosen as the most solid home base for a Housing Table that would address AccèsLogis development in the neighbourhood. Community groups' interest in social housing began to return.

Advent of the housing crisis

With social housing construction continuing at a reduced rate in Quebec and Montreal, tenants also enjoyed an overall high vacancy rate and low rents. This was not the case in the rest of Canada, however. Montreal did share the rest of the country's growing problem of homelessness, seen by many to be due to a combination of rising housing prices, rising poverty and deinstitutionalization. By 1998, homelessness had become a high profile public concern and federal level intermediary organizations were working hard to make the link between homelessness and the federal government's withdrawal from social housing funding. The Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM)'s declaration, in collaboration with Toronto's Disaster Relief Committee, that homelessness was a National Disaster was a highly successful media strategy that provoked public outrage and federal government action.

The National Secretariat on Homelessness was created in response, an agency that had funds to support the creation of homeless shelters and transitional housing to help get people off the streets. While the funds were much needed for homelessness, the FCM began working with the Canadian Housing and Renewal Association (CHRA) to keep the pressure on to return to social housing funding. Housing advocates at all levels of intervention criticized the federal government for its turn to band-aid solutions in response to homelessness and blamed the

problem of homelessness on the federal downloading of housing responsibility to the provinces without any change in taxation powers. In the run-up to the 2000 federal elections, the federal government bent to pressure, from such diverse sources as the housing movement (FRAPRU 2004) municipalities (FCM 1998), children's rights organization (Campaign 2000 2002), the World March of Women (FFQ 2000) and even the United Nations (UN Committee on Economic 1998), and announced its intention to return to funding of the construction of "affordable housing".

The general housing situation was also deteriorating. A very quick change occurred in the housing market so that, by 2000, Quebec also considered itself to be in the grips of a severe housing crisis characterized by a shortage of housing (both in terms of size and vacancy rates) and a dramatic rise in housing costs. As Montreal's economic situation improved, several factors intersected to create the crisis: young people who had stayed with their parents throughout the economic recession began to seek their own apartments at a much greater rate; more people were able to afford living alone or in apartments bigger than they needed; the end of federal subsidies for private rental unit development halted this type of construction; social housing development was also significantly curtailed. Quebec intermediary organizations began to focus on the housing crisis as a central concern and found the provincial government more receptive to their demands as public awareness of the problem increased. Their memberships increased as more and more organizations began to feel an urgent need to address housing issues.

Around this time, FRAPRU and the CQCH began intensive collaboration with federal-level housing organizations, particularly the FCM, CHRA and CHF-Canada. For FRAPRU, this was a new approach, having been nearly exclusively focused on the provincial government throughout its existence. For one of the first times, the provincial government began approaching the provincial intermediary organizations as allies in relation to the federal government. In the summer and fall of 2001, several interviewees reported that there were occasions at a national housing ministers' conference in London, Ontario, and a UN Habitat meeting in New York where there was informal collaboration between federal and provincial

intermediary organizations with representatives of the Quebec government with the intention of coordinating their pressure on the federal government to reinvest in social housing. The end result was a return of the federal government to "affordable housing", subsidized rental units that could be owned by the private sector. Quebec was one of the only provinces where the federal money is being used in part to fund what has been defined earlier in this thesis as "social housing". Provincial intermediary organizations see federal investment essential (and in need of expansion) if provincial commitment is not to fade away.

At the municipal level, Montreal lent its support for the 'affordable housing' federal-level campaign through its participation in FCM's efforts. The city has also, since the beginning of the housing crisis, renewed its demands of the province to increase social housing funding. Right before the 2003 merger of the Island of Montreal's numerous municipalities into one city, elections shifted the power on City Council to the party of Gérald Tremblay who had campaigned on a promise to significantly increase social housing construction. The mergers brought a change in the way that AccèsLogis projects were approved (putting them through an approval process at the Borough Council level) at the same time as the City and the province agreed to fund 5000 units of housing within 3 years in response to the housing crisis. This is still far short of the 8000 units a year (Quebec-wide) demanded by FRAPRU but community groups still celebrated the decision as a victory.

In Côte-des-Neiges, the housing crisis brought social housing to the top of the Community Council's list of priorities and new and diverse members to the Housing Table. There has also been a growth in interest and membership of CDN organizations in provincial intermediary organizations, particularly FRAPRU and the Regroupement des comités logement et associations de locataires du Québec (RCLACQ). The Housing Table has become a sophisticated advocate for social housing projects in the neighbourhood, negotiating with the City's Direction d'habitation and lobbying their local Borough Council. The Housing Crisis has meant that they have to do battle with condominium developers to secure

development sites in the neighbourhood, a competition that often plays out at the Borough Council.

Contextual trends in the community movement, 1993-2003

Apart from the political context and the policy trends specific to housing, the CDN housing actors were situated within the broader trends of Quebec's community movement. As discussed at length in Chapter 3, the community movement faced a trend of professionalization and demobilization beginning in the 1980s (Panet-Raymond and Mayer 1997; Shragge 1999). There were two somewhat contradictory forces at play. The first was that the community movement, in its more radical era of the late 1960s and 1970s, had achieved significant victories with the incorporation of new social services and social rights protections into the welfare state. While these were advances for the quality of life of many people, they also had the effect of demobilizing activists while the welfare state was at its most generous. Community groups on the whole became more professionalized, offering state-funded services to the community rather than engaging in 'agitation' or political education.

When the neo-liberal mania about debt and deficit reduction arrived in the mid to late 1980s, the community movement had begun to question the usefulness of oppositional tactics (René and Panet-Raymond 1984). For the most part, the community movement began to lose its popular base and capacity to mobilize citizens in opposition to state cutbacks. Coupled with the lack of political orientation of community groups was the government propaganda that there was no alternative to the shrinking of the welfare state, that its retreat was the only rational response to a situation of high debt and deficit. Many citizens believed this version of events and were therefore not susceptible to engagement in political actions proposed by those community groups that did try to mobilize.

By the early 1990s in Quebec, there was a strong trend towards what has been called the "arrimage entre l'État et le communautaire" (Mathieu and Mercier 1994), or the alignment of state and community interests, or at least actions. The community movement began to make headway in its long-standing demand for

official recognition of the community movement. The Politique de reconnaissance et de soutien de l'action communautaire (Policy to Recognize and Support Community Action) began to be seriously debated (Quebec 2001). This Policy was seen by some as a means to secure core funding for community groups engaged in the defense of social rights, community development and alternative services. At the same time, it opened the community movement to the pressures of a closer relationship with the state, mentioned in my interviews with organizers as a danger in terms of independence and ability to maintain a critical stance.

Faced with the withdrawal of the state from social service provisioning and investment in community infrastructure, certain sectors of the popular movement began to turn to community development, including economic, and alternative services as a response to the shrinking of the state. In Quebec, the government encouraged the growth of this social economy, formalizing its support with the 1996 Economic Summit. There was increasingly a tension between state support for independent community initiatives and the state use of community initiatives as a way of withdrawing from direct provisioning and lowering the costs and scope of service delivery (Graefe 1999).

Trends within the housing movement

The social housing movement, as reported in my interviews, followed these general trends of the community movement, with a professionalization of its staff and services. In particular, the technical resource groups (represented by the Associations des GRT du Québec - AGRTQ) and the federations representing community housing (Regroupement québécois des OSBLs d'habitation – RQOH, the Confédération québécoise des coop d'habitation – CQCH, and their regional counterparts) turned their emphasis away from oppositional-style mobilization to professional service provision and advocacy.

Interviews with these intermediary organizations (AGRTQ, RQOH, CQCH) and with state actors indicate that there exists a close relationship between the two types of actors. The Association des GRT du Québec (AGRTQ), the RQOH and the CQCH were successful in lobbying the provincial government

to accord them a space within the official processes of social housing development. For example, AccèsLogis projects must be developed with a GRT as the liaison with the government and AccèsLogis cooperatives are obliged to become members of their local federation. The AGRTQ, in cooperation with the RQOH and the CQCH, also has easy access to SHQ (Société d'habitation du Québec) officials when it comes to policy development. The AGRTQ's policy analyses and proposals are considered to be serious and well founded in research and experience by the City of Montreal and the SHQ.

Related to the trend towards community partnership with and recognition by the state is the 1998 creation of the Fonds québécois de logement communautaire (FQLC). Out of the 1996 Economic Summit came a provincial government commitment to fund community housing (co-ops and OSBLs) as a form of the social economy. Within the framework of public/private partnerships, the Fonds was conceived of as an independent forum for communication between government, community and private sector housing actors. Bringing together actors who previously had few occasions to talk or get to know each other, it was reported in interviews that the Fonds has had an important impact on the way that social housing policy gets developed. More professionalized and advocacy-oriented groups see the Fonds as a place to gain access to government officials. They assert that, if they are able to convince their diverse fellow Fonds members to accept a certain policy position, it becomes embarrassing for the government to refuse. The renewal of the AccèsLogis program in 2003, for example, was heavily based on the evaluation of the first AccèsLogis program undertaken by the Fonds. The Fonds was also successful in pressuring the City of Montreal to move more quickly in its implementation of the Solidarité 5000 logements program by intervening in cases where local boroughs were blocking social housing development.

More opposition-oriented organizations tend to see the Fonds as a necessary evil; they do not believe that the Fonds can be a radical influence on government but feel that they must show good faith by participating in such collaborative efforts before they go around the official process. They maintain

that, although the Fonds does represent a way to access government decision-makers, in the end it is only political pressure and public opinion that move governments to act outside of the neo-liberal paradigm of the free market.

Following upon the above idea, the neighbourhood-based housing committees and the HLM tenants' committees – led by their corresponding coalitions of FRAPRU and FLHLMQ – were among the only community groups that continued to use political mobilization of tenants to put pressure on the government as a central and effective tactic. In the year after the 1993 federal cuts to social housing construction, FRAPRU staged demonstrations and media campaigns against the decision. When they failed to get any results, they turned their attention to the upcoming provincial election, eventually securing the Parti Québécois' commitment to maintain provincial funding for social housing.

It is difficult to say with certainty what has resulted in FRAPRU and the FLHLMQ maintaining their more oppositional approach to housing organizing in an era when most community groups abandoned this approach. My interviews and observations lead me to believe that it was a combination of factors. First of all, I have observed that many of the activists involved in local housing organizing believe that housing should be considered a basic human right and find it aberrant that poverty or discrimination block access to housing on the private market. The fact that housing is also a physical as well as a social need adds to the sense of entitlement. As a social good to which all citizens require access, this conception of housing facilitates mobilization of people both in self-interest and out of political conviction.

This, in itself, however, cannot explain the continuing mobilization. Another important factor, suggested by my observation of three years of FRAPRU general assemblies, is that there is a core of community organizers who come from common backgrounds (to the point that four or five Montreal housing committee coordinators completed their Masters in political science together at UQAM in the 1980s) and share strong political perspectives on the state and of housing as a social right. These core organizers have remained central to the leadership of FRAPRU since the early 1990s, reinforcing each other's political

(i.e. Marxist) convictions at work but also in their social lives. While the tight relationship between these core members can sometimes make it difficult for new FRAPRU members to integrate (as has been the case, to at least some degree, for members coming from Côte-des-Neiges), it also provides stability to the coalition, strength of convictions and a high degree of trust that allows for more risky actions.

CDN organizations within the housing movement

As explained in Chapters 7, there were two organizations in Côte-des-Neiges which had housing as central to their mandates between 1993 and 2003: Organisation d'éducation et informations logement (OEIL) and Project Genesis. In the period prior to the federal cuts to social housing, these groups were rather unconnected to the broader housing movement. Instead, they focused their efforts more on the defense of tenants' rights in private housing as local mobilization for social housing in CDN without much collaboration outside the neighbourhood.

My interviews and observations lead me to attribute this to several contextual factors. The first is that the more Anglophone and immigrant nature of CDN organizations is in contrast to the very Québécois character of FRAPRU. Not only were culture and language a challenge for communication but also many stereotypes exist between the different communities, making it difficult to collaborate. A second reason I see is that up until the 1993 cuts by the federal government, the HLM Committee had been quite successful acting on its own. It had been able to secure the construction of family HLMs and, in the late 1990s, the SHDM (Société d'habitation de Montréal) targeted the northern sector of Côte-des-Neiges for massive social housing investment. This was a boom time for CDN social housing that was happening seemingly independently of the action of a wider coalition. Local organizations were fully occupied actualizing the social housing projects being built in the neighbourhood.

The federal government's withdrawal from social housing funding changed the scenario in Côte-des-Neiges. The SHDM ceased further investment and, in the early days after the federal cuts, it was not clear whether the provincial

governments would continue funding social housing unilaterally. The neighbourhood faced the prospect of no further housing investment. Long-time organizers in Côte-des-Neiges describe the federal cuts as having a seriously demobilizing effect on local organizations. The HLM Committee disbanded in 1993 with many of its members moving on to become board members of the Habitations communautaires de CDN, created in 1995 in order to manage the OSBL housing units recently developed by the SHDM. Perhaps because so much investment had happened so recently in the neighbourhood, most of the former members of the HLM Committee chose to withdraw from housing organizing altogether. Not only was the housing market in favour of tenants at the time but also, according to interviews, many of the organizers and their members felt that there was no hope for future investment in social housing.

This bleak scenario led Project Genesis to look outside of the neighbourhood for allies with whom to work on social housing. Convinced that, in the long term, social housing was the only way to divorce access to housing from the mechanisms of the private market, they joined FRAPRU in 1993 and were soon followed by MultiCaf. Both groups became active members. Broader local involvement in social housing issues did not resume in Côte-des-Neiges until the AccèsLogis program was created in 1998 with a clearly mandated role for community groups. My interviews and observations lead me to conclude that local groups formed the Housing Table as a working group of the Community Council so as not to miss out on their share of the AccèsLogis budgets. Within two years, however, the housing crisis was really being felt by the constituents of CDN community organizations, causing more of them to take an interest in housing and deciding to participate in the Housing Table. It is my interpretation of the interviews and my observations that the overall motivation behind involvement in the Housing Table changed from a desire to take full advantage of an already available budget for social housing to a desire to address a serious need in the community by expanding non-market housing options. Since the advent of the housing crisis, several CDN organizations have decided to become even more involved in social housing policy work by joining FRAPRU, including

organizations that work on mental health issues, community development and immigrant settlement.

As we have seen in this section, the period of 1993 through to 2003 saw many important shifts in the context shaping social housing policy. The 1993 federal elimination of social housing fit within a larger, international trend towards neo-liberal economic and social policy that dictated a retraction of the welfare state. In Quebec, the mobilization of intermediary housing organizations was able to effect enough political pressure for the province to maintain albeit a lower level of social housing funding. The late 1990s saw a situation of federal budget surpluses coupled with a national scandal around homelessness, largely orchestrated by federal-level intermediary organizations. By 2000, the federal government had returned to low-level funding for 'affordable' housing.

The years 1993-2003 also represent years of change for the community movement within which CDN housing actors mobilized. There was an overall trend towards increased community collaboration or partnership with the state with a focus on community development and alternatives services. Many of the CDN housing actors followed this overall trend but FRAPRU, the FLHLMQ and their members were one of the only community sectors to continue using direct action and political opposition in favour of their cause.

I have analyzed the socio-political context in which CDN housing actors made their choices about how best to organize in relation to the state in favour of social housing. The next section of this chapter analyses the community organizing choices made by CDN housing actors in light of my conceptual framework while the following chapter analyses the relationships that exist between the different actors and the impacts they might have had on policy outcomes.

How do groups organize?: choices made by local actors

This section addresses my research question regarding how community groups organize for social housing in immigrant neighbourhoods. Chapter 8 described in detail the different forms of community organizing that are brought to bear on the social housing issue. The conceptual framework allowed for the highlighting of the fact that there is a great diversity of organizing tactics being used in Côte-des-Neiges, drawing on the framework's four models of community organizing: community development, advocacy, alternative services and social action. Here, I will offer my analysis of what options were available to CDN housing proponents given the context in which they were acting before analyzing the motivations behind the actual choices made by the various groups in terms of organizing.

Using the conceptual framework put forth in Chapter 4, it is possible to analyze the findings on community organizing for social housing in Côte-des-Neiges, taking into account the issues of analysis of the state, roles of community groups in relation to the state, and the community organizing models they ultimately choose in order to have an influence on policy outcomes. The "integration" orientation of the formal state structures significantly shape the actions of community and intermediary actors but there is also a willingness to challenge these structures, using "oppositional" models, when it is felt that underlying power dynamics are blocking a desired outcome.

As I raised in my conceptual framework chapter, much of the literature on community organizing models links political orientation and ultimate goals with the model chosen (Rothman 1974). It has also been argued that, in fact, the same model or approach can be used by organizations with differing political analysis and differing ultimate goals (Rothman 2001; Shragge 2003). This is what can be understood from the findings. In the following section, I will turn to what these concepts and my findings told me about what actually happened in CDN social housing organizing between 1993 and 2003.

Contextual parameters to community organizing

As described above, the overall socio-political context for community organizing during the period covered in this study was quite hostile: neo-liberalism was on the rise internationally; social housing policy was very significantly reduced; and there was a move among community groups towards partnership or consensus-building with the state.

Faced with this difficult context, I would argue that housing groups nevertheless had a broad range of possibilities in terms of organizing. In the following section we will see how most of these possibilities were taken up at one time or another by one of the housing actors with links to Côte-des-Neiges. Here I will simply introduce them:

- ❖ Giving up the struggle of organizing for social housing. Faced with a federal government declaring that it will never again fund social housing and a trend across Canada for provincial governments to follow suit, housing groups might have decided that organizing around social housing was a waste of precious time and resources which could be spent on more winnable issues;

- ❖ Maintaining the same tactics of advocacy and social action, used to different degrees by different groups. Housing groups might have chosen not to readjust their tactics in recognition of the changing social and policy context in which they were acting, choosing instead to continue using the same approach in the hopes that it might work again;

- ❖ Focusing on tenants' rights in private housing by offering alternative services (individual rights advocacy) or advocacy and social action for policy changes. Recognizing that the federal cuts make it even more likely that the majority of tenants will continue to live in private housing, housing groups might have decided to shift their focus to tenants' rights within the private market;

- ❖ Turning to other sources of money for more independent housing development, following the community development model. Given the

lack of public funds, housing groups might have sought alternative sources of funding for social housing (bank loans, Community Reinvestment Act-type legislation, foundations, use of cooperative and OSBL movement's assets as leverage for loans, etc.);

❖ Factionalizing. In a situation of scarce resources, the housing groups might have broken off into factions, each fighting so that their form of social housing received the little government funding available;

❖ Focusing advocacy and social action on provincial government policy. Accepting the federal government's withdrawal, housing groups might have turned their focus onto the provincial government, insisting that it respond to its constitutional responsibility for housing issues;

❖ Focusing advocacy and social action on federal government policy. Insisting that the federal government is the only one with the taxation powers to raise the funds necessary for social housing, housing groups might have focused their lobbying efforts on the federal level, pushing them to reinvest;

❖ Increasing pan-Canadian alliances for the purposes of advocacy or social action. In efforts to build a strong enough counterbalance of power to the state, housing groups might have sought alliances across Canada in order to collaborate in political pressure or lobbying.

The rise of neo-liberalism was so strong during this period, however, that dreams of fundamentally changing the way that people gain access to housing (i.e. by separating this access from the private market on a large scale) were put aside in favour of efforts to gain more immediate victories.

In the following sections, a review of the choices made by housing actors between 1993 and 2003 in relation to social housing organizing allows an analysis of the motivations behind these choices: How do community groups in immigrant neighbourhoods organize in order to have an impact on social housing policy? And how do these organizing choices relate to the conceptual framework in terms of socio-political context, liberal structures for participation and models of community organizing?

Organizing choices at the intermediary level

In seeking to answer my question about community groups and their organizing around social housing policy issues, I eventually found that, in fact, community groups have very little involvement in policy organizing. In contrast to much of the rhetoric observed among local groups, it is rather the intermediary organizations that do most of the policy work. In terms of analysis of current government programs, development of alternative policies and direct lobbying, it is the intermediary groups who take the lead with local organizations following, lending support and sometimes analysis from a local perspective.

Since 1993, the socio-political context has been such that intermediary groups have made a variety of organizing choices. When the federal government first withdrew from social housing, Quebec intermediary organizations representing the full range of non-profit housing interests (AGRTQ, CQCH, RQOH, FRAPRU, FLHLMQ) came together in a way that had not happened previously. They felt that social housing was too important to put it aside as a demand and also rejected the idea that funding sources alternative to the state could ever be sufficient to meet social housing needs. Rather, believing that the federal government was the only source of sufficient funds to meet the need for social housing, they chose to coordinate their lobbying and political action in order to have the greatest effect. Previously, the more professionalized, advocacy-oriented groups (AGRTQ, CQCH, RQOH) had always worked separately from the more social action-oriented groups (FRAPRU, FLHLMQ). During the first year, they collaborated to concentrate on protesting the cuts, using both advocacy and social action.

This year of protest against the federal government failed to produce any results. When the provincial elections came onto the horizon in 1994, the intermediary groups saw this as an organizing opportunity. The intermediary organizations were able to maintain their collaboration in order to put pressure on the various provincial political parties to make public commitments to fund social housing. Again, this focusing of their efforts on the provincial government took the form of both advocacy and social action. The intermediary organizations were

able to secure the commitment of the Parti-québécois, which was subsequently elected.

Once the new provincial government began to formulate its support for social housing the intermediary organizations began to have difficulties collaborating. It had become necessary to spell out the details of provincial social housing programs. The differing definitions of social housing came to play a role in organizing decisions. As discussed in Chapter 7, a further divide between the two camps of intermediary organizations is their assessment of the relevance of HLMs as a format of housing. The provincial government wanted to cease its support for new HLMs, a position supported by the AGRTQ, the CQCH and the RQOH because they believed that HLMs failed to offer the possibilities of empowerment and alternatives to the state they attributed to housing cooperatives and OSBLs. Some of those interviewed mentioned the view that these organizations were also acting to secure their futures. FRAPRU and the FLHLMQ maintained that, although there was a need for greater tenant power within HLM management, the format remained relevant for some tenants. They also saw HLMs as a way of ensuring long-term state involvement in social housing.

This difference of opinion led to a split in the organizing tactics among intermediary organizations, with the AGRTQ and its allies entering into negotiations with the government on the details of pilot projects and, eventually, AccèsLogis. At the beginning, FRAPRU and the FLHLMQ withdrew from the collaboration in order to use social action techniques to demand HLM inclusion in the new projects. When they saw that the government was not likely to back down, however, they became involved in the negotiations and consultations that went into the development of the programs.

The 1996 Economic Summit and the ensuing push of the social economy, including third sector housing, were controversial. Many in the community movement (including some of those interviewed) saw this as a cover for state disinvestments in social programs. Others (including some who were interviewed) saw it as an opening to have access to funding and to the ears of decision makers. None of those I interviewed believed that this move was done entirely out of the

goodwill of the state. By 1998, the Economic Summit had led to the creation of the Fonds québécois de logement communautaire. All of the provincial intermediary organizations interviewed for this thesis are represented on the Fonds. Their motivations include an interest in staying up-to-date on policy issues, gaining access to decision-makers, building power through collaboration with other actors, a desire to influence government and a sense of obligation to be perceived as credible by the public and the state. Despite their presence at the Fonds as colleagues of various government actors, FRAPRU and the FLHLMQ both retained the possibilities of using social action in order to pressure the government to take action when they deemed it necessary.

Throughout the late 1990s, intermediary organizations proceeded with their involvement in the delivery of AccèsLogis social housing. FRAPRU, however, supported by the FLHLMQ, was the only group that continued to apply direct pressure on the federal government to reinvest in social housing. The advent of the housing crisis radicalized all sectors of the housing movement, motivated by the feeling that only the federal funds could respond to the crisis but also by the feeling that their cuts had moreover contributed to the current situation. The housing crisis created a situation similar to that described above, immediately after the 1993 federal cuts. Faced with a dramatic housing problem, the full range of provincial intermediary organizations were able to pull together, even seeking alliances with organizations across Canada, in order to increase their power in relation to the federal government.

Unfortunately, however, the unprecedented degree of collaboration among intermediary organizations leading up to the 2000 announcement of the federal Affordable Housing program was, as with AccèsLogis, followed by factionalization when it was time to negotiate the details. Both sides had maintained their positions regarding the relevance of HLMs as a format for social housing. This time, however, the provincial government was facing huge public pressure to solve the housing crisis and municipal governments were estimated to have the capacity to produce housing (i.e. HLMs). The possibility to include HLM development within the Affordable Housing guidelines was a great

disappointment to the AGRTQ, CQCH and RQOH and it raised tensions between the intermediary organizations.

Organizing choices at the neighbourhood level

Early on in the research process, it became clear that the local housing actors, the members of the CDN Housing Table, had little direct involvement in social housing policy issues. At the beginning of my case study in 2000, three local organizations participated in FRAPRU actions around social housing policy and this increased by another three by 2003. Except for Project Genesis, however, the CDN FRAPRU members did not bring the policy debates back to their memberships for real discussion and political education. Groups for whom housing was not an integral part of their missions simply had no time for more in-depth involvement. As discussed in Chapter 8, their participation in FRAPRU was as support, coming out to demonstrations, signing collective letters, and presenting briefs through the CDN Community Council. Groups without a clear housing-related mission felt that they lacked the time and resources to intervene meaningfully on policy issues if they were acting more independently.

Organizing around policy issues was so secondary to CDN housing actors that I soon expanded the focus of my thesis to include organizing for social housing development, a much more in-depth activity in the neighbourhood. With this as a focus, I was more easily able to determine the organizing responses of CDN groups to the 1993 federal social housing cuts. While I had expected them to turn to social housing policy issues, they had instead focused their energy on social housing development, coming to policy issues much later.

In the 1980s, as discussed earlier in this thesis, CDN community groups had created the HLM Committee and had successfully used social action tactics (such as demonstrations, public rallies mobilizing local residents on HLM waiting lists and letter-writing campaigns) in order to pressure the SHQ and City of Montreal to construct family HLM in the neighbourhoods. The social activity of the HLM Committee also attracted the attention of the newly created SHDM's director in the late 1980s. When, in 1988, the SHDM approached local groups to

collaborate in the acquisition of run-down buildings in northern Côte-des-Neiges in order to renovate and convert them into cooperative and OSBL housing, the members of the HLM Committee agreed to use a more community development approach to their organizing. Having won major investment from the SHDM, social action was less often used against the City and the SHQ in favour of advocacy on a joint steering committee for the development of projects in the neighbourhood and participating in community development decision-making.

In this period of high investment in the neighbourhood's social housing, there was little incentive for local organizations to take a more oppositional approach towards the government. Efforts were instead concentrated on integration activities, contributing to decisions about how government resources were to be spent in the neighbourhood. As mentioned above, it may be these recent victories that contributed to the neighbourhood's relative lack of action in the face of the 1993 cuts to social housing budgets. Although these cuts put an end to any further SHDM investment and put the provincial social housing programs into question, there was little protest from Côte-des-Neiges. The HLM Committee disbanded after the 1993 announcement, deciding that, in the context of neo-liberal debt and deficit hysteria, there was no use in continuing their social housing organizing when there was no federal funding and none in sight.

Among CDN groups, Project Genesis was alone in 1993 in deciding to continue to fight for social housing by joining and participating in FRAPRU's social action for housing policy. MultiCaf soon followed but they remained the only two local members until 2000. The former members of the HLM Committee and the joint steering council with the SHDM remained with the community development approach, creating the Habitations communautaires de CDN in 1995, a non-profit organization established in order to take over the management of the SHDM non-profit housing. The Habitations communautaires has remained more of a management organizations that an advocacy or community development organization.

In fact, CDN organizations did not renew their interest in social housing organizing until the 1998 creation of AccèsLogis created a specific role for them

to play in implementing social housing projects in the neighbourhood. As mentioned above, only the local FRAPRU members had participated in the social action and advocacy that had led up to the creation of AccèsLogis. The new opportunity, however, brought other CDN organizations to come to the conclusion that it was worth spending their time on social housing issues, seeing a concrete benefit for their constituencies.

The CDN/Snowdon Community Council, at the instigation of local FRAPRU members, began discussing how the neighbourhood should organize itself to participate in the consultations with the community sector required under the AccèsLogis program. The format of a Community Council Housing Table was decided upon as a way to maintain maximum awareness among CDN organizations of housing issues and to establish some political clout behind the Housing Table. With its official role as the representative of the CDN community sector, under the tri-partite funding agreement for community councils by the City of Montreal, the Régie régionale de services sociaux et santé and Centraide, the Community Council was already recognized by the City and the province as a legitimate actor with some credibility. At the same time, the Community Council's staff would be able to play a coordinating role for the Housing Table.

As described in Chapter 8, the Housing Table's official mandate is to take on advocacy work in favour of Côte-des-Neiges social housing development. Most of the time, the Housing Table follows the procedures set out by the City in implementing the AccèsLogis program. These procedures require local groups to cooperate with the City by advocating for projects that fit AccèsLogis criteria and then supporting their implementation using a community development approach. Interestingly, while local groups consider the process itself to be fair if taken at face value, the existence of resistance to social housing development in the neighbourhood (with City councilors favouring condominium development) leads the members of the Housing Table to sometimes subvert their cooperative role and take a social action approach, organizing such actions as demonstrations, delegations to the Borough Council or unannounced visits to politicians' offices.

The housing crisis has increased CDN interest in both the Housing Table, as a way to ensure a fair share of the AccèsLogis and Affordable Housing budgets, and FRAPRU, as a way to address the ongoing policy framework deemed necessary to ensure continued and, hopefully, expanded investment in social housing. The housing crisis has also radicalized, to some degree, the local housing actors, making them more open to social action as an approach. The sense of crisis and outrage that their constituents face such difficult housing conditions seems to have pushed many CDN organizations out of their previous complacency. In my analysis, the high media profile of FRAPRU's social action approach has also helped to contribute to the feeling in CDN that this has been instrumental in terms of convincing the federal government to intervene on housing issues. FRAPRU has also made a concerted effort to recruit CDN members, seeing the participation of groups from this huge and diverse neighbourhood as important to their overall strategy. The presence in the Côte-des-Neiges of organizers with previous affinities with FRAPRU has also helped open the neighbourhood to membership.

Organizing links to the conceptual framework

Although the organizing process is not linear and influences arise at different moments within the process, the general constellation of an organization's analysis of the state, its structures of participation and its underlying power dynamics, along with the role they feel is most effective to maintain in relation to the state, combine to give rise to choices around which model of community organizing to draw upon. Tactics, strategies, levels of intervention and the social theories guiding these choices are all intertwined (Rothman 2001; Shragge 2003). However, one cannot draw straight lines between a particular model of practice and a particular theory of the state. Community groups and intermediary organizations are fundamentally pragmatic so that a group's choice of strategy and demands may be more a reflection of their reading of the current political conjuncture than their political ideology. Organizational and personal values create parameters for these decisions.

In this section, I will use the guidance of my conceptual framework to add to my analysis of how community groups in Côte-des-Neiges organize for social housing. The socio-political context, liberal state structures and underlying power dynamics all help to explain why CDN community groups made the decisions they did in drawing upon the community organizing models discussed in Chapter 3 and the conceptual framework.

Socio-political context

The political and economic context is key to groups' choices around organizing. Community groups analyze social, economic and political trends in the effort to determine how they can be most effective in working toward their goals. It is difficult for groups to conceive of practical plans that would go outside of prevailing norms and practices so that the actions of groups' allies, targets and public opinion all play a strong role in determining an organization's analysis of a reasonable course of action. Previously, I discussed at length the socio-political context as well as the more specific context of the overall community movement between 1993-2003.

During this period, the rise of neo-liberalism within North American governments put housing groups into a defensive position, struggling to maintain previous gains rather than expanding. I have offered my analysis of how groups reacted to the organizing possibilities presented by such a hostile context. The most important contextual factors I see in influencing the organizing choices were the following. First, with an international turn to neo-liberalism, the federal government's moves towards cutting back the welfare state in all areas made housing organizers lose confidence that the trend could be reversed in social housing, a program that had already lost its universal eligibility and was seen as serving a 'special interest' (i.e. the poor). It also made it more difficult to mobilize citizens to fight for social housing reinvestment. In terms of the provincial government, its dual interest of bringing social movements onside while reducing the costs of social service delivery made third sector housing an attractive model for intervention. Fitting well with the provincial government's objectives in the

mid-1990s was the community movement's demands for recognition as an important player around social rights (Quebec 2001; White 2001). At the local level, recent massive investments in CDN social housing probably demobilized groups at the beginning of the period examined in this study, having little immediate need for new housing. It was the advent of the housing crisis that kick started CDN and intermediary housing organizing in a more direct fashion as people reacted to a dramatic change in housing conditions.

Liberal state structures

These elements of the socio-political context helped to shape the formal state structures for participation in both the development of social housing units and of policy, structures that are designed according to liberal principles of governance, as discussed in Chapter 4. These formal structures exercise significant influence in groups' decisions about which models of organizing to draw upon. Although groups reported in interviews that the formal structures are far from perfect, they do offer some degree of opening to the state. Few groups are willing to pass up this opportunity. Pragmatic decisions lead them to use organizing models that allow them to participate in these structures while retaining the option of going outside the structures when deemed effective.

The significance of these structures can be observed in the way that the AccèsLogis program regulates community involvement in the social housing development process. The Housing Table was actually created in response to AccèsLogis requirements and, for the most part, groups restrict their actions to its stipulations. In my analysis, groups choose to cooperate in the AccèsLogis process since it is a way to acquire local social housing with minimum demands on their already stretched resources. Organizing in a more oppositional manner, trying to expand or reform AccèsLogis, takes time and money of which the groups do not have a lot. So, as long as they are able to make gains via the official process, community groups are willing to participate.

Another form of liberal structuring of the community movement's participation in social housing issues is the funding program offered to them by

the various levels of government. Funding opportunities shape organizing choices in a very significant way. Much more support is available for alternative services and community development (especially social development) than for advocacy or social action. As a result, many groups develop projects or programs that fit the first two models but then use their activities to conduct political education and to gain insight into community conditions that can feed into advocacy or social action organizing.

Underlying power dynamics

These decisions are not made in a power vacuum, however. Underlying power dynamics do come into play, with class and immigration issues most evident in Côte-des-Neiges social housing organizing. The class interests of tenants versus city councilors with real estate connections were evident in dealings with the Borough Council, for example. The organizing approaches used by CDN community groups had to take into consideration the particularities of working in a diverse immigrant neighbourhood, also, if they hoped to be effective. Communication challenges have to be addressed, as do legitimate fears related to having precarious immigration status when in confrontation with the state.

Community groups are not often in a position of real power compared to the state so they often judge it ineffective to openly oppose the state, especially in this era of decreased mobilization for political action. The recent increase in incidence of arrest during demonstrations and the revelation that FRAPRU, for instance, was under ongoing undercover investigation by the Sécurité-Québec, highlight the risk that groups take in using models that oppose the state, a risk of particular concern for activists with precarious immigration status. It may therefore be misleading to judge a group according to the formal role they play in relation to the state and to believe that that is an indication of the model of organizing they will draw upon. As discussed in Chapter 8, several groups take on the advocate role officially but use the social action model to back up their demands when necessary.

When it comes to understanding the state and the underlying power dynamics of organizing, groups employ a diversity of state analyses. Often, different analyses are present within most organizations, with contradictions in the positions taken by the official organization, its organizers and members. This results in an ongoing debate within the organization about the best approach and sometimes results in compromises.

In my analysis, it became clear that Ng et al.'s contention that the state is not monolithic, but rather a complex set of relations within a particular power dynamic (Ng et al. 1990), also helps to explain the complexity of choices around organizing models. In cases where there is a sympathetic and cooperative civil servant working on a dossier (of which I found examples in every government agency in which I interviewed), groups often decide that they can get more done, at least in the short term, using an "integration" approach.

How do community groups relate to the state?: links to social housing policy

This section addresses my research question regarding how relationships between community groups and the state influence social housing policy. Chapter 8 addressed some of the types of relationships that are present as community groups organize in order to affect social housing policy. My conceptual framework in Chapter 4 argued that there are three principal roles taken on by community groups in relation to the state: partner, advocate and opponent. As I have explored earlier in this thesis, all three of these roles can be observed among housing actors with links to Côte-des-Neiges and the same group may take on each of these roles at different times or in different settings in order to better work towards its objectives.

Here, I will offer my analysis of why CDN housing proponents chose to take on their various roles in relation to the state before analyzing the links between the choice of roles and the social housing policy that results. As discussed in the conceptual framework, there is a tendency to link community

roles in relation to the state to specific models of community organizing. For example, you might not think that groups in the partnership or advocate position would use social action in order to influence the state. You might also not expect that a group that identifies as an opponent of the state would engage in de-politicized advocacy. As I will demonstrate in this section, however, these scenarios can be observed due to community groups' pragmatic analysis of the context in which they are acting.

Using the conceptual framework put forth in Chapter 4, it is possible to analyze the findings on community organizing for social housing in Côte-des-Neiges, taking into account the issues of analysis of the state, roles of community groups in relation to the state, and the community organizing models they ultimately choose in order to have an influence on policy outcomes.

Partners with the state

Since the mid-1990s, and especially since the Economic Summit of 1996, the Quebec government has promoted the idea of community/state partnership as a way to improve the quality of social services, bringing them closer to the population, and also as a way of responding to the community movement's demands for recognition. In forming partnerships with the community sector, the government stands to benefit from community expertise and lower its costs in service delivery. It is also more difficult for the weaker partner (community groups) to exert political pressure on the stronger one (the state). At the same time, engaging in partnerships with the community sector demonstrates an openness to citizens that is positive for government public relations. Also at play in the government interest in partnership is the fact that many of the civil servants who deal with community groups have come out of the community movement itself, with prior relationships or as workers.

While, in general, the community movement has rejected the government's call for partnership as a slippery slope towards cooptation, more subtle forms of partnership have found their way into the relationship between the

state and community groups. Sub-contracting of government services to community groups, requirement of community involvement in social development processes, dependent funding relationships and an increase in government/community consultative councils have all contributed to different forms of de facto partnership between community groups and the state. The relationship is far from equal, however, as would be the case in situations of true partnerships (Panet-Raymond 1992; White 2001).

Partnership with the state has also found its way into social housing organizing. My interviews revealed a near unanimous rejection of the idea of becoming partners with the state, indicating a fear of cooptation and loss of critical independence, but nearly all the groups participated in some of the forms of de facto partnership mentioned above.

At the intermediary level, the AGRTQ, CQCH and RQOH work closely with the provincial government in order to iron out the details of the AccèsLogis regulations while Montreal GRTs, FÉCHIMM and the Fédération des OSBL d'habitation de Montréal (FOHM) work closely with the City of Montreal's Direction d'habitation in ironing out the implementation of the AccèsLogis program. In both of these examples, intermediary organizations have easy access to the government civil servants and their technical contributions are welcomed as if from colleagues. The government agency retains decision-making power, however, and this scenario only occurs when the civil servants have the mandate to change regulations or program parameters.

A second, somewhat odd, partnership type of relationship is the funding arrangement between the SHQ and FRAPRU. When AccèsLogis was established in 1998, FRAPRU was able to negotiate that its members receive contributions in proportion to the number of AccèsLogis units developed in their neighbourhoods. The official agreement stipulates that groups may receive up to $12,000 a year (the average being more around $10,000) in recognition of the services that FRAPRU members offer to the residents of social housing as well as their work in promoting social housing to the public in general. What is odd about this agreement is that social housing tenants are less likely than private tenants to need

support from housing committees. Also, the money is used to promote social housing to the general public but it is just as often used to support organizing against the SHQ, the Quebec government in general or the federal government in order to increase social housing budgets. This funding contribution from the SHQ is central to many FRAPRU members' budgets yet they do not seem to fear that actions against the SHQ might jeopardize this funding. In Côte-des-Neiges, OEIL and Project Genesis both benefit from this funding arrangement.

A final example of partnership is the Fonds québécois de logement communautaire, described earlier in the thesis. The Fonds brings together actors from the provincial government, municipalities, banks and social housing intermediary actors. This partnership has been quite influential as the province and the City have readjusted their social housing development programs, with members reporting in interviews that they feel able to get over the uncomfortable situation of sometimes having to put pressure on the organizations represented by their colleagues on the Fonds with whom they have developed friendly relations. FRAPRU and the FLHLMQ are the most skeptical of the utility of the Fonds but remain involved in order to have access to decision-makers and in order to show good faith in respecting the policy structures set forth by the government. From the perspective of the liberal state, the Fonds is a classic example of bringing together a variety of social interests so that the SHQ can ultimately mediate their demands.

Advocates in relation to the state

Most of the housing actors interviewed for this study identified most closely as advocates in relation to the state. They saw themselves as representing a particular constituency and its interests in terms of social housing. As the community movement has moved away from the opponent role more common in the late 1960s and 1970s, advocacy has become the more common role. This role – when used as I have used it in this thesis (meaning the representation of specific interests to the government without mobilizing political support for the position among a constituency) – offers somewhat of a compromise as community groups

face state pressures for partnership at the same time that they have lost, for the most part, their ability to mobilize citizens which is so necessary for successful opposition.

I see several reasons for the popularity of the advocacy role. The first is that the structures around social housing policy reform and development have a clear place for advocates. For example, the AccèsLogis program requires the implementing agency (in this case study, the City's Direction d'habitation) to consult local community organizations before approving a project. The CDN Housing Table was created to fill this role and it usually keeps to the advocacy role.

Another reason why groups may prefer the advocacy role is that it can be quite effective when there are sympathetic ears within the state apparatus. My interviews revealed that there were former community housing workers (particularly from GRTs) in low-level decision-making positions at all three levels of government. Not only do housing group organizers often know the civil servants from past work experiences together but they also share a common frame of reference in which to discuss social housing. I have also observed that most activists are uncomfortable using confrontational tactics if they feel that less aggressive advocacy will work, as they are likely to feel when addressing former allies from the community movement.

Finally, when it comes to CDN members of the Housing Table, the immigrant character of the neighbourhood is a factor in choosing advocacy as the preferred role. Given that partnership is not desired, advocacy is a role that allows intervention on social housing issues without being likely to bring on strong government resistance, particularly in the form of police action. The relatively safe, non-confrontational nature of advocacy is less threatening to people with precarious immigration status or for those unfamiliar with the workings of the Canadian state. I feel that, although this is a valid consideration, it is sometimes used to the detriment of groups' being able to draw on the more radical activist experience that is also present among the CDN immigrant and, particularly, refugee, population.

Many of the non-state housing actors, especially at the intermediary level, aim to retain access to government decision-makers as advocates able to provide solid, substantiated, policy-relevant information. At the same time, there is an acceptance of the usefulness of a diversity of approaches. Groups playing the role of advocate, and even partner, sometimes facilitate the actions of opponents while not taking public responsibility themselves. The GRTs, for example, often share information on blocked social housing projects with local organizations with an understanding that the information will be used in the local groups' actions to pressure politicians or the Direction de l'habitation.

Opponents to the state

Few of those interviewed identified primarily as opponents of the state in terms of social housing. FRAPRU and the FLHLMQ were the most forthright in this role, arguing that the state serves the interests of class and other elite interests unless faced with significant resistance that threatens its control. While their analysis is shared quite widely among those interviewed, most groups were not willing to take on the opponent position unless they felt that the specific socio-political conjuncture meant that using this role would bring results. Otherwise, it was deemed too risky, bringing on the danger of legal action or, less dramatically, a loss of access to government decision-makers for other issues.

It is interesting to note, however, that neither FRAPRU nor the FLHLMQ have, in fact, lost access to government decision-makers, as attested by their continuing presence on the Fonds québécois de logement communautaire and FRAPRU's continuing funding agreement with the SHQ. It is true, however, that these organizations have faced arrests at their demonstrations in recent years and surveillance by the Sécurité-Québec, facts that many dissuade some people from becoming involved with them. This dissuasion is of major concern for members of the CDN Housing Table who cannot ethically expose their immigrant membership to risk of arrest that could lead to detention and deportation for certain individuals. Project Genesis and OEIL both identify more as opponents to the state but both organizations are cautious about what forms this opposition may

take. This will become evident in the following examples of ways that groups assume the opponent role.

In May of 2002, FRAPRU organized a province-wide week of action in order to draw attention to the housing crisis. The provincial and municipal governments were seriously and very publicly criticized for failing to respond appropriately to the crisis. Government was accused of siding with landlords. This week of action revolved around civil disobedience tactics, occupying abandoned buildings and lots that local organizations had targeted as desirable for social housing development. This week led to prolonged media coverage of the FRAPRU critiques and the City of Montreal soon after announced emergency measures to address the fallout from the housing crisis on the upcoming July 1st.

CDN organizations made careful decisions about how to participate in this week of action. Members of the Housing Table decided that they could not risk an occupation in Côte-des-Neiges, deciding instead to show their opposition through a street fair that would engage local residents in popular education encouraging critique of government action around social housing and the housing crisis. The members of CDN housing groups were fully informed of the risks involved in participating in the broader FRAPRU actions that focused on squatting as a tactic. In the end, the CDN organizers attended squats in other neighbourhoods accompanied by members who decided they were able and willing to risk arrest.

On the local level, there are also examples of the CDN Housing Table deciding to engage in opposition in order to support a particular AccèsLogis project or to address general shortcomings of the AccèsLogis program, particularly as it is managed at the Borough level. One such situation arose when a building, which the City condemned as unsafe after OEIL organized its tenants to demand repairs, was sold to a private developer who was friends with one of the CDN city councilors. Local groups had hoped that the City would support the acquisition of the building for social housing conversion so when the Borough then also made an exception to the housing crisis ban on condominium conversion in order to accommodate the developer, members of the Housing Table were furious. Not only had the tenants been put out of their homes after the City had

neglected their complaints until the building had to be condemned, but now they had also lost the possibility of returning to their apartments after the repairs were done. The Housing Table, throughout the condominium conversion process, organized delegations of tenants to pack Borough Council meetings and asking angry and embarrassing questions. This particular case went ahead but they were able to gain concessions for other social housing projects soon afterwards.

Relationship links to the conceptual framework

As set forth in Chapter 4's conceptual framework, an understanding of the socio-political context of organizing, the liberal nature of the official structures for non-state participation in government decision-making and the underlying power dynamics which shape non-state actors' access to these structures contributes to an understanding of how and why different organizations take on different roles in relation to the state. Community and intermediary actors make choices about how they will engage with the state, responding to their analysis of the current socio-political context, official structures and underlying power dynamics, all of which is coloured by their basic analysis of the state itself.

Socio-political context

Finally, the social and political context in which all of these factors interact has a major influence. This thesis examines the actions of community groups in an era where neo-liberal policies were being advanced and consolidated around the world, including Canada and Quebec. Possibilities and outcomes are evaluated within this context, leading to conclusions that might be different in different times. For example, in the context where the federal government had completely withdrawn from the direct provisioning of social housing, the creation of the Affordable Housing Program is considered a great victory. In a more favourable political context, most of the social housing actors I interviewed would heavily criticize the government for creating a mechanism that subsidizes the profit-making of private landlords rather than investing public money into collectively-owned, long-term affordable social housing. While this critique is much discussed in social housing circles, for the moment, there is recognition that

it is significant to have been able to funnel any of that money into social housing at all.

The overall political context influences the types of relationships that develop between community and state actors. In terms of the macro political and economic context, early chapters reviewing the literature described the turn to the right that has occurred in Western welfare states, including Canada, since the 1980s. The implementation of the neo-liberal project was somewhat delayed in Quebec and the Parti québécois tended to use consensual, social democratic language, masking a turn to the right in order to more easily implement its agenda. The rise of neo-liberalism worldwide has also had its impacts in Quebec. The cuts to social housing seen in other welfare states, the privatization of public services and pressure from the World Bank to cut social programs, etc., have all had an impact on what community groups believe is possible. In a context where the state is retreating from social programs but offering to form partnerships for the provision of specific services, community groups have sometimes decided that it was better to have something rather than nothing. With the federal government completely withdrawn from funding new social housing for almost ten years and with Quebec one of the only provinces left in Canada that was involved in social housing, many community and intermediary actors were anxious to maintain their credibility with the province and keep its attention on policy issues.

The local political and economic context also has an impact on the roles that groups are willing to adopt. The January 2003 merger of the City of Montreal with adjacent municipalities brought with it changes to the process of social housing development. Whereas local social housing projects were approved centrally by the Service d'habitation before, the local Borough Council now has a central decision-making role. Given community groups' connections with the Borough Council representatives on a regular basis, as well as the many common social and political networks linking local politicians to community group organizers and members, the role of opponent became difficult to maintain. With the devolution of responsibilities to the Borough Council came an interest in

forming partnerships, or at the very least collaborations, between the Borough and local organizations.[35]

This research also took place within the context of a highly politicized and highly mediatized housing crisis that first came to public attention in Montreal in 2000 and peaked in 2002.[36] Vacancy was at a historic low, landlords were more easily able to neglect their responsibilities to maintain apartments, discrimination against families with young children and the poor peaked, and rents were increasing at an unprecedented pace. For many years, rental housing in Montreal was a tenants' market, influencing the power dynamic between tenants, landlords and politicians. The new housing crisis meant not only that the constituencies of community and intermediary housing actors were desperate for social housing now but also that it was effective to put political pressure on the state to prioritize social housing as well. During a housing crisis, it is no longer simply the poorest of the poor who face housing problems. So while the Borough Council situation was encouraging groups to act as partners or advocates, the extreme situation of the housing crisis opened the door for many groups to increase their use of the opponent role.

Liberal state structures

The actors examined in this thesis could be broadly categorized as opponents, advocates or partners but the situation is more complex than might be assumed. Official roles are determined in part by the formal state structures of participation. According to these structures, and the funding arrangements that support them, community and intermediary actors are meant to act as advocates

---

[35] At the time of writing this thesis, local politicians have been meeting with representatives of Borough community groups concerned with housing in the interest in creating a joint Housing Commission. This has been a demand of local organizations that organized tenant presence at the Borough Council over many months in late 2003 but now that the politicians have agreed to the Commission, the two sides are so far unable to agree on its mandate and powers.

[36] The CMHC attributes Montreal's housing crisis to a number of factors: stagnation of rental unit construction (both private and social); formation of new households (divorce but, especially, improving economy meant that more young people could afford to live alone or in bigger apartments); steady immigration; increased demand for condominiums led to conversion of rental units (related to large cohort of young people who lived with their parents longer than usual during the recession and who saved enough money to buy condos – with the improving economy,

and, increasingly, partners. The rules regarding charitable status, essential to community and intermediary actors' ability to access public and private grants and donations, are increasingly limiting the possibility of taking on the opponent role. The Canadian Revenue Agency's position on what constitutes political action precludes many of the activities one might undertake as a social housing actor trying to influence policy:

> Some forms of advocacy can be charitable (*e.g.*, to advocate on behalf of individuals, to advocate in order to change people's behaviours) while others are unlikely to be charitable (*e.g.*, to advocate on behalf of a group, to advocate to change people's opinions.) (CRA 2002).

Extremely important are the legislative or regulatory factors affecting the relationship between the two sectors. It came out strongly in the interviews that both government regulations around social housing and funding opportunities play a key role in shaping the relationship between the community sector and the state. Personal and professional histories may shape the fine details (or back-door character) of relationships but, in public or in the presence of others with authority, organizers and civil servants tend to fill the role accorded to them by their institutional setting and by official procedures.

In my conceptual framework, I drew from the literature the concept of formal state structures being shaped according to liberal principles. In the case of CDN social housing activities, I think that this concept helps to explain my findings. I observed that, for both social housing development and policy, there were formal state structures in place to mediate and shape the involvement of different actors.

In the case of social housing policy, there are also liberal structures in place to mediate and shape the participation of non-state actors. All three levels of government have policies that relate to social housing and to housing in general. In Quebec, however, the provincial level of government is the most influential social housing policy since it decides how to use the funds provided by the federal level and it dictates to the municipal level how to apply the AccèsLogis program

---

there was a spike in demand) (CMHC 2003).

(SHQ 2004). The existence of the Fonds québécois d'habitation communautaire, bringing government and community actors together on an advisory board, is another structuring factor (FQHC 2003).

The basic structure for influencing social housing policy is similar at all three levels of government. In most cases of policy reform, the elected officials of the government at any level may give civil servants the mandate to develop new social housing policy or reform existing policy. Governments usually come to this decision to work on social housing policy due to advocacy or political pressure from different interests concerned with social housing. Politicians are supposed to receive the information that a change is needed through such sources as letters from voters and organizations, meetings with their constituents, reports in the media, academic research and advice from civil servants. Once the decision is made that a change is due, forums are usually established for non-state actors to offer their input on the form the policy should take. Public commissions or public hearings are designed to give different actors the opportunity to express their opinions on social housing. Participants may be individuals, local or intermediary organizations, other levels of government or representatives of the private sector. The government is then meant to take these opinions into account and mediate the different interests, eventually designing a policy that promotes the greatest good for the public.

Unlike the process in place for decision-making around the development of social housing units, the process for the development of social housing policy is viewed by several of those interviewed among community social housing actors as more vulnerable to being skewed. This is largely because, although a formal process for advocacy and consultation exists, there is no clear designation of who has the right to participate, what information will be deemed credible or what information will be taken into account, giving much leeway to the state to pursue its interests. The range of possible involvement is so wide that not all those who are concerned will necessarily be heard. In the case of social housing policy, non-governmental actors often feel that underlying power dynamics (such as those

between private developers and elected officials) are the real motor of the process...

In the case of social housing development, the formal structure is very local in focus. Very recently, the federal government restarted its transfer of funds to Quebec for the purposes of "affordable housing".[37] The Quebec government allocates this money, along with its own funds, to the Société d'habitation du Québec who, setting social housing program parameters (AccèsLogis), transfers money to municipalities in order to implement the program. In the case of Montreal, the city allocates these funds, along with its own contributions, to its Service d'habitation for administration. The Service d'habitation then allocates a certain proportion of its funds to each neighbourhood in Montreal and begins accepting housing project proposals.

Before accepting an AccèsLogis project, the City is required to consult with community actors. Although the definition of 'community actors' is not included in the regulations, the fact that almost all neighbourhoods have developed some form of Housing Table that includes a variety of community groups means that, in practice, it is extremely difficult for the City to go around them. They are the de facto City counterparts in accepting AccèsLogis projects. Projects must also have the zoning approval of the local Borough Council. Officially, City decisions are simply administrative, not political, based on the financial viability of proposals and their conformity to AccèsLogis guidelines. The official decision-making structure allows for many different stakeholders to be involved in the process (via the Housing Table or the Borough Council) and the City is meant to act as a neutral decision-maker, using rational criteria.

In most cases, local organizations, who contributed to the development of this official structure through past advocacy and, sometimes, social action, reported in interviews to be satisfied to participate in this official process. As an independent process, most seem to consider it fair. In some cases, however, members of the Housing Table consider that their experience in trying to develop

---

[37] At the time of my interviews, the Affordable Housing program was very new so it has not been included for discussion in this thesis.

a social housing project does not live up to the supposed neutrality of this liberal structure. In such cases, members of the Housing Table will argue that underlying power dynamics are coming into play, as discussed in the following section.

Underlying power dynamics

Another example of complexity is the manner in which groups take on roles that do not, on the surface, correspond with their interpretation of the state. Many organizers and members of non-state organizations have a Marxist or critical analysis of the state that, one would think, precludes the partner role or the role of advocate in its most moderate sense. Nevertheless, several of these organizations do take on these roles, deeming it unrealistic in the current political context to attain significant social change by taking on the opponent role. Rather, they make the decision that, for the moment, it is better to aim for concrete reforms that *are* achievable, slowly building towards a context in which the broad public would support more serious opposition.

The Marxist and critical theory literature on the state and public policy suggest some important concepts related to the underlying power dynamics that can help explain how government decisions are made. The authors reviewed earlier on in this thesis (Ng et al. 1990; Wharf and Clague 1997; Evans and Wekerle 1997), suggest that it is important to look past the formal structure to ask questions about who benefits from the status quo and whether particular groups (such as women, ethnic and racial minorities, the poor) experience state policy differently.

Indeed, even though many of the organizations examined in this study hold a liberal analysis of the state (mostly in terms of its official structures), they rarely believe that the state is entirely neutral. Most actors reported that they believe that there are underlying power dynamics that exercise significant influence in the development of social housing units and policy and this belief is supported by my observations in the CDN social housing debate.

In terms of social housing development at the local level, CDN groups have many examples of ways in which elite interests (especially class and ethnic)

come into play in the process. Recently, despite the City declaring its goal of building 5000 units of social housing in response to the housing crisis, many projects have been blocked at the level of the Borough Council. A lack of flexibility in zoning for social housing, an unwillingness to act decisively against abusive and neglectful private landlords[38] and a willingness to allow derogations in order for the conversion of rental units into condominiums have all made it difficult for social housing projects to reach completion in Côte-des-Neiges. Community groups also note that one private developer is often given the same weight as the entire Housing Table, representing hundreds of local residents. There is a privileging of private property over collective or non-profit property. Councilors are more flexible and facilitating for condominium development than social housing.

The impact of underlying class and other social power dynamics is even more evident at the policy level. On a fundamental level, the federal government was able to cut funding for new social housing construction despite a wealth of evidence supporting the public benefits of this social program. Subsidies for private ownership continued, the federal government sought to privatize or download what little social housing it still owned and the new Affordable Housing Program continues this trend to subsidize private ownership. Such policies help those with money to continue to make profits rather than invest in public goods, a reflection of our political system's basis in private property (Chouinard 1990). In terms of policy decision-making process, the private sector is able to put more resources into lobbying the government (both exerting influence and forming the interest group needed in a liberal democratic system to justify the continuing policies which favour private capital) and the current focus on neo-liberal economic efficiency (i.e. profit generation) gives them particular credibility with government decision-makers. Actors within the state also stand to

---

[38] The City of Montreal has a bylaw that allows the City to step in and effect repairs in cases where a private landlord has already been fined and refuses to do the repairs him or herself. The costs of such repairs, in addition to the relevant fines, are then levied against the property. If the landlord fails to pay these charges, the City can eventually seize the property, just as they can for unpaid property taxes. In such cases, many social housing actors expect that the property

benefit from privatization. Many of the politicians connected to Côte-des-Neiges, especially on the Borough Council, have real estate interests personally or are friends with developers, and would therefore benefit more from the development of private housing than social housing. Outside of the liberal formal structures of government policy-making, members of our society's elite (in terms of wealth, gender or race) are able to exploit their social, political and business connections with government officials in order to have their concerns heard outside of the official forums.

There are also, however, some underlying power dynamics which benefit community and intermediary actors. Related to the concept that the state is not a monolithic entity (Muller et al. 1990), community and intermediary actors benefit from the fact that a great number of the civil servants working on social housing policy issues come out of the community movement. Many of them retain their sympathy for the demands of the community sector and there are many social and work connections between organizers and civil servants. In this way, community actors are able to pass their opinions on to the government in informal ways as well, although at a somewhat lower level than members of the elite who are more likely to have informal connections to the politicians themselves. CDN community groups do benefit from an ally on the Borough Council, however. One of the neighbourhood's city councilors comes out of a progressive background and he often supports the Housing Tables demands when other members are less helpful. Unfortunately, however, this city councilor is only one among six and cannot always convince his colleagues to support his positions.

This thesis illustrates that there are several factors that shape the relationships between the government and community actors. My interviews revealed that there are personal, professional, legal/regulatory and contextual factors that come into play. For example, on a personal level, organizers' personal analysis of the state (whether they see it as benevolent, neutral or representing the elite) will have an impact on the direction they aim to lead their organization in

---

should be turned over for social housing development.

building a relationship with the state. As well, organizers' personalities play a role in the relationships constructed. Some of the organizers in Côte-des-Neiges are known for their feisty personalities, others for their extremely passive personalities and this, of course, will impact how they relate to their counterparts in the government.

On the professional level, it is quite common for community organizers to move into civil service positions as their careers advance. In almost every interview I conducted with state representatives, either the interview subject themselves or one of their close colleagues came to the government out of the community sector. In speaking with community workers, many of them mentioned past colleagues who now work in the government. Government workers have personal relationships and, in most cases, shared values with those who continue to work in the community sector. This illustrates the concept raised in my framework that the state cannot be considered monolithic but rather as an entity that aims to further the interests of the elite, all the while being challenged from within and from without in a complex power dynamic.

Also interesting in the discussion of relationships between the community and the state is the way in which many housing actors stated in interviews that it is to their overall advantage to have allies acting in the full range of possible roles in interfacing with the state. Most groups seem satisfied that they have chosen an appropriate role to take on but also seem to view different roles as complementary. These ideas of complementarity of approaches to the state, as well as the basic ideas about what constitutes each organization's most effective relation to the state, contribute, in turn, to choices about models of community organizing.

For me, there are four major concepts that emerge from this examination of the roles taken on by community groups in relation to the state as they organize for social housing in an immigrant neighbourhood. First, there is an inherent tension that exists within the formal state legal and regulatory structures framing the processes of both social housing project and policy development. These

structures exist within a particular historical context, however, which influences the impact of these structures as well as the underlying power dynamics. Competition between interest groups means that both community and state actors struggle to use the structures to attain their goals.

Second, the roles taken on by community actors in relation to the state – while ultimately framed by legislation and regulations – are played out according to the intersection of many factors such as individual personalities and histories, organizational culture and history, and current political and economic context at both the local and macro levels.

Third, in response to this tension, a clear (yet flexible and highly interdependent) division of labour has evolved among social housing actors as each actor continues to work to attain their goals. Among community actors, this division is reflected in the organizing models adopted by each group. If taken at face value, there exists a significant gap between community groups' rhetoric and their practice. A more careful examination, however, reveals that the pragmatism of community actors guides them to make short-term concessions in their approach and demands in the hope of eventually creating an opening in which their underlying critique of society can be taken up by more broadly-supported popular social movements and acted upon in a more political manner, either because popular education has convinced more people of the worthiness of the demands or because the group has increased its ability to mobilize people for political action.

To conclude, I will address the influence of the neighbourhood's immigrant character on the choices groups make about social housing development and policy corollaries. In keeping with the liberal framework of the state (which recognizes individual rather than group rights – Kymlicka 1992), the formal structures around social housing do not address issues of immigration. The diversity within Côte-des-Neiges is an unavoidable fact, however, making it a concern for organizations in terms of their demands, their organizing approaches and overall strategies, as well as their relationships with other actors.

Emerging ideas to take from this analysis

In concluding this chapter, I will highlight some of the most striking ideas that arise from my analysis of the social housing organizing situation in Côte-des-Neiges. For me, the most fascinating aspect has been the delicate dance that organizations perform, balancing their beliefs and long-term goals with their material situation and the political conjuncture. From my observations, I would argue five major points: (1) there is a basic tension around the formal structures for community and intermediary participation in state decision-making; (2) the role of community groups in relation to the state is shaped by a broad variety of factors; (3) the roles taken on by community groups, intermediary organizations and perhaps even sympathetic civil servants create a widely accepted division of labour among actors; (4) pragmatism leads to a gap between groups' analysis or rhetoric on the state and the forms organizing they undertake; and 5) immigration is an omnipresent undercurrent to the activities of CDN housing actors but it is a determining factor.

Basic tension of structure

The development of both social housing units (via AccèsLogis) and policy (such as via parliamentary commissions or Borough Council meetings) takes place within a state-defined (and community-influenced) structure for community and intermediary participation in decision-making. These structures conform to a liberal conception of the state as a neutral mediator of competing interests. Underlying social power dynamics influence access to and effectiveness within these structures, however. In Côte-des-Neiges, the influence of condominium developers on the Borough Council was evident, as is a lack of political will to apply laws that may penalize landlords and aid the development of social housing.

A basic tension exists due to the fact that these structures exist partly due to community demands to be involved in social housing decision-making and control and partly due to the state's desire to download certain social housing responsibilities to the community level, in step with neo-liberal calls to dismantle

the welfare state. Both community and state actors try to use these formal structures to serve their interests. For community groups with a critical analysis of the state, there is a dilemma in the choice of (1) full participation in these structures in order to achieve what gains are possible or (2) a rejection of these structures as biased according to underlying social power dynamics and working towards (though unlikely to occur anytime soon) a fundamental change in our society's distribution of power and resources.

Factors in the relationships between state & community

Within the basic legal and regulatory framework that surrounds social housing development and policy, the factors influencing the relationships between the state and community actors are complex. Apart from the effect on organizing choices, these regulatory and legal frameworks also influenced the relationship between community groups and the state. The rules surrounding charity status constrain the political action of CDN housing actors, funding programs impose a form of partnership with the state (or at least a subcontracting of services), and the social housing policy development channels and AccèsLogis programs suggest particular ways of intervening.

Organizational factors were also important. The personalities of the organizational representatives, along with their personal socio-political analysis, were important to relationships, a factor that was not much discussed in the literature. Whether the representative had a personality that tended more toward conflict or consensus had a significant impact on the type of relationships they were interested or able to maintain, as did their personal work histories. The types of relationships they had had in the past came into play (whether positive or negative), as did the type of knowledge and experience gained in past jobs and the existence of previous work relationships among current representatives. Organizational history was also significant. The origins of the organization, its history of autonomy from the state, its security of funding and the type of membership base had an impact on the relationships the organization was able or interested in maintaining.

Finally, there are the contextual factors that shape the relationship between community groups and the state. The broader political climate – in terms of the prevailing analysis and activities of other social actors, state projects, state reaction to community demands, international political and economic pressures, etc. – will have an impact on the type of relationship that develops. In the case of Côte-des-Neiges, we saw how the rise of neo-liberal political ideas, the desire of the state to shift housing to the community sector – "l'arrimage entre le communautaire et le secteur publique" (Mathieu and Mercier 1994) – the explosion of the housing crisis and, recently, the broad mobilization of the community sector against the policies of the recently-elected right-wing government have all had their impact on organizing.

Division of labour among groups

The different roles taken on by the range of social housing actors contributes to what I found to be one of the most interesting aspects of my findings. The division of labour among community and intermediary social housing actors came out clearly over the course of my study. In interviewing actors at the different levels of intervention, both community and state, the actors were quite open to the roles taken on by others and the community organizing models they chose. Actors, for the most part, shared a common view of the constellation of roles played by different actors as well as the time and place for different organizing models. The idea of their being a complementarity of roles and models of organizing was widely shared. This division of labour is clear but can also be flexible, with recognition of the interdependence of these different roles and models within the social housing movement.

To illustrate this idea, I can give several examples. GRTs have a close relationship with the state, acting more as partners, a relationship they aim to preserve in order to maintain access to decision-makers and help projects move forward. Because of this, they do not turn to social action when the City or the province is stalling on a project. They prefer to advocate and negotiate. They are not necessarily upset, however, if the Housing Table makes an autonomous

decision to disrupt a Borough Council meeting in order to raise the problem and may even support this happening through the passing of information. Another example comes from a civil servant who explained that having their Minister confronted by protesters opened the door to them being able to introduce discussion of important issues and possible reforms.

The work to secure the Affordable Housing program is another good example of this. The campaigns to increase investment in social housing, especially within the context of a national housing crisis, brought together social housing actors from across the spectrum. Historic differences among the different groups – divisions around proper relationship to the state, demands for specific forms of social housing (especially HLM vs. OSBL and cooperatives), and long-standing personal conflicts – were generally put aside in order to address the crisis at hand. It seems to me that it was a combination of the unprecedented need with which organizations were faced and the analysis that the political conjuncture was ripe for real victories that allowed groups to come together in this way. A perfect example is the Ministerial meeting to negotiate the Affordable Housing Program that took place in London, Ontario, in August 2001. There was coordination between different organizations to have a tent city outside the negotiations as well as organizational representatives within the negotiations. At the same time, sympathetic civil servants encouraged the non-governmental actors to use a variety of approaches, suggesting that a combination of lobbying and social action would be most effective in helping them (the sympathetic civil servants) convince their Ministers to go ahead with the agreement.

Gap between rhetoric and practice

The complex interaction of factors discussed above, from state structures to roles taken on to division of labour, helps to explain the gap that exists between groups' analysis and action. Among those groups with a Marxist or critical view of the state, most have chosen to participate fully in the state-defined housing structures for the present while slowly making headway towards fundamental changes by seeking opportunities to raise political awareness in favour of

progressive political options. On the surface, their actions may seem wholly oriented towards achieving social integration but a closer look shows an ongoing commitment to critical analysis of the state and popular education with their constituencies for social opposition.

The need for public rhetoric to support integration activities is enforced by many factors: legal and regulatory constraints on non-profits, especially those with charity status; desire to maintain access to government officials; desire to obtain immediate victories; the interest of attracting members who may be uncomfortable at first with the idea of oppositional activities; the divergent political analyses which exist within many organizations.

It is also important to note that groups who hold a liberal analysis of the state sometimes engage in actions which seem more militant or conflictual as a result of other factors such as collaborating with groups with a more radical tradition or the judgement that more liberal tactics are failing to have an effect (Kruzynski 2000). Most groups with a liberal analysis will nevertheless argue that there are sometimes problems with the application of the liberal model and that, sometimes, it is necessary for disadvantaged social groups to go outside of the usual framework in order to reestablish a power balance. Other factors include: maintaining working relationships with groups holding the more Marxist or critical analysis; organizational tradition; or oppositional models for integration goals. Pragmatism is the over-riding consideration in choosing organizing approaches.

Immigration as a factor in social housing organizing

One of my most fundamental reasons for being interested in Côte-des-Neiges is its immigrant character. One of the goals of this thesis was to explore the place of immigration as a concern in organizing for social housing. I have found that, for a neighbourhood as undeniably diverse as Côte-des-Neiges, immigration is a constantly present undercurrent in organizing. In housing matters, however, it does not seem to be primordial. The two main areas in which immigration has an impact is in organizing approaches and housing needs.

As discussed above, immigration affects organizing styles in a variety of ways. First of all are the communication challenges that come from diverse cultures and diverse languages. Other considerations involve political histories and their meanings in terms of organizational structures, tactics and strategies. Different experiences can also bring new and diverse analyses of the state and its responsibilities. Of particular concern is the possible impacts of community organizing activities, especially in the social action vein, for participants who have precarious immigration status in Canada and for whom involvement with the legal system can have serious consequences, even going so far as deportation.

In terms of housing demands, I discussed earlier how the immigrant families tend to have larger families and multiple generations within a household, creating a need for larger apartments. There are also design considerations, such as improved ventilation for certain styles of cooking, which come into play. Social housing can also sometimes offer respite to the discrimination in housing faced by immigrants in the private housing market and it can allow space for immigrants to design housing that suits their traditions and cultural practices a little more closely than most Canadian housing.

Overall, however, the community groups of Côte-des-Neiges consider themselves to be working with immigrants for social housing, not for immigrant housing. Immigration is a secondary consideration for them and they indicate a conviction that housing issues are basically the same for anyone.

Conclusion

In this chapter, we have reviewed the findings of my fieldwork, drawn links between my findings and my conceptual framework and offered an analysis of how community groups organize to influence social housing development and policy in Côte-des-Neiges. This analysis is only a beginning, however, and there are many questions left unanswered. In my concluding chapter, I will summarize my analysis of community organizing for social housing in Côte-des-Neiges,

raising some new questions and reflecting upon my experiences in undertaking this research.

Chapter Ten

Lessons Learned & Conclusions

My thesis explores two questions that perturbed me in my past experiences as a housing activist. I began this case study in 1999, after five years of participation in social housing activism demanding federal reinvestment without any results. I was frustrated, feeling that, although the case for social housing seemed to be strong in terms of human need, human rights and even economic spin-offs (at least the kind that are equitably distributed), the state was immovable. I began to feel that my housing organizing would be stronger if I better understood the process of community organizing that went into social housing demands and I was particularly interested in how this happened in immigrant neighbourhoods, the environment in which I work most often. I also began to suspect that those of us in community groups had a poor understanding of the relationships that exist between the many levels of social housing actors. Perhaps if these were better understood, we could understand how the different actors influence each other. I also believed that I wasn't the only person wondering about these things, which helped me to justify my focus for an impending PhD. These concerns about having an effect on social housing policy coalesced into the following two questions:

How do the relationships between community, intermediary and state social housing actors influence the development of social housing projects and policy?

How do community groups in immigrant neighbourhoods organise in order to have an impact on government social housing policy?

This thesis has addressed both questions, whose meanings and significance shifted somewhat as the social housing policy context began to shift quickly after I began my work in 1999. In 1999, the federal government was only just starting to react to the organizing of groups that had been engaged in this

struggle for years. By the end of my thesis, the federal government had returned to funding social housing (once Quebec had reinterpreted the agreement), definitions of social housing and affordable housing were in transformation and there were new alliances and new tensions between non-state housing actors.

Despite the shifting terrain, I have, in this dissertation, offered my answers to the above questions using the following format. After an introduction to the subject and content of the thesis, I wrote two chapters reviewing the academic literature to serve as a baseline for understanding my field research examining the relationship between the state and community groups. The literature on analyses of the state in capitalist societies, the welfare state as a configuration of social policies and housing policy specifically was covered in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 focused on the tradition of community organizing and the different models that guide community groups' choices of strategies and tactics. A conceptual framework in Chapter 4 drew together the most useful ideas from the literature, forming a guide I could use to analyze my findings. Liberal and Marxist analyses of the state, theories about roles played by community groups in relation to the state and the models of community organizing were the principal elements.

My research methods were explained in Chapter 5. This was a qualitative case study, drawing on interviews with 29 individuals working in 22 different organizations or agencies that are connected to social housing development and policy for Côte-des-Neiges. The next chapter turned to a profile of the neighbourhood at the centre of this study, describing its history, geography and current socio-economic situation. These elements were important to the context shaping organizing decisions in Côte-des-Neiges.

It was in Chapters 7 and 8 that I delved into my research findings. The first focused on profiling the housing actors involved in Côte-des-Neiges in terms of their origins, missions and structures of accountability. The varying definitions of social housing employed in organizing were also problematized in this chapter. Chapter 8 turned to the community organizing models that underlie strategic and tactical choices made by CDN and intermediary groups, reflecting upon the

implications of community organizing choices for the roles that groups can take on in relation the state.

Finally, in Chapter 9 I applied my conceptual framework to my findings in order to answer the two research questions mentioned above. I discussed how and why groups make the community organizing choices they do and well as what roles groups take on in relation to the state and why. In this concluding chapter, I will raise the two overarching themes that emerged from my thesis work, drawing from them lessons for organizing. In the conclusion, I will also share some of the spin-offs that have occurred out of this research.

Complexity of the struggle for social housing

The great complexity of the social housing development and policy debates was somewhat of a surprise to me. Coming to the research as a relative 'insider', I thought I was well informed about the factors that played into social housing policy, who was involved, who did what (roles) and how (community organizing approaches). I expected that the interconnection of the factors would be what was new for me. Instead, my research led to a discovery and a documentation of the variety of factors, actors, roles and actions that affect the social housing debate.

In terms of the 1993-2003 socio-political context that shapes the parameters of the social housing debate covered in this thesis, there were influences from all levels. As a simplistic example, internationally, the increasing pace of capitalist globalization went hand-in-hand with the rise of neo-liberalism. The arrival of this global neo-liberalism in Canada gave the World Bank the encouragement to cut social housing at a time when the federal government was in full-swing debt and deficit hysteria. The subsequent withdrawal of the federal government left housing investment to the provinces. Luckily for Quebec, the provincial government was eager to distinguish itself from the federal government, avoid social movement pressures and retain its social democratic image by working with the third sector to create social housing. This government

move was in parallel with a general trend in the community movement towards demobilization and a turn towards service provision. The resulting AccèsLogis program was to be implemented by the municipal government. When the City of Montreal merged, there was once again a shift in the way that groups had to negotiate the system in order to achieve their social housing goals. Recognition of the complexity of the socio-political context is essential if groups hope to be more effective in building power to impose change on the state.

The CDN Housing Table brought together groups with a wide range of mandates. Anti-poverty, food security, immigrant settlement and environmental organizations have created a common cause with the more traditional social housing organizations: tenants committees and neighbourhood development organizations. The commitment of these non-housing groups to collaborate on housing issues when there would be no shortage of issues demanding their attention back in their own organizations attests to the importance of housing to people's quality of life. If these groups spend time on housing, it is because they deem it essential to their constituency's well-being and that that need is not currently being met. This willingness to get involved is an important consideration for those looking to build power around social housing issues. Allies are to be found in seemingly unlikely places.

When it came to understanding the housing actors in action, the complexity was again striking. I observed among the community and intermediary actors the taking on of three roles in relation to the state: partner, advocate and opponent. The partner role was unpopular among the groups for self-identification. Most groups identified as advocates and several identified primarily as opponents. While housing actors usually remained within one of these roles, their analyses of the socio-political context sometimes led them to deviate from the primary role in order to have greater impact. For housing organizers, openness to looking beyond first appearances can reveal a more radical analysis behind a rather mainstream public profile, useful if one hopes to eventually act 'outside the box'.

The story around the use of community organizing approaches is similar. The models set out in my conceptual framework, as ideal types, were also all used within Côte-des-Neiges social housing organizing. Alternative services, advocacy, community development and social action were all observed and most groups used more than one of these approaches. In general, the approaches used by groups corresponded with the official roles they adopted in relation to the state but groups also made pragmatic decisions to use other approaches they deemed useful towards their goals. The community groups of CDN were willing to try any tactic they estimated to be useful according to an analysis of the potential risks and benefits of a given action. In cases where groups were unable or unwilling to participate in a certain type of action, they would often facilitate another groups' participation. When asked what characterized the CDN approach to social housing organizing, a long-time neighbourhood told me that they did what it took to have an impact: 'a little bit of everything, with a lot of gravy!' - from whence came the title of my next section.

Pragmatism of practice: "De tout avec ben de la sauce"

This PhD research has caused me to reevaluate the pragmatism of pragmatic strategizing. Whereas before I tended to see pragmatism as closer to opportunism, my findings reveal that the disconnected pragmatic decision-making of diverse housing actors, sometimes to their mutual chagrin, adds up to a common strategy that we can call, 'De tout avec ben de la sauce'. In terms of achieving social housing reform, 'de tout avec ben de la sauce' appears to have been a relatively effective strategy, especially when viewed over the long-term. Unfortunately, no one has yet discovered how to achieve the revolution of social housing, at least not in my case study neighbourhood...

Pragmatic organizing decisions are necessarily shaped by both the socio-political and organizational contexts. Failure to take into account the parameters for action suggested by these contexts is a recipe for frustration at the least and, in the extreme, severe state repression. It goes without saying that such scenarios do

not bode well for long-term goals in organizing. People are unlikely to maintain their involvement if they see no concrete gains or if their experience of state repression is useless in terms of achieving their goals. At the moment, the organizing environment of continuing neo-liberalism and security-mania is rather hostile, especially for those working in an immigrant neighbourhood where people have rising fears of detention, deportation or even just criminalization. Pragmatism suggests working in critical collaboration with the state is not a bad idea in terms of making minor gains, as well as maintaining an environment in which it is possible to build political support for more fundamental changes over the long term. In a future, more positive organizing environment, present pragmatism may bear fruit. Moving towards this, however, requires a constant visiting of political analysis and political goals.

One of the most important lessons to be drawn from the pragmatism revealed in interviews and observation is that the division of labour that occurs among social housing actors. In earlier chapters, I described how, put very simply, certain groups (ex. AGRTQ, FOHM, FÉCHIMM) tend to take a more collaborative or integrative approach with the government while others (FRAPRU, FLHLMQ) tend to be more oppositional. The two sides have very similar long-term goals and have basic respect for each other's work but they suffer from such different ideas about how to achieve their goals that it is often difficult for them to come together in collaboration. My research showed that, in times of great crisis (ex. complete federal cut of social housing funding or the housing crisis), they are able to coordinate their efforts. Interestingly, however, interviews with representatives of the state agencies that are the targets of such efforts brought out their contention that even when the community groups do not consciously coordinate their efforts, it can have somewhat the same effect.

In fact, in talking with government officials at all three levels of government, the overall theme that emerged was that it was only a diversity of tactics that finally moves government to act. The explanation for this is related to the concept of the state not being monolithic in nature. Within the state working on social housing issues, as discussed earlier, are many people who actually came

out of the community movement. These people have for the most part retained their desire for progressive change but find themselves constrained by the structure in which they work. Over and over, I was told that ally civil servants need help from those on the outside in order to make any changes within the state. Overall, the state does appear to protect capital and private property at the expense of housing being an applied human right. It is possible to achieve improvements under certain circumstances. A quick review of the circumstances leading to the federal government's return to affordable housing funding is illustrative.

According to interviews with both state and intermediary organizations involved in negotiating the Affordable Housing Agreement, it was only the cumulative effect of groups from many different sectors of society mounting successful media, lobbying, social action and advocacy campaigns simultaneously that created enough public pressure for the government to step in. One government official told me that he appreciated when social action groups "hounded" his minister on social housing issues because, when the minister was frustrated enough to actually ask him what these protesters were going on and on about and what can they do to shut them up, he was able to put forward concrete proposals that are constructed in large part based upon the information and documentation provided by the more sedate advocacy organizations. Together, they were able to have an impact. Neither of the approaches would work on its own.

For me this need to collaborate across approaches is the most important lesson to be drawn from the thesis. Quebec community and intermediary groups are able to do this, as has been seen in the past, but it is not an easy task. In my opinion, it is extremely difficult to maintain a critical independence from the state once one begins collaborating with them or even just seeing oneself as an advocate. Not wanting to be associated with radical action, thereby perhaps losing access to decision-makers, can lead groups to become closed to other forms of organizing. The more radical groups also sometimes dismiss the value of the reforms that can be achieved by this more mainstream approach. Dogmatic

rigidity in either camp is a weak strategy in the long term by either limiting oneself to goals of minor reform rather than seeking fundamental social change or by giving up opportunities to make real improvements in people's actual living conditions on the (very long) way to the revolution.

Conclusion

This doctoral research has allowed me to explore and document the process of community organizing for social housing in the immigrant neighbourhood of Côte-des-Neiges. I have also explored the relationships between the state and community actors when engaged in this debate. An analysis of the findings produced from investigating these two broad areas has allowed me to develop conclusions that offer insights, discussed above that may be useful to others who are also struggling for social housing from the local level.

Unfortunately (but not surprisingly) there is a good chance that none of the people I interviewed will want to read this thesis. It is simply too long and they are too busy working on social housing. They are interested in the results, however, so the results of this dissertation will be directly disseminated to social housing actors in two ways. The first will be an executive summary that will be sent to each person I interviewed. The second is a training guide for local housing activists who are seeking a better understanding of the structures and processes that go into both building social housing and influencing its policy. Having already secured funding for the copying of such a guide, I will arrange to distribute it via the memberships of the intermediary groups I interviewed. I will also offer to give workshops to any housing groups that request one.

Now at the end of the PhD research process, I find myself drawing back to look at social housing from a larger perspective. I am reminded that, of course, no housing solution actually addresses the root causes of households being unable to access adequate, suitable and affordable accommodations. Housing problems are directly related to income inequality and the commodification of a good necessary for human survival and dignity:

> En effet, …depuis les premières cités ouvrières du siècle dernier jusqu'aux grands ensembles, le logement social a toujours signifié qu'une classe sociale, en tant que telle, se trouvait privée de la maîtrise de son habitat et logée par une autre. (Morin and Dansereau 1990:17)

What else to do, then, than keep on keeping on? Social housing is simply one battle within the bigger war against social injustice.

Reference List

Abramovitz, Mimi. 1988. *Regulating the Lives of Women: Social Welfare Policy From Colonial Times to the Present*. Boston: South End Press.

Advisory Committee on Population Health. 1996. *Report on the Health of Canadians*. Ottawa: Federal, Provincial, Territorial Advisory Committee on Population Health.

Ahlbrandt, Roger S. Jr. 1986. "Public-Private Partnerships for Neighborhood Renewal." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 488(November):120-134.

Alinsky, Saul D. 1946. *Réveille for Radicals*. Toronto: Random House.

————. 1972. *Rules for Radicals: A Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Radicals*. New York: Vintage Books.

Alperovitz, Gar. 1991. "Socialism Based In Community: Starting at the Bottom." *The Nation*:522-25.

Andrew, Caroline. 1998. "Les Femmes Et L'État-Providence: Question Revue Et Corrigée." *Politique Et Sociétés* 17(1-2):171-82.

Anner, John. 1996. "Having the Tools at Hand: Building Successful Multicultural Social Justice Organizations." Pp. 17-30 in *Beyond Identity Politics: Emerging Social Justice Movement in Communities of Color*, Editor John Anner. Boston: South End Press.

Aumont, Ginette. 1998. *Avec Les Familles Immigrantes*. Québec: Ministère de la Santé et des Services sociaux and Ministère de la Famille et de l'Enfance.

Austin, Michael J. and Neil Betten. 1990. "The Roots of Community Organizing: An Introduction." Pp. 3-15 in *The Roots of Community Organizing, 1917-1939*, Editors Neil Betten and Michael J. Austin. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Bacher, John C. 1993. *Keeping to the Marketplace: the Evolution of Canadian Housing Policy*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's press.

Badiuk, Eileen. 2000. "A National Symposium: Toward an Affordable Housing Policy for Canada." *Canadian Housing* 16(4):8-9.

Banting, Keith G. 1987. "The Welfare State and Inequality in the 1980s." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 24(3):309-38.

Barkan, Elliott R. 1986. "Vigilance Versus Vigilantism: Race and Ethnicity and the Politics of Housing, 1940-1960." *Journal of Urban History* 12(2):181-89.

Barndt, Deborah. 1989. *Naming the Moment: Political Analysis for Action*. Toronto: Jesuit Centre for Social Faith and Justice.

Barrow, Clyde W. 2000. "The Marx Problem in Marxian State Theory." *Science & Society*

64(1):87-118.

Barton, Stephen E. 1985. "A History of the Neighbourhood Movement in San Francisco."
    Berkeley Planning Journal 2(1-2):85-105.

Battle, Ken. 1998. "Transformation: Canadian Social Policy Since 1985." *Social Policy and
    Administration* 32(4):321-40.

Bauman, John F., Norman P. Hummon, and Edward K. Muller. 1991. "Public Housing, Isolation,
    and the Urban Underclass: Philadelphia's Richard Allen Homes, 1941-1965." *Journal of
    Urban History* 17(3):264-92.

Beckwith, Dave and Cristina Lopez. 1997. "Community Organizing: People Power From the
    Grassroots." COMM-ORG: The On-Line Conference on Community Organizing and
    Development.

Bennett, Arnold. 1997a. *Shelter, Housing and Homes: a Social Right*. Montreal: Black Rose
    Books.

————. 1997b. "A Short (Anecdotal and Partial) History of the Fight for Housing in Montreal."
    Pp. 1-16 in *Shelter, Housing and Homes: A Social Right*, editor Arnold Bennett.
    Montreal: Black Rose Books.

Bennett, Larry. 1997c. "Urban Redevelopment and Grassroots Action in Chicago and Sheffield:
    Themes, Variations and Uncertain Legacies." *International Journal of Urban and
    Regional Research* 21(4):664-76.

Berg, Bruce L. 2001. *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. Toronto: Allyn and
    Bacon.

Bernèche, Francine and Luba Serge. 1994. *Les Impacts Du Program D'Acquisition De Logements
    Locatifs (PALL) Sur La Revitalisation Des Quartiers Montréalais*. Montreal: SHDM.

Betten, Neil and Michael J. Austin. 1990. "The Conflict Approach to Community Organizing." Pp.
    152-60 in *The Roots of Community Organizing, 1917-1939*, Editors Neil Betten and
    Michael J. Austin. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Betten, Neil and William E. Hershey. 1990. "The Urban Political Boss As Community Organizer."
    Pp. 137-50 in *The Roots of Community Organizing, 1917-1939*, Editors Neil Betten and
    Michael J. Austin. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Blumenfeld, Hans. 1968. "Est-Il Possible De Loger Convenablement Tout Le Monde?" Pp. 13-25
    in *Une Ville à Vivre: Une Colloque Sur L'Habitat Urbain D'Aujourd'Hui Et De Demain*,
    editor Institut Canadien des Affaires Publiques (ICAP). Montreal: Éditions du jour.

Bobo, Kim, Jackie Kendall, and Steve Max. 1996. *Organizing for Social Change: A Manual for
    Activists in the 1990s*. Minneapolis, MN: Seven Locks Press/Midwest Academy.

Borgos, Seth and Scott Douglas. 1996. "Community Organizing and Civic Renewal: a View From
    the South." *Social Policy* 27(2):18-28.

Boris, Eileen. 1993. "The Power of Motherhood: Black and White Activist Women Redefine the

'Political'." Pp. 213-45 in *Mothers of a New World*, Editors Seth Koven and Sonya Michel. New York: Routledge.

Bourne, L. S. 1993. "The Changing Settlement Environment of Housing." Pp. 271-88 in *House, Home and Community: Progress in Housing Canadians, 1945-1986*, Editor John R. Miron. Ottawa: CMHC.

Bratt, Rachel. 1987. "Dilemmas of Community-Based Housing." *Policy Studies Journal* 16(2):324-34.

Breton, Raymond. 1983. "La Communauté Ethnique, Communauté Politique." *Sociologie Et Sociétés* 15(2):23-37.

Broadbent, Edward. 1999. "Social Democracy: Past and Future." *Dissent* 46(4):45-52.

Buchanan, Allen and Dan W. Brock. 1986. "Deciding for Others: Competency." *The Milbank Quarterly* 64(2 (Supp).

Bujold, Renald. 2000. *Conseil Communautaire CDN/Snowdon: Développement Des Communautés Locales, Portrait De Concertations De Quartier à Montréal*. Montreal: Centraide.

Calpotura, Francis and Kim Fellner. 1996. *The Square Pegs Find Their Groove: Reshaping the Organizing Circle*. http://comm-org.utoledo.edu: COMM-ORG working paper.

Campaign 2000. 2002. *Poverty Amidst Prosperity: 2002 Report on Child and Family Poverty*. Toronto: Campaign 2000.

Canada. 1992. *Consensus Report on the Constitution: Charlottetown, August 28, 1992: Final Text*. Ottawa: Government of Canada.

Canadian Housing. 2000. "A CHF Victory." *Canadian Housing* 16(4):6.

Carroll, Barbara W. 1989. "Post-War Trends in Canadian Housing Policy." *Urban History Review* 18(1):64-74.

Carroll, Barbara W. and Ruth J. E. Jones. 2000. "The Road to Innovation, Convergence or Inertia: Devolution in Housing Policy in Canada." *Canadian Public Policy* 26(3):277-93.

Carter, Tom. 1997. "Current Practices for Procuring Affordable Housing: The Canadian Context." *Housing Policy Debate* 8(3):593-631.

Center for Third World Organizing. 1998. "Appendix: Examples From Training Manual." Pp. 258-72 in *Community Organizing in a Diverse Society*, 3rd ed. Editors Felix G. Rivera and John L. Erlich. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Chekki, Dan A. 1995. "Glimpses of Urban Poverty in Europe and North America." *Research in Community Sociology* 5:3-12.

CHF Canada. 1998. *Planning For Change: CHF Canada's Strategic Plan*. Ottawa: Cooperation Housing Federation of Canada.

Chiasson, Guy. 1997. "The 'Crisis in the Welfare State' and Democracy: A Discourse Analysis of ACOA." Pp. 74-87 in *The Welfare State in Canada: Past, Present and Future*, Editors

Raymond B. Blake, Penny E. Bryden, and J. F. Strain. Concord, ON: Irwin Publishing.

Chimbos, Peter D. 1986. "The Changing Organization of Greek Canadian Communities." *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 27(3-4):208-16.

Chisholm, John. 1999. "No Place to Stay: Social Policy Reform in Canada and Its Impact on Affordable Housing." *Canadian Housing* 16(2):14-18.

Chouinard, Vera. 1990. "The Uneven Development of Capitalist States: 1. Theoretical Proposals and an Analysis of Postwar Changes in Canada's Assisted Housing Programmes." *Environment and Planning A* 22(10):1291-308.

CHRA. 2004. *Canadian Housing and Renewal Association: Your National Affordable Housing Ally*. Ottawa: Canadian Housing and Renewal Association.

Chui, Tina. 1996. "Canada's Population: Charting into the 21st Century." *Canadian Social Trends*(42):3-7.

City of Montreal. 2001. *Fonds De La Société D'Habitation Et De Développement De Montréal: 1988-2001*. Montreal: City of Montreal.

———. 2002. *Communiqué De Presse: Le Sommet De Montréal: Les 4, 5, 6 Juin 2002*. Montreal: City of Montreal.

———. 2003a. *Habiter Montréal: Une Approche Intégrée En Matière D'Habitation*. Montreal: City of Montreal, Habiter Montréal.

———. 2003b. *Les Logements Sociaux Et Communautaires à Montréal, En Date Du 31 Décembre 2002*. Montreal: Ville de Montréal, Service du développement économique et du développement urbain, Direction de l'habitation.

———. 2004. *Profil Socio-Économique: Arrondissement Côte-Des-Neiges/Notre-Dame-De-Grâce*. Montreal: City of Montreal, Service du développement économique et développement urbain.

Clapham, David and Keith Kintrea. 1994. "Community Ownership and the Break-Up of Council Housing in Britain." *Journal of Social Policy* 23(2):219-45.

CLSC Côte-des-Neiges. 2001. *Annual Report 2000-2001*. Montreal: CLSC Côte-des-Neiges.

CMHC. 2003. *2003 Canadian Housing Observer*. Ottawa: Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

Cohen, Carol S. and Michael H. Phillips. 1997. "Building Community: Principles for Social Work Practice in Housing Settings." *Social Work* 42(5):471-81.

Connelly Consulting Services. 2003. *Guaranteeing a Future: The Challenge to Social Housing As Operating Agreements Expire*. Ottawa: CHRA.

Cooper, Matthew and Margaret Rodman. 1994. "Accessibility and Quality of Life in Housing Cooperatives." *Environment and Behavior* 26(1):49.

Copp, Andrew. 1974. *The Anatomy of Poverty: The Condition of the Working Class in Montreal 1897-1929*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.

Cortes, Ernesto J. Jr. 1996. "Community Organization and Social Capital." *National Civic Review* 85(3):49-53.

Cox, Fred M. and Charles Garvin. 1974. "Community Organization Practice: 1865-1973." Pp. 39-59 in *Strategies of Community Organization: A Book of Readings*, Editors Fred M. Cox, John L. Erlich, Jack Rothman, and John E. Tropman. Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock Press.

CRA. 2002. *Summary Policy: Advocacy and Political Activities*. Ottawa: Canadian Revenue Agency.

Croft, Suzy and Peter Beresford. 1988. "Being on the Receiving End: Lessons for Community Developement and User Involvement." *Community Development Journal* 23(4):273-79.

Cullingworth, J. B. 1979. *Essays on Housing Policy: The British Scene*. Boston: George Allen & Unwin.

Dansereau, Francine. 1993. "Neighbourhood Differentiation and Social Change." Pp. 289-307 in *House, Home and Community: Progress in Housing Canadians, 1945-1986*, Editor John R. Miron. Ottawa: CMHC.

Dansereau, Francine and Anne-Marie Séguin. 1995. *La Cohabitation Interethnique Dans Le L'Habitat Social Au Québec : Études De Cas*. Québec: Société d'habitation du Québec.

David, Gary. 1999. "The Impact of Community Identity on Ethnic Organization Development." Wayne S. U. Department of Sociology.

Davies, Linda and Eric Shragge. 1990. *Bureaucracy and Community : Essays on the Politics of Social Work Practice*. Montreal: Black Rose Books.

Davies, Wayne K. D. and Ivan J. Townshend. 1994. "How Do Community Associations Vary? The Structure of Community Associations in Calgary, Alberta." *Urban Studies* 31(19):1739-61.

DeKeseredy, Walter S., Shahid Alvi, Martin D. Schwartz, and Barbara Perry. 1999. "Violence Against and the Harassment of Women in Canadian Public Housing: An Exploratory Study." *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 36(4):499-516.

Delgado, Gary. 1997. *Beyond Politics of Place: New Directions in Community Organizing*. Berkeley, CA: Chardon Press.

Dennis, Michael and Susan Fish. 1972. *Programs in Search of a Policy: Low Income Housing in Canada*. Toronto: Hakkert.

Desrochers, Pierre. 29 Jun 2002. "Shattering Shelter Myths." *The Gazette* (Montreal), B, p. 7.

Dewey, John. 1927. *The Public and Its Problems*. New York: H. Holt and Company.

———. 1929. *The Quest for Certainty: a Study of the Relation of Knowledge and Action*. New York: Minton, Balch.

Dickens, Peter. 1988. "Architecture, the Individual and Social Change." *Housing Studies* 3(4):259-62.

Dionne, Irène. 1997. "Community Activist." Pointe-St-Charles, Montréal: Personal interview.

Doling, John. 1997. *Comparative Housing Policy: Government and Housing in Advanced Industrialized Countries*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Dominelli, Lena. 1989. *Women and Community Action*. Birmingham, UK: Venture Press.

———. 1998. "Anti-Oppressive Practice in Context." Pp. 3-22 in *Social Work: Themes, Issues and Critical Debates*, Editors Robert Adams, Lena Dominelli, and Malcolm Payne. London: MacMillan Press Ltd.

Dorais, Louis-Jacques. 1998. "Vietnamese Communities in Canada, France and Denmark." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 11(2):107-25.

Dorvil, Henri and Paul Morin. 2001. "Le Logement Social Et L'Hébergement: Multiples Enjeux Et Perspectives Diverses." *Nouvelles Pratiques Sociales* 14(2):20-27.

Dowling, Paul. 2000. "Toward an Affordable Housing Policy for Canada." *Canadian Housing* 16(4):10-13.

Dunphy, Bill. 1997. "New Deal Fails to Protect Social Housing." *Canadian Housing* 14(1):23-24.

Edin, Kathryn and Laura Lein. 1997. *Making Ends Meet: How Single Mothers Survive Welfare and Low-Wage Work*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Esping-Anderson, Gøsta. 1989. "The Three Political Economies of the Welfare State." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 26(1):10-36.

———. 1990. *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Etzioni, Amitai. 1993. *The Spirit of Community: Rights, Responsibilities, and the Communitarian Agenda*. New York: Crown Publishers, Inc.

Evans, Patricia M. and Gerda R. Wekerle. 1997. "The Shifting Terrain of Women's Welfare: Theory, Discourse, and Activism." *Women and the Canadian Welfare State: Challenges and Change*, Eds. Patricia M. Evans and Gerda R. Wekerle. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Evans, Sara. 1979. *Personal Politics: The Roots of Women's Liberation in the Civil Rights Movement and the New Left*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Fallis, George. 1995. "The Social Policy Challenge and Social Housing." Pp. 1-49 in *Home Remedies: Rethinking Canadian Housing Policy*, C.D. Howe Institute. Ottawa: Renouf Publishing.

FCM. 1998. *National Housing Options Paper*. Ottawa: Federation of Canadian Municipalities.

———. 2000. *A National Affordable Housing Strategy*. Ottawa: Federation of Canadian Municipalities.

———. 2004. *A Brief History of FCM*. Ottawa: Federation of Canadian Municipalities.

Federal Task Force on Housing and Urban Development. 1969. *Report of the Federal Task Force on Housing and Urban Development*. Ottawa: Information Canada.

Feldman, Roberta M., Susan Stall, and Patricia A. Wright. 1998. ""The Community Needs to Be Built by Us": Women Organizing in Chicago Public Housing." Pp. 257-74 in *Community*

Activism and Feminist Politics: Organizing Across Race, Class and Gender, Editor Nancy A. Naples. New York: Routledge.

FFQ. 2000. World March of Women: Fédération des femmes du Québec.

Fisher, Robert. 1994a. *Let the People Decide: Neighbourhood Organizing in America*. New York: Twayne Publishers.

———. 1994b. "Community Organizing in the Conservative '80s and Beyond." *Social Policy* 25(1):11-22.

Fisher, Robert and Joseph Kling. 1993. "Conclusion: Prospects and Strategies for Mobilisation in the Era of Global Cities." *Mobilising the Community: Local Politics in the Era of the Global City*, Editors Robert Fisher and Joseph Kling. London: Sage Publications.

Fisher, Robert and Eric Shragge. 2000. "Challenging Community Organizing: Facing the 21st Century." *Journal of Community Practice* 8(3):1-20.

FOHM. 2004. *Un Peu D'Histoire*, Montréal: Fédération des OSBL d'habitation de Montréal.

Fong, Eric. 1996. "A Comparative Perspective on Racial Residential Segregation: American and Canadian Experiences." *The Sociological Quarterly* 37(2):199-226.

FQHC. 2003. *Fonds Québécois D'Habitation Communautaire: Un Foyer De Solidarité*. Quebec: Société d'habitation du Québec.

Frank, J. A. and Michael Kelly. 1979. "'Street Politics' in Canada: An Examination of Mediating Factors." *American Journal of Political Science* 23(3):593-614.

FRAP. 1970. *Les Salariés Au Pouvoir*. Montréal: Les Presses Libres.

FRAPRU. 1997. "Housing and Poverty in Quebec: An Indictment." Pp. 98-123 in *Shelter, Housing and Homes: a Social Right*, Editor Arnold Bennett. Montreal: Black Rose Books.

———. 2004. *Dossier Noir De Logement 2004: Logement Et Pauvreté Dans Le Quartier Côte-Des-Neiges*. Montreal: Front d'action populaire pour le réaménagement urbain.

Fraser, Nancy and Linda Gordon. 1994. "'Dependency' Demystified: Inscriptions of Power in a Keyword of the Welfare State." *Social Politics* 1(1):4-31.

Gauthier, Hervé. 1995. "Variables Démographiques Et Charges Sociales: Comparaisons Annuelles Et Intergénérationnelles." *Cahiers Québécois De Démographie* 24(2):285-321.

Gilliland, Jason and Sherry Olson. 1998. "Claims on Housing Space in Nineteenth-Century Montreal." *Urban History Review* 26(2):3-16.

Gitlin, Todd. 1995. *The Twilight of Common Dreams: Why America Is Wracked by Culture Wars*. New York: H. Holt.

———. 1997. "Organizing Across Boundaries: Beyond Identity Politics." *Dissent* 44(4):38-40.

Gittell, Marilyn. 1980. *Limits to Participation: The Decline of Community Organisations*. With Bruce Hoffacker, Eleanor Rollins, Samuel Foster, and Mark Hoffacker. London: Sage Publications.

Glasser, Irene, Louise Fournier, and André Costopoulos. 1999. "Homelessness in Québec City, Québec and Hartford, Connecticut: A Cross-National and Cross-Cultural Analysis." *Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Systems and World Economic Development* 28(2):141-63.

Glazer, Nathan. 1983. "Individual Rights Against Group Rights." *Ethnic Dilemmas: 1964-1982*, (Ed.) Nathan Glazer. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

———. 1987. "The South-Bronx Story: An Extreme Case of Neighbourhood Decline." *Policy Studies Journal* 16(2):269-76.

Go, Amy. 1997. "Defending a Meagre Program." *The Battle Over Multiculturalism: Does It Help or Hinder Canadian Unity?*, eds. Andrew Cardozo and Louis Musto. Ottawa: Pearson-Shoyama Institute.

Godin, Pierre. 1994. *René Lévesque - Un Enfant Du Siècle - Tome 1*. Montreal: Boréal.

Gonzalez, David. 7 Jan 1993. "In the South Bronx, the Grass Roots Grow Up: Organisations Born in Protest Uncomfortably Find They'Re Now the Establishment." *The New York Times* (New York), p. B1.

Graefe, Peter. 1999. "Repenser L'Économie Sociale Face à L'État." *Lien Social Et Politiques -- RIAC* 41:129-42.

Graham, John, Roger Delaney, and Karen Swift. 2000. *Canadian Social Policy: An Introduction*. Scarborough, ON: Prentice Hall Allyn and Bacon Canada.

Guberman, Nancy, Danièle Fournier, Jennifer Beeman, and Jocelyne Lamoureux. 1997. *Innovations Et Contraintes: Des Pratiques Organisationnelles Féministes, Rapport De Recherche*. Montréal: Centre de formation populaire et Relais-femmes.

Gutiérrez, Lorraine, Rosegrant A. Alvarez, Howard Nemon, and Edith A. Lewis. 1996. "Multicultural Community Organizing: a Strategy for Change." *Social Work* 41(5):501-9.

Gutiérrez, Lorraine M. and Edith A. Lewis. 1994. "Community Organizing With Women of Colour: A Feminist Approach." *Journal of Community Practice* 1(2):23-44.

———. 1998. "A Feminist Perspective on Organizing With Women of Color." Pp. 97-116 in *Community Organizing in a Diverse Society*, 3rd ed. Editors Felix G. Rivera and John L. Erlich. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Hamel, Jacques. 1993. *Case Study Methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Hamel, Pierre. 1983. *Logement Et Luttes Urbaines à Montréal (1963-1976)*. Montréal: Université de Montréal.

Haney, Lynne A. 2000. "Feminist State Theory: Application to Jurisprudence, Criminology and the Welfare State." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26:641-66.

Hanley, Jill. 1999. *Cross-Cultural Community Organising: Evolving Practices for Social Change*. Boston: Tufts University (Master's thesis).

———. 2001. "Challenging Gendered and Ethno-Racial Assumptions in Organising for Housing

Rights." *Paper Presented at the Canadian Women Studies Association Conference, Quebec, QC, May 2001.*

———. 2004. "Feminist and Cross-Cultural Organizing Models for Social Housing: Putting Them to the Test in a Multi-Ethnic Neighbourhood." *Paper Presented to the Graduate Student Conference of CEETUM in Montreal.*

Harrison, Malcolm L. 1990. "Welfare State Struggles, Consumption, and the Politics of Rights." *Capital & Class* 42(Winter):107-30.

Hasson, Shlomo and David Ley. 1994. *Neighbourhood Organizations and the Welfare State.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

———. 1997. "Neighbourhood Organizations, the Welfare State and Citizenship Rights." *Urban Affairs Review* 33(1):28-58.

Heskin, Allan D. and Robert A. Heffner. 1987. "Learning About Bilingual, Multicultural Organizing." *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science* 23(4):525-41.

Hulchanski, J. D. 1988. *Canada's Housing and Housing Policy: An Introduction.* Vancouver: UBC, School of Community and Regional Planning.

———. 1993. "New Forms of Owning and Renting." Pp. 64-75 in *House, Home and Community: Progress in Housing Canadians, 1945-1986,* Editor John R. Miron. Ottawa: CMHC.

Jetté, C. 1998. *Évaluation Du Logement Avec Support Communautaire à La FOHM.* Montréal: LAREPPS.

Jordan, Steven and Jill Hanley. 1997. *UNITAS Community Development Project: Evaluation Report of the Pilot Program.* Montreal: Jamaican Association of Montreal.

Kahn, Si. 1995. *Organizing: A Guide for Grassroots Leaders.* Washington, D.C.: NASW.

Keyes, Langley. 1987. "The Shifting Focus on Neighbourhood Groups: The Massachusetts Experience." *Policy Studies Journal* 16(2):300-306.

Knuttila, Murray. 1987. *State Theories: From Liberalism to the Challenge of Feminism.* Toronto: Garamond Press.

Koebel, C. T. 1998. "Nonprofit Housing: Theory, Research, and Policy." Pp. 3-20 in *Shelter and Society: Theory, Research, and Policy for Nonprofit Housing,* Editor C. T. Koebel. Albany: SUNY Press.

Kretzmann, John P. and John L. McKnight. 1993. *Building Communities From the Inside Out: A Path Toward Finding and Mobilizing a Community's Assets.* Chicago: ACTA Publications.

Kruzynski, A. &. S. E. 2000. ""Something's Happenin' Here, What It Is Ain't Exactly Clear": The Impact of Social Movements on Community Organizing Practices. Paper Presented at the Joint Conference of the International Federation of Social Workers and the International Association of Schools of Social Work." .

Kymlicka, Will. 1989. *Liberalism, Community and Culture.* Toronto: Oxford University Press.

—————. 1992. *Recent Work in Citizenship Theory*. Ottawa: Corporate Policy and Research, Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada.

LaClau, Ernesto and Chantal Mouffe. 1999. "Radical Democracy: Alternative for a New Left." Pp. 494-97 in *Social Theory: The Multicultural and Classic Readings*, Editor Charles Lemert. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Laferrière, Michel. 1982. "Blacks in Québec: Minorities Among Minorities." *Research in Race and Ethnic Relations* 3:3-27.

Lalonde, Luc, Nathalie Mercier, and Diane Tremblay. 2001. "Brique Et Éthique: Du Logement Autrement, Mais Comment?" *Nouvelles Pratiques Sociales* 14(1):28-38.

Lamoureux, Henri, Jean Panet-Raymond, and Robert Mayer. 1998. "Enjeux, Défis Et Perspectives." Pp. 411-48 in *La Pratique De L'Action Communautaire*, Editors Henri Lamoureux, Jocelyne Lavoie, Robert Mayer, and Jean Panet-Raymond. Sainte-Foy: Presses de l'Université de Québec.

Lamoureux, Jocelyne. 1994. *Le Partenariat à L'Épreuve, L'Articulation Paradoxale Des Dynamiques Institutionnelles Et Communautaires Dans Le Domaine De La Santé Mentale*. Montréal: Éditions Saint-Martin.

Lang, Karen. 2004. *A Statistical Portrait of Côte-Des-Neiges*. Montreal: Côte-des-Neiges/Snowdon Community Council.

Lawson, Ronald and Stephen E. Barton. 1990. "Sex Roles in Social Movements: A Case Study of the Tenant Movement in New York City." Pp. 41-56 in *Women and Social Protest*, Editors Guida West and Rhoda L. Blumberg. New York: Oxford University Press.

Layton, Jack. 2000. *Homelessness: the Making and Unmaking of a Crisis*. Toronto: Penguin/McGill Institute.

Lesemann, Frédéric. 2001. "De L'État-Providence à L'État Partenaire." Pp. 13-46 in *L'État, La Société Civile Et L'Économie. Turbulences Et Transformations*, ed. G. Giroux. Québec: PUL.

Ley, David, Kay Anderson, and Dough Konrad. 1994. "Chinatown-Strathcona: Gaining an Entitlement." Pp. 112-36 in *Neighbourhood Organizations and the Welfare State*, Editors Shlomo Hasson and David Ley. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Lijphart, Arend. 1991. "Self-Determination Versus Pre-Determination of Ethnic Minorities in Power-Sharing Systems." *Language and the State: The Law and Politics of Identity*, ed. David Shneiderman. Montreal: Les Éditions Yvon Blais, Inc.

Linneman, Peter D. and Isaac F. Megbolugbe. 1994. "Privatisation and Housing Policy." *Urban Studies* 31(4-5):635-51.

London Edinburgh Weekend Return Group. 1979. *In and Against the State : Discussion Notes for Socialists*. London : The Group.

Lopez Turley, Ruth. 2003. "When Do Neighborhoods Matter? The Role of Race and

Neighborhood Peers." *Social Science Research* 32(1):61-79.

Lotz, Jim. 1997. "The Beginning of Community Development in English-Speaking Canada." Pp.
15-28 in *Community Organizing: Canadian Experiences*, Editors Brian Wharf and
Michael Clague. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Lotz, Jim and M. Welton. 1997. *Father Jimmy. Life and Times of Jimmy Tompkins*. Cape Breton
Island, NS: Breton Books.

Lustiger-Thaler, Henri and Eric Shragge. 1998. "The New Urban Left: Parties Without Actors."
International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 22(2):233-44.

MacNeil, Della and John W. Warnock. 2000. *The Disappearance of Affordable Housing in
Regina*. The Council on Social Development Regina, Inc.

Malpass, P. 1999. "Housing Policy: Does It Have a Future?" *Policy and Politics* 27(2):217-28.

Marcuse, Peter. 1987. "Neighbourhood Policy and the Distribution of Power: New York City's
Community Boards." *Policy Studies Journal* 16(2):277-89.

Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. 1969. *The Communist Manifesto*. Introduction A. J. P. Taylor.
Baltimore, MD: Penguin Books.

Mathieu, Réjean and Clément Mercier. 1994. "Présentation Du Dossier Sur L'Arrimage Entre Le
Communautaire Et Le Secteur Public." *Nouvelles Pratiques Sociales* 7(1):17-21.

Mayer, Robert, Henri Lamoureux, and Jean Panet-Raymond. 1998. "Évolution Des Pratiques
Communautaires Au Québec." Pp. 9-60 in *La Pratique De L'Action Communautaire*,
Editors Henri Lamoureux, Jocelyne Lavoie, Robert Mayer, and Jean Panet-Raymond.
Sainte-Foy: Presses de l'Université de Québec.

Mazerolle, L. G., J. Ready, W. Terrill, and E. Waring. 2000. "Problem-Oriented Policing in Public
Housing: the Jersey City Evaluation." *Justice Quarterly* 17(1):129-58.

McClain, Janet. 1993. "Housing As a Human Service: Accommodating Special Needs." Pp. 220-
238 in *House, Home and Community: Progress in Housing Canadians, 1945-1986*,
Editor John R. Miron. Ottawa: CMHC.

McKnight, John. 1995. *The Careless Society: Community and Its Counterfeits*. New York:
HarperCollins Publishers, Inc.

McMahon, M. and . 1996. "Significant Absences." *Qualitative Inquiry*(2):320-336.

McMahon, Michael. 1990. *Metro's Housing Company: The First 35 Years*. Toronto: University of
Toronto Press.

McRoberts, Omar. 1997. "Congregation-Based Community Organizing and the Challenges of
Urban Religious Diversity." COMM-ORG: The On-Line Conference on Community
Organizing and Development.

Mead, Molly. 1998. *A Model of Gender Practices in Youth Development Programs*. Boston:
United Way of Massachusetts Bay.

Medoff, Peter and Holly Sklar. 1994. *Streets of Hope: The Fall and Rise of an Urban*

Neighbourhood. Boston: South End Press.

Melamed, Anshel. 1968. "Aperçu Sur Les Programmes Et Les Politiques De Logement Dans Quelques Pays." Pp. 61-67 in *Une Ville à Vivre: Une Colloque Sur L'Habitat Urbain D'Aujourd'Hui Et De Demain*, editor Institut Canadien des Affaires Publiques (ICAP). Montreal: Éditions du jour.

Miller, Michael. 1996. *'Beyond the Politics of Place': A Critical Review*. http://comm-org.utoledo.edu: COMM-ORG working paper.

Miller, S. M., Martin Rein, and Peggy Levitt. 1990. "Community Action in the United States." *Community Development Journal* 25(4):356-68.

Minkoff, Debra C. 1995. *Organizing for Equality: The Evolution of Women's and Racial-Ethnic Organizations in America, 1955-1985*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univeristy Press.

Miron, John. 1995. "Private Rental Housing: The Canadian Experience." *Urban Studies* 32(3):579.

Miron, John R. 1993. "On Progress in Housing Canadians." Pp. 7-21 in *House, Home and Community: Progress in Housing Canadians, 1945-1986*, Editor John R. Miron. Ottawa: CMHC.

Mishra, Ramesh. 1990. *The Welfare State in Capitalist Society: Policies of Retrenchment and Maintenance in Europe, North America and Australia*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Monti, Daniel J. 1989. "The Organizational Strengths and Weaknesses of Resident-Managed Public Housing Sites in the United States." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 11(1):39-52.

Moore, Eric G., Brian Ray, and Mark Rosenberg. 1989. "Redistribution of Immigrant Groups in Canada." Pp. 62-79 in *Policy Forum on the Role of Immigration in Canada's Future*, Editors Charles M. Beach and Alan G. Green. Kingston, Ont: Queen's University, John Deutsch Institute for the Study of Economic Policy.

Morin, Richard and Francine Dansereau. 1990. *L'Habitation Sociale: Les Clientèles Et Leur Vécu, Les Modes De Gestion, Les Solutions De Rechange. Synthèse De La Littérature*. avec la colloboration de Daniel Nadeau. Montreal: INRS-Urbanisation.

Morissette, Diane. 1987. *Housing for Canadian Women: An Everyday Concern*. Ottawa: Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women.

Mukerjee, Roman. 1979. *Qui Est Québécois?* Montreal: Éditions Fides.

Muller, Jacob, Gillian Walker, and Roxana Ng. 1990. "Problematizing Community Organization and the State." Pp. 13-28 in *Community Organization and the Canadian State*, Editors Roxana Ng, Gillian Walker, and Jacob Muller. Toronto: Garamond.

Myles, John. 1998. "How to Design a "Liberal" Welfare State: A Comparison of Canada and the United States." *Social Policy and Administration* 32(4):341-64.

Naples, Nancy A. 1998a. *Grassroots Warriors : Activist Mothering, Community Work, and the War on Poverty*. New York: Routledge.

———. 1998b. "Women's Community Activism." Pp. 327-50 in *Community Activism and Feminist Politics: Organizing Across Race, Class and Gender*, Editor Nancy A. Naples. New York: Routledge.

Neysmith, Sheila M. 1987. "Organizing for Influence: The Relationship of Structure to Impact." *Canadian Journal on Aging* 6(2):105-16.

Ng, Roxana, Jacob Muller, and Gillian Walker. 1990. "Community Class Struggles and State Formation." *Community Organization and the Canadian State*, eds. Roxana Ng, Gillian Walker, and Jacob Muller. Toronto: Garamond Press.

Nimni, Ephraim. 1989. "Marx, Engels and the National Question." *Science and Society* 53(3):297-315,326.

Novac, Sylvia. 1995. "Seeking Shelter: Feminist Home Truths." Pp. 51-70 in *Change of Plans: Towards a Non-Sexist Sustainable City*, Editor Margrit Eichler. Toronto: Garamond Press.

O'Connor, Julia S. 1989. "Welfare Expenditure and Policy Orientation in Canada in Comparative Perspective." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 26(1):127-50.

———. 1993. "Gender, Class and Citizenship in the Comparative Analysis of Welfare State Regimes: Theoretical and Methodological Issues." *British Journal of Sociology* 44(3):501-18.

O.M. Collective. 1971. *The Organizer's Manual*. New York: Bantam Books, Inc.

Ogilvie, Rita J. 1997. "The State of Supported Housing for Mental Health Consumers: A Literature Review." *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal* 21(2):122-31.

Olson, Sherry and Patricia Thornton . 1991. "Family Contexts of Fertility and Infant Survival in Nineteenth-Century Montreal." *Journal of Family History* 16(4):401-17.

OMH de Montréal-Nord. 2001. *HLM Place Normandie (Montrél-Nord) Et "Bon Voisinage": Bilan D'Un Projet Pilote D'Intervention Communautaire*. Québec: Société d'habitation Québec.

Ontario Association of Housing Authorities. 1964. *Good Housing for Canadians: A Study by the Ontario Association of Housing Authorities*. Toronto: Ontario Association of Housing Authorities.

Orloff, A. 1993. "Gender and the Social Rights of Citizenship: The Comparative Analysis of Gender Relations and Welfare States." *American Sociological Review* 58:303-28.

Ouellette, Jean. 1968. "Comment Conçoit-on Actuellement Le Logement?" Pp. 53-59 in *Une Ville à Vivre: Une Colloque Sur L'Habitat Urbain D'Aujourd'Hui Et De Demain*, editor Institut Canadien des Affaires Publiques (ICAP). Montreal: Éditions du jour.

Panet-Raymond, Jean. 1992. "Partnership: Myth or Reality?" *Community Development Journal* 27(2):156-65.

Panet-Raymond, Jean and D. Bourque. 1991. *Partenariat Ou Pater-Nariat? La Collaboration Entre Établissements Publics Et Organismes Communautaires Oeuvrant Auprès Des*

Personnes Âgées à Domicile. Montreal: Université de Montréal, Groupe de recherche en développement communautaires.

Panet-Raymond, Jean and Robert Mayer. 1997. "The History of Community Development in Quebec." Pp. 29-61 in *Community Organizing: Canadian Experiences*, Editors Brian Wharf and Michael Clague. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Pascall, Gillian. 1997. *Social Policy: A New Feminist Analysis, 2nd Edition*. London: Routledge.

Pearsall, Judy and Bill Trumble. 1996. *The Oxford English Reference Dictionary*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Phillips, Anne. 1992. "Democracy and Difference: Some Problems for Feminist Theory." *Political Quarterly* 63(1):79-90.

Pilisuk, Marc, JoAnn McAllister, and Jack Rothman. 1998. "Coming Together for Action: the Challenge of Contemporary Grassroots Community Organizing." *Journal of Social Issues* 52(1):15-38.

Piven, Frances F. and Richard A. Cloward. 1977. *Poor People's Movements: Why They Succeed, How They Fail*. Toronto: Random House.

Prince, Michael J. 1998. "Holes in the Safety Net, Leaks in the Roof: Changes in Canadian Welfare Policy and Their Implications for Social Housing Programs." *Housing Policy Debate* 9(4):825-48.

Putnam, Robert D. 1993. "The Prosperous Community: Social Capital and Public Life." *The American Prospect*(13):1-9.

————. 1995. "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital." *Journal of Democracy* 6(1):65-78.

Quebec. 2001. *L'Action Communautaire : Une Contribution Essentielle à L'Exercice De La Citoyenneté Et Au Développement Social Du Québec*. Quebec : Secrétariat à l'action communautaire autonome.

Ramsey, Meredith. 1998. "Redeeming the City: Exploring the Relationship Between Church and Metropolis." *Urban Affairs Review* 33(5):595-637.

Raphael, Jody. 2001. "Public Housing and Domestic Violence." *Violence Against Women* 7(6):699-706.

Ray, Brian. 1994. "Immigrant Settlement and Housing in Metropolitan Toronto." *Canadian Geographer* 38:262-65.

Ray, Brian K. and Eric Moore. 1991. "Access to Homeownership Among Immigrant Groups in Canada." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 28:1-29.

René, Jean-François and Jean Panet-Raymond. 1984. *Faut-Il Brûler Les Pancartes? Le Mouvement Populaire Aujourd'Hui*. Montreal: ACEF du Centre du Montréal.

Richards, John. 1994. "The Social Policy Round." Pp. 31-97 in *The Case for Change: Reinventing the Welfare State*, vol. 1, Editors William G. Watson, John Richards, and David M.

Brown. Ottawa: C.D. Howe Institute/Renouf.

Rivera, Felix G. and John L. Erlich. 1998. *Community Organizing in a Diverse Society*. Toronto: Allyn and Bacon.

Rochon, Marc. 1997. "Towards Affordable Housing." *Canadian Housing* 14(1):19-20.

Rose, Albert. 1980. *Canadian Housing Policies (1935-1980)*. Toronto: Butterworth.

Rose, Damaris. 2000. "Des Recherches Antérieures Touchant Sur Les Immigrants Et Le Logement Social: Tour D'Horizon Des Enjeux Soulevés, Paper Presented at the Conference, "L'Insertion Des Immigrants Dans Le Logement Social à L'Heure De La Réorganisation Municipale: Problématiques Et Enjeux", Immigration Et Métropoles, Volet 2." .

Rose, Damaris and Martin Wexler. 1993. "Post-War Social and Economic Changes and Housing Adequacy." Pp. 239-56 in *House, Home and Community: Progress in Housing Canadians, 1945-1986*, Editor John R. Miron. Ottawa: CMHC.

Rosenberg, M. M. and Jack Jedwab. 1992. "Institutional Completeness, Ethnic Organizational Style and the Role of the State: the Jewish, Italian and Greek Communities of Montreal." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 29(3):266-87.

Rothman, Jack. 1974. "Three Models of Community Organization Practice." Pp. -39 in *Strategies of Community Organization: A Book of Readings*, Editors Fred M. Cox, John L. Erlich, Jack Rothman, and John E. Tropman. Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock Press.

———. 2001. "Approaches to Community Intervention." Pp. 27-64 in *Strategies of Community Intervenion*, Sixth edition ed. editors Jack Rothman, John L. Erlich. and John E. Tropman. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers.

Saegert, Susan and Gary Winkel. 1996. "Paths to Community Empowerment: Organizing at Home." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 24(4):517-51.

Saldov, Morris. 1988. "In Search of a Policy for the Social Integration of Lower Income Households in Social Housing." *Social Development Issues* 12(1):49-55.

Saugeres, L. 1999. "The Social Construction of Housing Management Discourse: Objectivity, Rationality and Everyday Practice." *Housing Theory and Society* 16(3):93-105.

Serge, Luba and Margaret Monfort. 1995. *Impact D'Un Program Paramunicipal Sur Le Marché Du Logement Locative*. Ottawa: CMHC.

SHQ. 2003a. *Logement Abordable Québec*. Quebec: Société d'habitation Québec.

———. 2003b. *Logement Social*. Société d'habitation Québec.

———. 2004. *Programme AccèsLogis Québec: Des Projets De Logement Communautaire Et Social, Pour Un Meilleur Milieu De Vie*. Quebec: Société d'habitation du Québec.

Shragge, Eric. 1997. *Community Economic Development: In Search of Empowerment*. Montreal: Black Rose Books.

———. 1999. "Looking Backwards to Go Forward: The Quebec Community Movement 30 Years

Later." *Interventions*(110):53-60.

———. 2003. *Activism and Social Change: Lessons for Community and Local Organizing*. Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press.

Silvestro, Marco and Jill Hanley. 2001. *Le Développement Économique Communautaire Dans Un Contexte Métropolitain: Le Cas De Pittsburgh*. Montreal: Département d'études urbaines et touristiques.

Skaburskis, Andrejs and D. Mok. 2000. "The Impact of Withdrawing Subsidies for New Rental Housing: Projections for Toronto and the Rest of Ontario." *Housing Studies* 15(2):169-94.

Skocpol, Theda. 1979. *States and Social Revolution*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Smiley, Charles W. 1975. "Reality, Social Work and Community Organization." *Community Development Journal* 10(3):162-65.

Smith, Adam. 1982. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. London: A. Strahan & T. Cadell.

Smith, Susan. 1994. "Housing Studies." Pp. 253-56 in *The Dictionary of Human Geography*, 3rd ed. Editors R. J. Johnston, Derek Gregory, and David M. Smith. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Somerville, P. 1998. "Explanations of Social Exclusion: Where Does Housing Fit in?" *Housing Studies* 13(6):761-80.

Spector, Aron. 1998. "The Hidden Housing Problem: Housing Affordability Among Older Single Women Living Alone." *Canadian Housing* 15(1):27.

Stall, Susan and Randy Stoecker. 1998. "Community Organizing or Organizing Community? Gender and the Crafts of Empowerment." *Gender and Society* 12(6):729-56.

Staples, Lee. 1984. *Roots to Power: A Manual for Grassroots Organizing*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Steele, Marion. 2001. "Housing Allowances in the US Under Section 8 and in Other Countries: A Canadian Perspective." *Urban Studies* 38(1):81-103.

Stoecker, Randy. 1991. "Evaluating and Rethinking the Case Study." *The Sociological Review* 39:88-112.

Streich, Patricia A. 1993. "The Affordability of Housing in Post-War Canada." Pp. 257-70 in *House, Home and Community: Progress in Housing Canadians, 1945-1986*, Editor John R. Miron. Ottawa: CMHC.

Students for a Democratic Society. 1999. "Participatory Democracy (From the *Port Huron Statement*) (1962)." Pp. 348-52 in *Social Theory: The Multicultural and Classic Readings*, Editor Charles Lemert. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Styles, Ron. 1997. "The New Federal/Provincial Social Housing Agreement: Progress or Folly?" *Canadian Housing* 14(1):8-9, 25.

Suttor, Greg. 1999. "The FCM Housing Options Paper." *Canadian Housing* 16(2):8-10.

Taylor, Charles. 1994. *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton
University Press.

Taylor, M. 1998. "Combating the Social Exclusion of Housing Estates." *Housing Studies*
13(6):819-32.

Titmuss, Richard M. 1974. *Social Policy*. London: Allen and Unwin.

UN Committee on Economic, Social a. C. R. 1998. *Final Observations of the Comittee on
Economic, Social and Cultural Rights: Canada*. Geneva: United Nations.

United Nations. 1948. *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. New York: United Nations.

Vaillancourt, Yves, Marie-Noëlle Ducharche, Robert Cohen, Claude Roy, and Christian Jetté.
2000. *Portrait Des Politiques De Logement Social Au Québec à La Fin Des Années 1990.
Le Logement Social, Une Composante Importante Des Politiques Sociales En
Reconfiguration: État De La Situation Au Québec*. Montréal: LAREPPS.

Van Dyke, Vernon. 1977. "The Individual, the State and Ethnic Communities in Political Theory."
World Politics 29(3):343-69.

Venkatesh, Sudhir A. 2000. *American Project: The Rise and Fall of a Modern Ghetto*. Cambrige,
MA: Harvard University Press.

Walzer, Michael. 1980. "Pluralism: A Political Perspective." *The Harvard University
Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups* , Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Watson, William G. 1994. "The View From the Right." Pp. 1-30 in *The Case for Change:
Reinventing the Welfare State*, vol. 1, Editors William G. Watson, John Richards, and
David M. Brown. Ottawa: C.D. Howe Institute/Renouf.

Wekerle, Gerda R. 1991. "Canadian Women's Housing Cooperatives: Case Studies in Physical
and Social Innovation." Pp. 102-40 in *Life Spaces: Gender, Household, Employment*, 2nd
ed. Editors Caroline M. B. M. Andrew. Vancouver: UBC Press.

West, Cornell. 1993. *Race Matters*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Wharf, Brian. 1992. "Community Organizations and Social Policy." Pp. 181-216 in *Communities
and Social Policy in Canada*, Editor Brian Wharf. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Inc.

———. 1997. "Community Organizing: Canadian Experiences." Pp. 1-14 in *Community
Organizing: Canadian Experiences*, Editors Brian Wharf and Michael Clague. Toronto:
Oxford University Press.

Wharf, Brian and Michael Clague. 1997. "Lessons and Legacies." Pp. 302-25 in *Community
Organizing: Canadian Experiences*, Editors Brian Wharf and Michael Clague. Toronto:
Oxford University Press.

White, Deena. 1993. "Les Processus De Réforme Et La Structuration Locale Des Sytèmes. Le Cas
Des Réformes Dans Le Domaine De La Santé Mentale Au Québec." *Sociologie Et
Société* XXV(1):77-97.

———. 1997. "Contradictory Participation: Reflections on Community Action in Quebec." Pp.

62-90 in *Community Organizing: Canadian Experiences*, Editors Brian Wharf and Michael Clague. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

———. 2001. "Harnessing a Movement, Taming an Ideology on the State and the Third Sector in Quebec." *ISUMA*:40-50.

Wilensky, Harold L. and Charles N. Lebeaux. 1965. *Industrial Society and Social Welfare*. New York: Free Press.

Wilson, Elizabeth. 1977. *Women & the Welfare State*. London: Tavistock Publications.

Wilson, James Q. 1973. "Planning and Politics: Citizen Participation in Urban Renewal." *Urban Renewal: the Record and the Controversy*, Editor James Q. Wilson. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.

Wilson, William J. 1996. *When Work Disappears: the World of the New Urban Poor*. New York: Knopf.

Wood, Richard L. 1997. "Social Capital and Political Culture: God Meets Politics in the Inner City." *American Behavioural Scientist* 40(5):595-605.

Yegidis, Bonnie L., Robert W. Weinbach, and Barbara Morrison-Rodriguez. 1999. *Research Methods for Social Workers*. Toronto: Allyn and Bacon.

Yin, Robert K. 2003. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. London: Sage Publications.

Young, Iris M. 1993. "Together in Difference: Transforming the Logic of Group Political Conflict." *Principled Positions: Postmodernism and the Rediscovery of Value*, ed Judith Squires.

Annex 1: List of interview participants

Community groups

Conseil communautaire Côte-des-Neiges/Snowdon, Coordinator

Conseil communautaire Côte-des-Neiges/Snowdon, Executive member

Habitations communautaires de Côte-des-Neiges, Coordinator

Mountain Sights Community Centre, Coordinator

MultiCaf, Community organizer

Organisation d'éducation et d'informations logement (OEIL), Coordinator

Organisation d'éducation et d'informations logement (OEIL), Community
organizer

Project Genesis, Community organizer

Project Genesis, Housing organizer

PROMIS (Promotion - Integration - Société nouvelle), Community organizer

Société environnementale de Côte-des-Neiges, Coordinator

Intermediary organizations

AGRTQ (Association des GRT du Québec), Coordinator

Canadian Housing and Renewal Association (CHRA), Past President

Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM), Senior Policy Analyst

FÉCHIMM (Fédération des coops d'habitation intermunicipale du Montréal
métropolitaine)

FLHLMQ (Fédération des locataires d'HLM du Québec), Coordinator

FRAPRU (Front d'action populaire en réaménagement urbain), Coordinator

Groupe CDH (Conseil en développement de l'habitation), Projet officer

ROMEL (Regroupement des organismes du Montréal ethnique pour le logement),
Coordinator

Municipal Agencies

Ville de Montréal, Direction d'habitation, Director of Solidarité 5000 logements

Ville de Montréal, Direction d'habitation, Project officer for Solidarité 5000 logements

Ville de Montréal, Direction d'habitation, Director of Research and Policy

Société d'habitation de Montréal (SHDM), Project officer for Côte-des-Neiges

Société d'habitation de Montréal (SHDM), Director of social housing

Société d'habitation de Montréal (SHDM), Former Director

Provincial agencies

Société d'habitation du Québec/Fonds québécois du logement communautaire, Director

Federal agencies

Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC), Project officer

National Secretariat on Homelessness, Director of research

National Secretariat on Homelessness, Senior policy analyst

Annex 2: Sample interview guide for community actors

Date :

Lieu:

Groupe :

Représentant :

INTRODUCTION

Quels sont les objectifs généraux de votre organisme?

DIMENSION INDIVIDUELLE

Depuis quand êtes-vous l'organisateur du comité logement?

Qu'est-ce qui vous a motivé à occuper cette fonction?

En quoi consiste votre fonction ?

DIMENSION IDENTITAIRE

Pourquoi votre organisme a-t-il été mis sur pied ?

À quoi votre organisme s'identifie-t-il le plus ? Un territoire d'intervention, une
population cible ou un secteur d'activité?

DIMENSION ORGANISATIONNELLE

Buts en logement social

Comment définissez-vous le logement social ?

Quels sont les buts de votre organisme en termes du logement social?

Depuis quand est-ce que vous avez ces buts et qu'est-ce qui les a motivé?

Est-ce que vos buts en logement social ont subi des modifications depuis la fin de
financement pour le logement social par le fédéral en 1993 ? Lesquelles ?

Qui définit les buts en logement social de votre organisme? Comment cela se passe-t-il? Quels sont les rôles respectifs des différentes instances de votre organisme (assemblée générale, conseil d'administration, exécutif, comités de travail, direction-générale, etc.)?

DIMENSION TERRITORIALE

Est-ce que les caractéristiques spécifiques de Côte-des-Neiges influencent les activités que vous y menez ou vos choix d'approche?

Est-ce que les traditions du milieu dans lequel votre organisme intervient orientent (colorent, particularisent, spécifient, distinguent) les activités que vous y menez?

DIMENSION PROCESSUS DE DEVELOPPEMENT

Quel est le rôle de votre organisme dans le processus du développement de logement social à Côte-des-Neiges?

Est-ce que vous pouvez décrire l'approche ou la stratégie que vous utilisez afin d'atteindre vos buts?

Pouvez-vous décrire les étapes dans le développement d'un projet de logement social à Côte-des-Neiges, spécifiant les acteurs différents et leurs rôles respectifs?

Comment est-ce que vous caractérisez les relations entre ces acteurs différents? Comment est-ce que c'est résolu s'il y a des différences d'opinion?

Si c'était à vous de décider, est-ce vous ferez des changements dans le processus de développer des projets de logement social? Lesquels?

DIMENSION POLITIQUE DE LOGEMENT SOCIAL

Est-ce que vous considérez que vous participez aux débats en matière de la politique de logement social? Comment? À quel niveau?

Si c'était à vous de décider, est-ce vous ferez des changements dans les politiques de logement social? Lesquels?

Quelle serait la situation idéale en termes de politique de logement social?

Qu'est-ce que vous imaginez va se passer dans la domaine de logement social dans les prochaines dix ans?

Merci de votre collaboration.

Annex 3: Sample interview guide for intermediary actors

Date :

Lieu :

Groupe :

Représentant :

DIMENSION INDIVIDUELLE

Depuis quand êtes-vous avec votre organisme et qu'est-ce qui vous a motivé à occuper cette fonction?

En quoi consiste votre fonction ?

Comment définissez-vous le logement social ?

DIMENSION ORGANISATIONNELLE

Pourquoi votre organisme a-t-il été mis sur pied (histoire de l'organisme)?

Quelle est la mission de votre organisme, en particulier autour du logement social?

Quels sont les objectifs généraux de votre organisme?

Qui définit les objectifs de votre organisme? Comment cela se passe-t-il? Quels sont les rôles respectifs des différentes instances de votre organisme (assemblée générale, conseil d'administration, exécutif, comités de travail, direction-générale, etc.)?

Quels sont les moyens priviligiés par l'organisme afin de répondre à sa mission?

DIMENSION LOCALE

Est-ce que votre organisme intervient en matière de logement social (projets de développement, questions de politiques) sur le plan local? Si non, pourquoi?

Si oui, est-ce que vous pouvez décrire la stratégie que vous utilisez afin
d'atteindre vos objectifs?

Est-ce que vous pouvez décrire les relations que vous avez avec des acteurs
locaux?

Comment est-ce que vous caractérisez les relations entre ces différents acteurs?
Comment est-ce que c'est résolu s'il y a des différences d'opinion?

DIMENSION NATIONALE

Est-ce que votre organisme intervient en matière de politiques de logement social
sur le plan national? Si non, pourquoi?

Si oui, est-ce que vous pouvez décrire la stratégie que vous utilisez afin
d'atteindre vos objectifs?

Est-ce que vous pouvez décrire les relations que vous avez avec des différents
acteurs nationaux?

Comment est-ce que vous caractérisez les relations entre ces différents acteurs?
Comment est-ce que c'est résolu s'il y a des différences d'opinion?

DIMENSION FÉDÉRAL

Est-ce que votre organisme intervient en matière de politiques de logement social
sur le plan fédéral? Si non, pourquoi?

Si oui, est-ce que vous pouvez décrire la stratégie que vous utilisez afin
d'atteindre vos objectifs?

Est-ce que vous pouvez décrire les relations que vous avez avec des acteurs
locaux?

Comment est-ce que vous caractérisez les relations entre ces différents acteurs?
Comment est-ce que c'est résolu s'il y a des différences d'opinion?

GÉNÉRAL

Est-ce que vos objectifs en logement social ont subi des modifications depuis la
fin de financement pour le logement social par le fédéral en 1993 ?
Lesquelles ?

Est-ce que vos stratégies en logement social ont subi des modifications depuis la fin de financement pour le logement social par le fédéral en 1993 ? Lesquelles ?

Pourquoi est-ce que vous pensez que le gouvernement fédéral a investi dans le logement 'abordable' ?

Si c'était à vous de décider, est-ce vous ferez des changements dans le processus de développer des projets de logement social? Lesquels?

Si c'était à vous de décider, est-ce vous ferez des changements dans les politiques de logement social? Lesquels?

Quelle serait la situation idéale en termes de politique de logement social?

Qu'est-ce que vous imaginez va se passer dans la domaine de logement social dans les prochaines dix ans?

Merci de votre collaboration

Annex 4: Sample interview guide for state actors

Nom de l'agence°publique:

Nom de l'interview °:

Fonction°:

Date de l'entretien°:   1 avril 2004

1. Depuis quand tes-vous avec [votre agence] et pourquoi tes-vous venue y travailler?

2. Comment est-ce que vous d finissez le logement social°?

3. Comment et pourquoi est-ce que [votre agence] a t cr °? Quelle est votre relation exacte avec le gouvernement f d ral?

4. Quelle est la mission actuelle de [votre agence], en particulier ici au Qu bec?

5. Quels sont vos objectifs et comment sont-ils d finis°?

6. Est-ce que vous avez des liens directs avec des groupes communautaires ou des coalitions qui travaillent sur le logement social°?

7. Est-ce que vous avez l occasion de communiquer ou de travailler avec des instances municipales°?

8. Est-ce que [votre agence] a des liens avec la SHQ en termes de politiques ou projets°?

9. Est-ce que [votre agence] taient impliqu s dans la d cision du gouvernement f d rale de r investir dans le logement abordable°? Comment°?

10. Pourquoi est-ce que vous pensez que le gouvernement f d ral a d cid de r investir dans le logement social°? Quel en sont les impacts°?

11. Est-ce que [votre agence] prend en compte la question d immigration°?

12. Qu est-ce que vous pensiez se passera dans le domaine du logement social dans les prochain 10 ans°?

Annex 5: Consent agreement

This interview is part of the PhD research project of Jill Hanley, a student at the Université de Montréal. The study seeks to explore the relationships between different organizations and agencies involved in social housing development or policy with a connection to Côte-des-Neiges. Interviews are being conducted with the staff people of these various organizations and agencies.

The interview is designed to be flexible. You have the right to decline answering any of the questions or end the interview at any time. You can also specify if there are parts of what you say that you prefer to keep off the record.

If you agree, the dissertation will include the name of the neighbourhood at the centre of the case study, the name of your organization or agency and your position. You name will not be included. You will receive a draft for comment if your organization or agency is to be named in a publication other than the dissertation.

The results of this study will be disseminated through a dissertation, an executive summary and a training guide on community involvement in social housing policy development. You will receive a copy of the summary and the training guide.

I have read the above explanation and consent to the provisions of this research agreement.

Signature: Date: