

VOLUME THREE

**Break-on-Through:**  
Communities and the New Economy

Report of the Crossing Boundaries  
National Council Working Group  
On Seasonal Employment & Seasonal  
Economies in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century

September 2005

---

## Working Group Co-Chairs:

### Wes MacAleer

MLA for Charlottetown-Spring Park, Government of Prince-Edward-Island

### Richard Patten

MPP for Ottawa Centre

Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities,  
Government of Ontario

© The Crossing Boundaries National Council , 2005/ Le Conseil national Traverser les frontières , 2005

All Rights Reserved / Tous droits réservés

ISBN 0-9738193-2-4

Ce document est aussi disponible en français au [www.traverserlesfrontieres.ca](http://www.traverserlesfrontieres.ca)

## The Crossing Boundaries National Council

The Crossing Boundaries National Council (CBNC) is a not-for-profit national forum whose mission is to foster the development of Canada as an information society through the transformation of government and governance. CBNC is co-chaired by the Hon. Tony Valeri, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, and Dan Bader, Deputy Minister, Municipal Affairs, Government of Alberta. It is made up of about 40 members, including senior public servants and elected representatives from each of the 10 provinces and the federal government, as well as representatives from territorial and municipal governments and the Aboriginal community. The initiative is sponsored in part through a partnership with the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council under its Initiative on the New Economy program area.

Visit [www.crossingboundaries.ca](http://www.crossingboundaries.ca) for current information on the Council's projects.

## KTA Centre for Collaborative Government

This project was undertaken in partnership with the KTA Centre for Collaborative Government and the Crossing Boundaries National Council. The KTA Centre for Collaborative Government was established in 1999 as a vehicle for a more independent approach to public policy research, dialogue and development. Since then, the KTA Centre has achieved a national reputation for its ability to bring together leaders in the fields of politics, policy and governance, and break new ground in connecting the ideas, the people and the practices that are transforming governance and government for the 21st century. For more information please visit [www.kta.on.ca](http://www.kta.on.ca).

## Le Conseil national Traverser les frontières

Le Conseil national Traverser les frontières (CNTF) est un forum national à but non lucratif dont la mission est de promouvoir le développement du Canada en tant que société de l'information par la transformation du gouvernement et de la gouvernance. Le CNTF est coprésidé par l' Hon. Tony Valeri, leader du gouvernement à la Chambre des communes, et Dan Bader, sous-ministre, Affaires municipales, Gouvernement de l'Alberta. Le CNTF compte environ 40 membres, notamment de hauts fonctionnaires et représentants élus issus de chacune des 10 provinces et du gouvernement fédéral ainsi que les représentants des gouvernements territoriaux et municipaux et de la communauté autochtone. L'initiative est financée en partie grâce au partenariat avec le Conseil de recherches en sciences humaines dans le cadre des programmes de son Initiative de la nouvelle économie.

Visitez [www.traverserlesfrontieres.ca](http://www.traverserlesfrontieres.ca) pour plus d'information sur les projets du Conseil.

1354 Wellington Street, Ottawa, ON, K1Y 3C3  
Tel: 613-594-4795 Fax: 613-594-5925  
[www.crossingboundaries.ca](http://www.crossingboundaries.ca)

---



# Table of Contents

---

- Working Group Members** ..... 2
- Overview of the Process** ..... 3
- Introduction** ..... 4
  - Space for us all ..... 4
  - A few assumptions ..... 5
- The Community-Directed Approach** ..... 6
  - Working from the bottom-up ..... 6
  - The Prince Rupert case ..... 7
- The New Economy** ..... 9
  - The new order ..... 9
  - Diversity, capacity and opportunity ..... 10
  - The Winnipeg Film Industry ..... 12
- Making it work** ..... 14
  - Leadership ..... 14
  - Stakeholders and participants ..... 16
  - Collaboration ..... 17
  - New infrastructure ..... 18
  - A new resource ..... 19
  - Accountability ..... 21
- The Role of Government** ..... 22
  - Repositioning the relationship ..... 22
  - Removing obstacles ..... 22
  - Building capacity ..... 23
  - Supporting the plan ..... 24
- Income Support** ..... 26
- Conclusion** ..... 29
- Appendix** ..... 30

# Seasonal Employment & Seasonal Economies in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century

---

## Working Group Co-Chairs

**Wes MacAleer**, MLA for Charlottetown-Spring Park, Government of Prince-Edward-Island

**Richard Patten**, MPP for Ottawa Centre and Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities, Government of Ontario

## Working Group Members

**Dan Bader**, Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs, Government of Alberta

**Maurice Beaudin**, Professor of Economics and former Assistant-Director at the Canadian Institute for Research on Regional Development

**Jeff Bray**, MLA for Victoria-Beacon Hill, Government of British Columbia, 37<sup>th</sup> Parliament

**Charlene Johnson**, MLA for Trinity-Bay de Verde, Government of Newfoundland and Labrador

**Jay Kaufman**, Principal, KTA Centre for Collaborative Government

**Don Lenihan**, President and CEO, Crossing Boundaries National Council

# Overview of the Process

---

Between January and March 2005, the Crossing Boundaries National Council hosted a series of roundtables on the future of seasonal employment and seasonal economies in the New Economy. The task was to consider how a **community-directed approach** could help communities who feel left out of the New Economy participate more fully in it.

The Council believes that such an approach could be an innovative way for governments, community organizations, businesses and citizens to work together to help communities that are heavily dependent on traditional, seasonal industries to strengthen and diversify their economies. That view is shared by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, which supports the work of the Crossing Boundaries National Council through a strategic partnership under SSHRC's Initiatives in the New Economy program.

The project is co-chaired by **Wes MacAleer**, MLA for Charlottetown- Spring Park, Prince-Edward-Island and **Richard Patten**, MPP for Ottawa Centre and Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities, Government of Ontario. They head a working group of seven people that held sessions in Victoria, Winnipeg, Regina, Sudbury, Montreal, Carbonear, Moncton and Charlottetown. This report contains the findings from those sessions.

A word should be included here about our use of the terms "seasonal employment" and "seasonal economies." We distinguished between them. Seasonal employment may not be based exclusively in traditional industries, such as agriculture or fishing. In urban centres where the economy is often already quite diverse, it can take a variety of forms, such as assembly work in the automotive industries or piecework in textiles. While there is no single, authoritative definition of seasonal employment, we took it to include people who are full time employees in the active labour force but who work less than 26 weeks per year. This does not include part-time workers who put in less than 26 weeks per year or students who are not looking for full time work while in school. By contrast, seasonal economies are

usually peripheral and rural. They are less diversified and more dependent on traditional sectors, such as forestry, fishing or tourism.

Seasonal employment remains a vital component of Canada's economy. According to the most recent census data (2001), it directly involved over 1.1 million people in the year 2000, accounting for 7.2% of all employment. Within industry sectors, seasonal employment was highest in agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting. While seasonal employment exists in all of the country's 288 Census Divisions, it mostly affects eastern and peripheral, resource-based regions of Canada.

The roundtables brought together a range of stakeholders, including unions, academics, the business community, sector councils, regional economic development agencies, seasonal worker unions and associations, youth, entrepreneurs in non-traditional sectors and federal, provincial and municipal governments. It was the second of five stages in the project.

In stage one the working group planned the project and drafted the initial discussion paper. Stage two included the roundtables. Stage three involved the drafting and finalizing of this report. Stage four will involve a national roundtable to be held in Toronto, Ontario in the fall of 2005. It will bring together approximately 25 participants from across the country to discuss this report. The results of that meeting will also be published. Finally, the project will conclude with a community implementation strategy that will identify at least two or three communities in which to test some of the findings. This report outlines the ideas that will guide the process.

Hosting and facilitating non-partisan, multi-stakeholder discussions on topics such as this is part of the Council's mission to promote more inclusive governance through the use of deliberative processes involving citizens, community and voluntary organizations, and other governments. We would like to express our appreciation to the over 200 people across the country who participated in the exercise.

# Introduction

---

## Space for us all

In his recent book *The World is Flat*, New York Times columnist Thomas Friedman reports that information and communications technologies (new technologies) not only have shrunk the world, they have flattened it. Friedman sees this as the consequence of a recent transition to what he calls the third great era of globalization.

The first era began with European colonization of the Americas, Africa and beyond. It shrank the world from “a size large to a size medium.” The principal players during this period were nations, such as the British, French and Spanish, with their armies, bureaucracies and stores of wealth and expertise.

### The global market is no longer the exclusive domain of nations or corporations.

The second phase of globalization ran from the Industrial Revolution to the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. During this period, large corporations became increasingly important players until, by the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, they had globalized the production process and created a worldwide market for labour. In this phase the planet shrank even further—from “a size medium to a size small.”

According to Friedman, we have entered a third phase. We are living in a world that has been rendered “tiny” through the use of technology. But there has been a remarkable side effect: shrinking the world by yet another order of magnitude has also had the effect of flattening—or, as we might say, levelling—the economic playing field.

As a result, the global market is no longer the exclusive domain of nations or corporations. It is increasingly possible for enterprising individuals and small groups to stake their own claim. As an economic force, they will grow in significance. As they do, a new kind of economic equality is settling in whose implications are far-reaching. Friedman makes the point with a suggestive analogy.

Before the invention of the personal computer the enormous costs of owning and running main-frames pretty much limited the technology revolution to governments and corporations. But just as the PC suddenly opened up the game to small businesses and individuals by giving them access to the Internet, as well as a whole range of new management and computational tools, the third wave of globalization pries open a window into the New Economy that will allow individuals, small businesses and groups to enter. The optimistic message in Friedman’s book is that, in the Information Age, anyone can be a player.

---

## A few assumptions

Although this project was conceived and launched before Friedman's book was published, our point of departure bears an interesting resemblance to his. While there are many theories around globalization, we agree with him that it seems to be entering a new phase, which could make it easier for individuals and small groups to participate in the New Economy. In short, a whole new chapter in community economic development may be opening. We launched our project to test that possibility and to explore the implications, especially for communities with seasonal economies or high seasonal employment. Our starting point makes a few assumptions:

- Canada is in transition from an industrial to an information society;
- This change is making our economy increasingly dependent on the use of information, knowledge and new technologies;
- The New Economy is a global frontier that is opening up to innovative, entrepreneurial individuals and communities who want to get involved in it; and
- With the right approach, communities that so far have not benefited greatly from globalization have an opportunity to become sustainable and prosperous in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

Our discussions were guided by an overarching question: If the New Economy is opening up in ways that create new opportunities for individuals and communities, what should they do to take advantage of them? Our attempt to answer it starts with the assumption that every community has its special strengths and weaknesses and then goes on to ask:

- What are the processes, skills, resources, goals and attitudes that make each community different; and
- What would it take to marshal them and turn them into a realistic plan for sustainable development?

We called this *the community-directed approach*. Our efforts to link it to these new and emerging trends in the New Economy took us well beyond what Friedman has to say.

# The Community-Directed Approach

---

## Working from the bottom-up

Over the last two decades governments across the country have been experimenting with community-directed approaches in a variety of areas, ranging from economic development to the delivery of public services. This is the result of growing recognition that, while every (geographical) community is different, federal and provincial governments are not well-positioned to identify—let alone respond to—their special needs, strengths or weaknesses.

A community-directed approach helps communities leverage their special strengths or address their particular weaknesses by encouraging local citizens, organizations and governments to develop and implement their own solutions to their own problems.

On the contrary, when senior levels of government design programs and services for communities, they do so with a diverse range of communities in mind. As they look at communities across a province or the country, they tend to focus on similarities rather than differences—often in an effort to ensure that all communities are treated fairly. In practice, “fairly” has tended to mean “the same.” Unfortunately, while treating everyone the same way may be fair in one sense, it can also prevent governments from tapping into unique resources and important opportunities. As a result, the programs tend to blur rather than respond to differences.

A community-directed approach aims to correct this. It helps communities leverage their special strengths or address their particular weaknesses by encouraging local citizens, organizations and governments to develop and implement their own solutions to their own problems. In this sense, the approach is meant to be “bottom-up” rather than “top-down.”

In particular, communities contain a variety of networks, from community service providers to church groups. These networks are often well connected to—indeed, are constituted by—local people who know the community’s needs and preferences, as well as its strengths and weaknesses. They contain pools of knowledge and expertise regarding local concerns, issues, opportunities, and resources that are essential to determining the special strengths, weakness and opportunities that a particular community might have.

A community-directed approach leverages this capital by getting the networks to work together to identify opportunities, align themselves around a common goal and formulate a realistic plan to achieve it. Moreover, the process of engagement, reflection and debate is critical to building the kind of unity-of-purpose, sense of ownership and empowerment among community members and organizations that will be needed to implement the plan.

In our sessions we heard about a number of successful cases of community-directed development. The following is a particularly impressive example of how it can unite and engage a community around a plan for change. While the case may be an exceptional one in many ways, it is a rich and inspiring example of what a community can achieve when its members join together.

---

## The Prince Rupert case

Prince Rupert is a small community in northern British Columbia with approximately 16,000 people. A decade ago, the city was in decline. Its traditional place as a major port for the lumber and wood products industries was disappearing. There was no clear alternative or vision for the future.

The city responded by creating what at first looked like a standard development committee—the Economic Development Commission. In hindsight, it marked the beginning of a remarkable process in which stakeholders from across the community engaged one another in discussion and debate, reassessed their traditional roles in the community and forged new relationships that allowed them to work together in a new way.

### Empowering citizens and local organizations can lead to stronger, more self-reliant communities.

As the initiative progressed, the Commission found itself playing a critical role as the facilitator of a community-wide debate over the community's past, present and future. As the process unfolded, this role expanded to include other vital tasks. For example, it became the conduit for information for entrepreneurs and a liaison for contacts in and outside the city. It lobbied with political and regulatory bodies beyond the municipal level and it served as both a problem solver and strategic planner for the changing face of the city's economy.

This last role in particular helped the Commission break new ground. As the discussion progressed, it began to synthesize the findings into a single, coherent vision for the future. At an early stage, the Commission concluded that it had to focus its attention if it was to arrive at a clear plan. It decided to concentrate on three key areas: waterfront development, value added industries and expansion and support of existing industries.

The Commission defined the town's key assets (North America's closest port to Asia, the continent's deepest harbour, etc.) as its main strengths and proceeded to launch a discussion around the kind of strategic plan it would need to capitalize on them. As a result, a number of steps were taken.

First, the city established a port authority in 1999 that has since transformed the waterfront into one of the most vital on the west coast. Second, in considering opportunities for development, the Commission did not just look to the city's status as a port. Prince Rupert is also the western terminus of Canadian National, the only railroad in North America to cross the continent both east-west and north-south. Shippers therefore had seamless connections with major North American centres. By partnering with CN, the Port of Prince Rupert was able to offer strategic connections throughout the continent.

---

The third and final pillar of its strategic plan lay in communications technologies, which the Commission recognized were essential to complete the economic infrastructure it needed to realize its goals. It therefore went on to launch a project called the Broadband Initiative, which is today transforming Prince Rupert into one of the most connected communities in the country.<sup>1</sup> The Broadband Initiative is the only municipally-owned telecommunications network in western Canada. It has provided the flexibility and independence needed for the city to take on partnerships and joint ventures in the technologies industries.

Today, Prince Rupert has rebounded, becoming one of the busiest ports on the West Coast. When it found itself facing decline, it assembled its key stakeholders, discussed and debated what it felt were the strengths it could build on, and developed a vision and a plan to achieve it. The lesson here is that, by working through the process together and developing a clear plan, the city was able to seek the particular kind of support that it needed from governments and investors to move forward. It is an impressive example of stakeholders taking control of their own community and working collaboratively with one another as well as governments to achieve their goals.

This case is inspiring if only because it underlines that success really is possible. But it also served as a powerful catalyst for discussion around what is needed to make such a process work.

We summarized it this way: a community-directed approach expects the members of such communities to come together as a group to review their situation from at least three basic viewpoints: (1) history, values and culture; (2) internal resources, from skills to natural surroundings; (3) aspirations for the future. In the end, this kind of community-based deliberation is supposed to prepare the community to reach agreement on the special opportunities that they are well positioned to exploit and to develop a realistic plan-of-action. Communities must be in the driver's seat precisely because it allows them to engage in the kind of reflection that is needed to identify and leverage their internal resources.

Our participants thought that the example showed how empowering citizens and local organizations can lead to stronger, more self-reliant communities. They said that letting communities take responsibility for the decisions that shape their future and affect their well-being can result in a more entrepreneurial, dynamic and engaged relationship between citizens, local organizations and governments. We wanted to know whether it was also a good strategy to help them establish a foothold in the New Economy. We began by asking people to tell us their stories about how technology had affected their traditional industries over the last few decades.

<sup>1</sup> "Broadband" in this paper refers to the high-speed access to Internet connectivity whereby information can flow at exponentially higher rates than conventional low bandwidth or "dial up" connectivity that is common to many rural and northern regions.

# The New Economy

---

## The new order

In our roundtables, we heard many times about how agriculture and the harvesting of primary resources have become so efficient that what used to take many hands an entire season is now done by a few in a fraction of the time. Technology adds value by making the processes more efficient, say, by streamlining or automating them. As a result, while productivity goes up, traditional industries such as fishing, farming and logging no longer support the high levels of employment they once did.

While economies that depend upon this kind of work have always been seasonal, the technology has exaggerated that aspect of many industries—sometimes to the point of making it a caricature of itself. For some fishers today, a “season” can be a matter of days. Manufacturing, from textiles to automobiles, has also been deeply affected and, as a result, employment is increasingly cyclical in those industries as well, following a pattern not unlike traditional seasonal ones.

In communities and regions that are caught in a cycle of ever-decreasing work there is often a sense that globalization and the New Economy create winners and losers.

For some of the people in our sessions, this was the real face of globalization and the New Economy. In communities and regions that are caught in a cycle of ever-decreasing work there is often a sense that globalization and the New Economy create winners and losers. Some communities and regions are included, others get left out. To see why, we need to look at how globalization has changed business over the last few decades.

A generation ago businesses were far more self-contained. For example, a company like Ford designed and produced most of the parts it needed to build its cars. Indeed, a hundred years ago at the Rouge Plant in Detroit, Ford’s workers literally built their cars from the wheels up, beginning with raw ore, which they turned into auto-parts—axles, transmissions, steering wheels—and then assembled into automobiles.

Over the last few decades, information and communication technologies, new modes of shipping and transportation, demographic shifts and new trade relationships have changed how businesses work. Today, most of the work is no longer done in-house. Companies like Ford or Nike now rely on **supply chains**, that is, groups of companies that will produce the various pieces, assemble them and deliver the product. Their roles are carefully co-ordinated and timed to produce a final product as efficiently as possible.

Nike is a striking example. It is more of a ‘brand identity’ than a manufacturing firm, using legions of contractors to handle the actual production of running shoes and clothing while it concentrates on organizing, marketing and promotion. Nike sees itself as an exemplar of the new philosophy, promoting collaboration alongside competition, and actively engaging separate businesses in new and evolving relationships. At the same time, individual links in its supply chain will be replaced quickly if they are not efficient enough.

---

In effect, globalization is transforming the old self-contained corporations into a network of supply chains. From the viewpoint of the economy as a whole, this is a good thing because it makes more efficient use of the overall resources. But from the local perspective—that of individual workers, businesses and communities—the picture can be quite different. In communities whose economies have been historically dependent on the harvesting of natural resources or the manufacture of goods, these developments can be very worrying. The traditional corporation provided them with greater stability because it performed more of its tasks in a single location. As a result, it was less likely to disappear or downsize, more diversified and a more significant provider of wealth and employment to the local economy.

Today managers look to different locations around the globe to fulfill different tasks—so-called “outsourcing”—ranging from assembling some part of a product to carrying out administrative tasks, such as payroll or human resources management. So the manufacturer of a metal-based product may have little interest in a particular community, say, in British Columbia, beyond its ability to mine the raw resource. As it becomes possible to extract it more efficiently, employment falls but there is no incentive for the company to expand its operations in ways that will lead to new jobs.

Many people feel that there is little that communities or governments can do to protect against this situation beyond increasingly costly—and often desperate—efforts to entice corporations to expand or stay, such as tax incentives or wage reductions. It has been the source of much consternation and disagreement about the social impact of globalization. And as we crossed the country we heard many stories that suggest a pattern: as globalization progresses communities with seasonal economies face rising unemployment, growing dependence on government and, ultimately, decline. Given that for the foreseeable future so many communities will remain dependent on seasonal industries, it is understandable that they feel ambivalent

about, even threatened by, expansive talk around the New Economy.

Nevertheless, we also heard about communities who had been dependent on seasonal economies or high levels of seasonal employment but which have managed to adjust and prosper in these circumstances. So while some seem trapped in a cycle of low wage, low-skilled jobs, work shortages and a high dependence on income support, others are healthy, vibrant and growing. The New Economy seems not to have passed them by. This led us to ask the following questions: Why are some communities and regions included, while others are left out? Is there something inherently different in communities that succeed? If we are indeed entering a new, third phase of globalization, could the tide be turning?

## Diversity, capacity and opportunity

In his book, Freidman devotes several pages to detailing how the components for a personal computer he ordered online had been manufactured in a host of different countries around the world, many of whom are subsidiaries of Western-based multinationals. The final stage of shipping the pieces to a single location and assembling them into a unit was managed by a computerised network that can adjust the supply-chain hourly, offering customers special deals on whatever version of the computer happens, at that moment, to be more readily available from the production line on the other side of the world.

The example is meant to reveal the stunningly sophisticated relationship that now exists between global and local levels. The New Economy is now sensitive enough to respond immediately to a request from a single person shopping for a computer. Over the next decade the capacity to link global and local so intimately will explode. Personalized products and services will become the norm. In effect, we are going through an historic change in how goods and services are produced and marketed. The old way was to target a product at

---

as wide a range of consumers as possible. Increasingly, it will be to find and reach highly differentiated groups. As a result, there will be more and more room for niche players of all sorts, as part of a vast network of supply chains.

If we are looking for ways to diversify and develop local economies within Canada, this should be very welcome news. The immense diversity of Canadian communities is one of the most conspicuous features of the country. While that condition makes it unlikely that there is a single model for community economic development, it shows very clearly why the community-directed approach is a promising place to start. It assumes that every community is different—that it has its own unique set of assets, skills and resources—and asks its members to work together to mobilize and capitalize on them. It treats the differences between communities—their diversity—as a valuable resource that can be tapped and turned to their advantage.

If globalization is opening up the New Economy to niche players, communities may be the ideal candidates to lead the way as a new breed of entrepreneur. Blueberry farming in British Columbia provides an example.

**If globalization is opening up the New Economy to niche players, communities may be the ideal candidates to lead the way as a new breed of entrepreneur.**

B.C. is the largest producer of cultivated blueberries in Canada and accounts for 95% of the annual crop. The province is also one of the top three blueberry producing regions in the world. As part of a growing list of fruits and vegetables known as “functional foods” or “nutraceuticals,” blueberries have naturally high levels of anti-carcinogenic and anti-diabetic properties.

As a result, some B.C.-based blueberry growers began to diversify into this emerging market. Due to growing international demand, largely from Asia, the National Research Council’s Innovation Centre held a meeting in the summer of 1998 for growers and industry representatives to discuss the expanding B.C. functional food network. What emerged from this session two years later was a collective decision by the blueberry growing community and associated stakeholders to create the B.C. Functional Food and Nutraceutical Network. This not-for-profit association works on behalf of its members to access markets, resources, and networks to expand their economic opportunities nationally and globally. In other words, the blueberry growing community in B.C. responded to international demand of its local product by creating a larger resource community to successfully compete and benefit from the New Economy.

The association expects continued growth from both national and local markets due in large part to scientific evidence that diets high in blueberry extracts have been found to reverse brain and behavioral changes related to ageing. As the baby-boom generation ages the business opportunities could be very significant, especially as blueberry extract is more valuable than the blueberry itself. Rather than simply harvesting their blueberry crops for consumption, several communities in B.C. are now developing the skills, technology and marketing capacity to take advantage of these opportunities. In effect, they are building a new industry out of an existing one based on new knowledge.

While the example shows how a community can successfully position itself for the New Economy, we should not be simplistic or naïve about the challenges. Tapping a community’s resources can take a huge amount of time and work. In this sense, a community-directed approach is often as much a capacity-building exercise as an economic development process. Moreover, capacity building of the sort needed here goes far beyond, say, building new infrastructure, such as broadband access, or even training people with new technical skills. As we move from an industrial/resource-based economy

---

to a knowledge/information-based economy a wide range of new skills will be needed, from how to turn scientific knowledge into a marketable product, to how to develop and maintain business relationships around the world.

Communities are at very different stages in the development of such skills and they have very different internal assets and resources. Some are economically far less diversified than others, and far more dependent on declining industries and/or government support. Even basic skills and capacity, such as simple computer literacy or broadband access, remain a need in many

### A community-directed approach is often as much a capacity-building exercise as an economic development process.

communities. Recognition of these differences provoked a searching discussion among the members of our working group over the goal of community-directed approaches to economic development.

On the one hand, most of us agreed that the ultimate goal should be wealth creation, and that communities should be looking to finance their development through private investors. On the other hand, in the short term, this may be too much to expect of many communities. The lack of basic capacities and skills suggest that economic development agencies, government skills and training initiatives and other agencies will continue to have an important role here.

Nevertheless, we agreed that, even in cases where capacity and skills are weak, a community-directed approach suggests that there are alternatives. For example, local entrepreneurs, business operators, and industries can serve as valuable resource pools for best practices and innovative solutions. Another

suggestion we heard was for communities to invest in capacity development at earlier stages in life.<sup>2</sup> For example, if one of the challenges facing mainly rural and northern communities is youth retention and dwindling populations, capacity development could start in primary and secondary education. We heard about oil and gas companies operating in north-eastern B.C., such as Duke Energy and Encana, who are already stepping away from expensive recruitment strategies and investing in local schools to help develop a pool of talent. We also heard that school curricula could do more to promote youth retention in smaller communities by providing them with the skills to enter—and build on—local industries when they finish school.

But while many communities have a long way to go, others are quite advanced. We heard some very encouraging stories about communities that were using a kind of community-directed approach to marshal their collective skills and assets, connect with new networks and expand their businesses in ways that only a couple of decades ago were all but unthinkable. A particularly striking example was presented to us in Winnipeg where members of the local film community—a “community-of-interest” within a geographical community—told us about how they had worked together over a decade to build the business, transforming it from a marginal, seasonal employer into a thriving, full-time industry.

### The Winnipeg Film Industry

In 1993, the film industry in Winnipeg was little more than a loose collection of independent filmmakers. Very few major productions were actually filmed in Manitoba and those that were took place in the summer months. As a result, skilled professionals who wanted year-round work were forced to leave the province after the summer season to seek work in other cities, such as Vancouver

<sup>2</sup> “Capacity development” or “capacity building” in this paper refers to the larger process of investing, creating, and developing the full range of community skills, resources, and infrastructure (both physical and human) needed to diversify economically and to enter and compete in the global economy.

---

or Toronto. In short, the industry was small, fragmented and highly seasonal in nature.

A decade ago, a visionary leader in the community concluded that the Winnipeg film community had the resources to do much more. She pulled the local members of the industry together and argued that they had a sufficient supply of skilled labour to support a year-round industry. She persuaded them that if they banded together, developed a single strategy and went after the Hollywood producers, they could make the case to them that Winnipeg had the capacity for year-round filming, that its cultural and physical diversity allowed for a wide variety of projects, and that it would be cheaper to film in Manitoba than Toronto, Vancouver or the U.S.

The Winnipeg film community responded. It pulled itself together into a virtual community connected by email networks, websites and other communications tools. A similar strategy was developed to target and communicate with key stakeholders in Hollywood.

### The challenge for communities is to find a niche that they are well positioned to fill.

Through persistence and ingenuity the strategy paid off. In effect, the film makers in Winnipeg not only united themselves, but they became an active participant in the larger film community in Los Angeles, building new contacts and relationships with their counterparts there. Today the film sector has become one of the fastest growing businesses in the province. Indeed, they are now marketing Manitoba filmmakers globally.

We drew a number of important lessons from this case.

First, the New Economy cuts across conventional geographical boundaries. It is, first and foremost, a vast network of people who are organized into what are sometimes called “communities-of-interest” who are linked by a common purpose, such as creating wealth

by making films. The new technologies are a powerful tool for building such communities-of-interest.

Second, until now joining or building such a community in the New Economy required heft and leverage of a sort that left individuals and small communities on the sidelines. But as the networks and supply chains develop, it is increasingly possible for small players to build relationships with other groups and to find a place for themselves in it.

Third, the challenge for communities who want to attempt this is to find a niche that they are well positioned to fill, and to develop the products or services, skills and strategies to fill it.

Finally, we recognized that the New Economy is not a distant place. It is not confined to big cities or prosperous countries. Indeed, it is far less tied to geography than traditional economies. In the end, it is all about finding those who share a common goal or want the product or service a community is offering, and then having that community organize around itself to do business.

So the Winnipeg case shows how an enterprising group of people succeeded in transcending their geographic boundaries to break into this space. The key lay in their ability to band together and act as a community—a group of people with a shared goal, a realistic plan to achieve it and the skills, tools, resources and commitment to work together to implement it.

Many of our participants were keenly interested in the idea of combining a community-directed approach with new technologies to try to overcome their geographical limitations. But they were less than clear on how this could be done. In looking for the answer, we found ourselves engaged in a searching discussion around the idea of a community-directed process and of community-building. The next section sets out what we heard in these exchanges.

# Making it work

---

In trying to identify “success conditions” around community-directed approaches, we should bear in mind that every community is different. Along with its own mix of assets, resources and skills, it will have its own history, culture, and goals. If it is true that, in the end, economic development is about wealth creation, it is also true that wealth creation, in turn, must be balanced against quality of life. With that in mind, we can say that a number of common success indicators emerged from the cross-country roundtables, discussed below.

## Leadership

The topic of leadership was raised at every meeting and virtually everyone saw it as a critical success factor for the initiatives we were discussing. It is the primary force that pulls people together, focuses them on the issues, leads them in discussion, helps them formulate a plan, and then drives it through the implementation stage. We heard that good leadership often takes a team of people, with different ones assuming the key role at different stages in the process.

For instance, when a community reflects on its history, values and culture, it will need a leader who can bridge differences and resolve tensions in a fair-minded way. Over time community stakeholders will have assumed different roles, which may create tensions between them.

We agreed that if a community approach is to get off the ground the leader must help the community overcome such tensions. He or she must do more than create a climate of openness and trust. Stakeholders must agree that the process requires a realignment of these relationships. They must be willing to step outside their established roles and consider their place in the community from a new, more holistic and more collaborative viewpoint. This shift in perspective is essential if the community is to arrive at common goals and unite behind a single vision.

By contrast, the task of developing a realistic plan to achieve the vision takes other leadership skills. In one of our sessions, we asked how the community would know whether its goals were realistic. When is a special opportunity worth pursuing, asked a participant? This is a critical question and the leader has a critical role to play in answering it. He or she must have the business sense and the strategic foresight to help the community assess the prospects for achieving its goals and arrive at a practical plan to get them there. Certainly, the issue of wealth-creation will play an important role here.

At another meeting we talked about what would be needed to develop a community-building strategy using new technologies, an essential step in both the Winnipeg filmmakers and the Prince Rupert examples. While our participants knew that it would take more than a website, they were less than confident about how to use these tools, say, to forge new links with other communities. They wondered who could help them develop such a strategy.

In the end, we concluded that the leadership we were looking for is a many-sided thing. Our definitions of it shifted as we focused on different issues. Nevertheless, there was a unifying theme: because community-directed approaches are essentially collaborative enterprises, we agreed that they call for a **collaborative style of leadership**. It stands in contrast to what one participant described as “the old-style, command-and-control leadership” of traditional, hierarchical institutions.

Community approaches are all about getting a diverse group of people with different talents and interests to unite around a common goal and to work together to achieve it. Participants felt strongly that the leadership for such a process must come from within the community. The leader(s) must have first-hand knowledge of the community, its history and members. External professionals can provide useful advice, expertise and support, but the process must be owned by the community itself.

---

Bouctouche, New Brunswick was given as an example of collaborative leadership. It is a town of approximately 2,500 inhabitants in a small regional centre in Kent County, one of the most disadvantaged in Canada. In 2001, Kent County ranked 11th (out of 288 Census Divisions nationally) in terms of seasonal employment (26.5% of its labour force). Despite the obstacles, Bouctouche has made remarkable progress on economic diversification. It is now home to over 200 businesses that employ some 1,800 people across a variety of sectors (not including the public sector).

At the turn of the century, Bouctouche was largely dependent on fish and wood pulp exports. The economy of modern Bouctouche finds its strength in the know-how and enthusiasm of a great number of entrepreneurs working in retail, the service sector, and the tourism industry. Shellfish processing and prefabricated house construction are other major sources of employment. In his book *Community Economic Development in Atlantic Canada*, D.J. Savoie explained that of the many factors

### Participants regarded leadership as among the most important resources in any community.

contributing to the economic success of the Kent region, the most important is the “people factor.” While there was both public and private involvement, it was the people of Bouctouche who were the real cornerstone of the collaborative leadership process.

In the case of Bouctouche, the “people factor” has transposed itself into an organizational factor. The Bouctouche Business Improvement Association was established by a group of local business owners. Beautification was their first priority. They also began working toward developing a strategic plan for the Bouctouche area in collaboration with local stakeholders including the Kent Economic Commission Inc., the Town of Bouctouche, and the Bouctouche Chamber

of Commerce. The goal of this initiative was to identify aspects of the local economy requiring attention.

There have been major developments in the region’s tourism infrastructure in recent years. Both levels of government funded the construction of the Pays de la Sagouine, a theme park inspired by the internationally acclaimed novel *La Sagouine*, by Bouctouche native Antonine Maillet. Today, the park is managed by an independent board of directors, whose goal is to make it self-sufficient. In 1999 the park attracted approximately 90,000 visitors from all over Canada and parts of the United States. In addition, the Irving family contributed most of the required funding for the construction of the Dune de Bouctouche (Irving Eco-Center), an eco-tourism facility that attracts a large number of tourists every summer (about 154,000 visitors in 1999). The local business community has also responded to new opportunities resulting from the two projects. There are a number of new restaurants, new bed and breakfasts, and special boutiques catering to tourists that have opened in and around Bouctouche in recent years.

While the Kent region is still highly dependent on seasonal employment, economic indicators only tell part of the story. There is now a “can do” mentality in the region, which is in sharp contrast to the economically dependent reputation it once faced. This human switch of attitude is often called an “intangible” but has been a significant factor in turnaround situations across the country.

In Kent’s case, entrepreneurs have created a remarkable number of new businesses in recent years, but they and other community leaders have done more than that. They have assumed responsibility for important projects such as the Pays de la Sagouine and have met with success. Additionally, local entrepreneurs and community leaders donate volunteer time to promote the economic interests of their region as board members and advisers of the local initiatives such as the Economic Development Commission and the Kent Tourist Association.

---

It was clear from our discussions that our participants regarded leadership as among the most important resources in any community. But we also heard that, while it exists in all communities, it may not surface on its own. Sometimes it must be encouraged or fostered. Often the biggest challenge is identifying it.

Finally, we were told that in many rural communities, the leadership is exhausted. The same people have been called upon again and again to help their communities deal with what seems like an endless series of crises. Without important successes to energize them, most leaders eventually give up. As a result, the leadership capacity in many communities is badly in need of renewal. This is highly demoralising for the community and could pre-empt future development. A community whose leadership has been exhausted or failed to surface is hugely disadvantaged.

## Stakeholders and participants

An important corollary to the leadership question is the participant question: Who should be around the table when the discussions and planning take place? Certainly, our participants felt that a community-directed approach must be open to all citizens who wish to participate. They are the ultimate beneficiaries of the process and it is their voices that provide the real legitimacy behind it. In the end, the final test of the validity of a plan is whether it serves the interests of the citizens within the community. It should be *citizen-centred*.

Nevertheless, not all citizens will want to participate and there are other stakeholders whose participation is essential. We have already spoken of the various networks within a community. While these are made up of citizens, the people who represent them speak for a particular set of interests that are different from those of individual citizens. They may include local businesses, labour unions, voluntary organizations and community groups such as Rotary Clubs. These groups are essential partners in the process. They will have the collective

expertise, capacity and corporate memory needed to make the plan succeed.

We also heard about the importance of local governments. While no one thought that local government must lead a community-directed process, many people recognized that they are often the natural candidates to do so. Almost everyone thought that they should be viewed differently from provincial and federal governments because of their proximity to and special relationship with the members of the community.

One example where local government was the catalyst for economic development is Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan. Led by a leadership team made up of the mayor, councillors and community leaders, the town raised money from the Heritage Canada Main Street Program and then embarked on a revitalization of its historic downtown. As part of its plan, the leadership team looked initially to the private sector for investment in the Temple Gardens Mineral Spa, a hotel and spa complex built around the town's natural hot springs. Their request was turned down until community leadership secured the participation of the provincial government. The Spa is now a major economic force in the city, drawing customers from nearby Regina and Saskatoon and creating economic spin-offs for other local businesses. The lesson here, we were told, was that both governments and the private sector are more willing to come together to discuss investment when other players are involved.

On the other hand, when we talked to people in larger urban centres where seasonal employment was an issue for some but not others, we heard that a community-directed initiative might be launched by a sub-group—a community-of-interest—from within a geographical community, such as the Winnipeg filmmakers. The initiative might be led by individuals or local organizations, as that one was.

External players also have an essential role at some stages of the process. The idea of linking up with other

---

parties beyond one's borders, such as like-minded organizations or investors, is an essential part of the strategy. The challenge is to make one's own community part of a larger one. The question of when and how to bring these players to the table will depend on the community's plan, though our participants thought that, for the most part, it would be during the implementation phase.

We heard that political leaders could play an important role in helping to establish links within a given community or with other communities. They are natural ambassadors between their own communities and other ones. Moreover, expertise from the public sector could be used for a variety of purposes, such as hiring facilitators for strategic planning exercises or for implementation.

### Establishing the right relationships between citizens, the various stakeholders, governments and other communities is critical.

Finally, the presence of federal and provincial governments raised special issues that we discussed at length through the roundtables. We will return to this in Section 5 below.

## Collaboration

Community-directed initiatives invest citizens and stakeholders with a sense of ownership of the process by giving them the lead role in setting goals and priorities and developing a plan to achieve them. Because they are collaborative in nature, establishing the right relationships between citizens, the various stakeholders, governments and other communities is critical. In fact, collaboration requires a quite different organizational model from that used by governments to deliver conventional economic development programs.

In Victoria we heard about the Vancouver Agreement, an innovative arrangement that allows all three levels of government, along with non-governmental organizations from church groups to Meals on Wheels, to work together closely to support sustainable community health and safety, economic and social development, and community capacity building in the downtown east side of Vancouver. It is a good example of how collaboration works in practice and emphasizes the need for communities to redefine their relationships with government.

In setting up the Agreement, the parties recognized that the relationship between governments and community organizations had to be flexible enough to let the latter bring their special knowledge of the community to bear on solving local problems. They did it by agreeing to a framework of principles, goals and performance indicators that left enough flexibility for these organizations to make further choices about their own goals and priorities and plans for how to achieve them.

The Agreement takes for granted that the overarching goals are cross-cutting or interdependent. It thereby avoids arcane debates over which ones fall in whose jurisdiction. This leaves interested parties much freer to engage one another on a wide variety of fronts, in various ways, to achieve a variety of goals.

That is the Agreement's strength. It attacks complex problems from many angles at the same time by letting people and organizations do what they do best. As a result, there is now a whole network of policy makers and service providers in Vancouver who are working together to resolve these issues. In effect, the Agreement is a cluster of mutually supportive partnerships—a network—involving community organizations, the business community and the three levels of government.

While collaborative arrangements have had some remarkable successes, there have also been failures. Much remains to be learned about how to make them work. In our discussions, two issues in particular emerged that should be mentioned: a lack of capacity within many

---

communities to support these kinds of relationships; and reluctance on the part of many governments to allow voluntary organizations and communities to really take ownership of the process. We will deal with the first one in the next two sections and the second one in the section below on accountability.

## New infrastructure

In a collaborative arrangement like the Vancouver Agreement the relationships between the partners are complex and dynamic. Managing and coordinating them requires regular communication, as well as the collection, processing and sharing of large amounts of information—sometimes daily. Having the right information and being able to communicate it effectively with other members of the network is critical to their stability and coordination, especially in larger urban centres where the community in question may be a community-of-interest, such as the Winnipeg filmmakers. If the members are to develop a sense of solidarity and common purpose, they must be in regular contact with one another and well informed on the project and its evolution. In short, they must feel engaged.

Similarly, if the principal goal is to have the community reach beyond its geographical boundaries, link up with other communities, and capitalize on its opportunities, the right kind of information and communications network must be in place to support the initiative.

The Alberta SuperNet program is a promising initiative here. As the largest provincial project of its kind in Canada, SuperNet will ensure that every community in Alberta has high-speed broadband access. For many communities—particularly rural and northern—access to the Internet and email will significantly increase their economic opportunities.

Other communities in Alberta are already benefiting from this technology. Strategic Information Systems (SIS), an information and communications technologies solutions firm whose primary focuses are First Nations and Métis

communities, provides services including networking, Internet, office automation, training, and assistance with onsite maintenance. SIS assists communities in becoming “Information Centric Communities” where technology is incorporated into socio-economic development strategies.

One success story is the Little Red River Cree Nation, whose members live in three communities in northern Alberta. For part of the year, two of the three are accessible only by plane, making business ventures very difficult. To develop its economy, the Little Red River Cree Nation realized it had to work more closely with non-Aboriginal organizations. As a result, it developed a partnership with SIS to develop email and Internet service in all three communities. The idea was that it would provide administrative staff with new tools to enhance the community’s business prospects. Through this partnership with SIS, the Nation has now created a consortium of 10 companies, including two on-reserve stores, a fly-in fishing resort, a private airline, a forest fire fighting company, and a forestry holding company, with revenues of approximately \$30 million dollars annually. By using new technologies to build new relationships with organizations outside its boundaries, the community has prospered.

In fact, it takes sophisticated electronic infrastructure to support strategies like this one. We heard that in a paper-based system community-directed approaches involving whole networks of organizations are very difficult to manage. If the lines of communication are not kept narrow and short they quickly become clogged by stacks of files, errors and lapses in communication. Efforts to manage them through a conventional paper-based system are therefore likely to collapse under their own weight. For this reason, even though community approaches have been discussed for decades, they should really be seen as a new and emerging organizational form. They are creatures of a new era—the Information Age. Building the infrastructure to support them is a growing priority for governments.

---

For example, we heard about the Enterprise initiative, a partnership between the Government of New Brunswick and the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency that provides support to community-driven approaches. The 15 provincial Enterprise agencies have an active presence online with region-specific websites that house a wealth of relevant information such as economic development strategies, business enhancement tools, relevant regional and national links, and up-to-date statistics. It maintains communication with local communities through an e-newsletter that is available online and also distributed via email. Ready access to current, high quality information is an important facet to development in the New Economy. Entrepreneurs or community leaders can access information themselves or engage Enterprise staff for targeted support, such as assistance in developing strategic plans.

If the principal goal is to have the community reach beyond its geographical boundaries, the right kind of information and communications network must be in place.

Examples like these show that Canadian governments and the private sector are building a new generation of public infrastructure. It creates new options and opportunities that are changing how they do things and what they do. As this capacity matures, it will link citizens, communities and regions in new ways, allowing them to communicate, share information and improve their stores of knowledge as never before. It provides historic new opportunities to strengthen our communities and to create new kinds of linkages within our own country and abroad.

Canadians' future prosperity will depend on this new infrastructure, but we also heard that they will need the right skills and resources to use it effectively. The need for capacity building to ensure success in the New Economy was discussed in an earlier chapter. Many of these skills are well-known and will not be a surprise.

They include business and management skills, as well as the technical skills needed to build, operate and maintain the infrastructure. Participants told us about their needs for capacity-building here. In particular, we heard that rural and northern communities are under-skilled in new technologies relative to their urban counterparts.

But as we pursued the conversation, the need for capacity-building and skills development of a different sort emerged. If the new infrastructure creates new opportunities for economic and social development, communities have much to learn about how to use it to develop new products and services and reach beyond their geographical boundaries. This emerged as a new and critical capacity-building challenge facing many of them.

## A new resource

In a knowledge economy, knowledge and information is more than just a key element, it is **a primary resource**. Governments and communities are rich reserves of data, information and knowledge. Communities that have access to it and use it well will have a decided advantage.

Consider an area like health. Governments around the world are now developing the electronic health record (EHR) while one currently exists in the Ottawa region. It provides a complete and accurate history of a patient's interaction with the entire health system. Such a record will be a critical part of the health system of the future.

For example, it will allow health care workers to ensure that an elderly woman's transition from hip replacement surgery, to physiotherapy, to the pharmacy, to homecare or long-term care is as seamless as possible, and that all her special needs—such as diet, allergies or the kind of room she prefers—are known to the right people at the right time.

---

For policy makers, administrators and researchers, it could be a priceless source of data, allowing them to identify new health trends, improve services or develop new medical techniques or drugs. In short, the EHR will be a powerful new locus of information that can be used to improve services, research, policy and innovation.

As we move into the Information Age, “knowledge clusters” of this sort will form in virtually every area of government activity. The amount of information and knowledge concentrated within them will be orders of magnitude beyond what is available now. As the infrastructure evolves, it will get easier to “refine” the resource—that is, to organize, share and use it to create new knowledge, new products and new services.

**A powerful new information engine is emerging. Communities who want to succeed in the New Economy must learn to use it to create new knowledge.**

The opportunities for Canadians are hard to exaggerate. Businesses will use it to develop new products and services to prosper in a knowledge economy. Universities and think-tanks will have access to vast reserves of data and knowledge to support research. And communities could use it to help level the global playing field.

In effect, a powerful new information engine is emerging. Communities who want to succeed in the New Economy must learn to use it to organize, integrate and refine this resource to create new knowledge and new knowledge-fields that can be used to develop new products and services. Every community must find its own perspectives on how to use it innovatively and productively.

At the same time, federal and provincial governments must work to make this resource available to communities and community organizations. They must help them develop the infrastructure and skills that will allow them to build on their strengths and capitalize on their opportunities.

This is a deeply collaborative task. It requires a renewal of fundamental relationships. The more we talked to people in community organizations across the country, the clearer it became that the New Economy is as much a way of doing things as it is the things that get done. On the one hand, it requires innovative use of information and knowledge to develop new products and services. On the other hand, it requires a fundamental rethinking of traditional relationships among all stakeholders, including the business community, workers and governments, to develop, produce and market these products and services. These are like halves of a whole.

We concluded that recognition of the high economic and social value of information and knowledge should be the cornerstone of every community-building strategy. Learning to use the resource to develop new products and opportunities should be the cornerstone of every capacity-building strategy. Taking a community-directed approach is a critical step in that direction. It requires the support and participation of all three levels of government, as well as community organizations, labour unions, businesses and, of course, citizens.

---

## Accountability

Accountability was a final theme that occupied our participants. We heard that governments must adjust their practices if a community-driven process is going to work. While many participants thought that what governments say about collaboration and accountability is encouraging, they felt that there is often a gap between the theory and the practice.

We were told that governments today are acutely sensitive to the public's desire to know that their tax dollars are wisely spent and carefully managed. As a result, when partnerships are launched, governments have a strong tendency to try to minimize risk and liability through administrative and management practices that all but eliminate any flexibility that the partnership was supposed to create. In effect, decision-making too often flows in one direction only: from the top down—that is, from government officials to the community organizations. In such circumstances, the “partner” is little more than a contract worker for government.

### Governments must adjust their practices if a community-driven process is going to work.

A key challenge in making community-directed initiatives work in the future therefore lies in getting governments to allow a greater level of ownership of the project at the community level. They must be willing to accept and trust that accountability for outcomes is an adequate way to oversee the use of public funds. For its part, a community must be willing and able to provide a clear, reliable and well-defined plan, complete with milestones, focused objectives, performance indicators—and it must be willing and able to report adequately on the performance of tasks and achievement of goals.

Governments are not the only parties interested in clear accountability measures and detailed strategic planning. Private sector investors also require their own set of checks and balances and reporting structures. As with governments, the private sector is often concerned with mitigating the risks of financial investments regardless of the monetary value. What's more, we heard that although community-directed plans, in theory at least, are supported by community members, leadership is also accountable to its constituents for transparent reporting.

At the same time, we heard that, from government's point of view, reporting is often a problem. Many community organizations lack the skills and capacity to meet the requirements. In part, this is a result of inadequate information and communications infrastructure and skills. Building this capacity should be a central goal of federal and provincial governments and one in which the private sector can play a role.

# The Role of Government

---

## Repositioning the relationship

We said that participants told us that traditional economic development often failed because it was largely administered and controlled from the top down by federal and provincial governments. In contrast, a community-directed approach comes at the task from the bottom up. We also said that it was important to give communities a sense of ownership of the process. For one thing, it helps legitimize difficult decisions and motivates citizens to engage in the project in ways that may be critical to its success. For example, if in its efforts to promote tourism a town asks its citizens to plant flowers in their yards and improve the look of their community, they are more likely to comply if they feel that they are the original authors of the project, rather than having it imposed by government.

But taking ownership has another goal. We heard that in many communities with seasonal economies a culture of dependence has taken hold on some citizens and businesses. It can remove the incentive to take responsibility and frustrate even the best efforts by others in the community to promote economic development. Promoting the importance of community participation and ownership is seen as a promising way to break the cycle of dependence.

These points led us to conclude that a community-directed approach is really about establishing a new relationship between governments and citizens. It moves us beyond the traditional one in which citizens are essentially passive consumers of government services and moves us toward a view of them as active participants in governance. In short, community-directed initiatives are about much more than providing services or promoting development. They are about engaging citizens, fostering deliberation and debate, developing new relationships and building stronger communities.

Nevertheless, if our participants thought that their communities should take on a greater responsibility for community development, they also agreed that

governments must continue to play a critical role in such initiatives, especially in communities that feel trapped in traditional economies. Municipal governments are at the forefront. Because of their close ties with citizens and community organizations they can help organize and engage people at the grassroots level. In many cases they are the natural candidates to lead such initiatives. By contrast, we sorted the roles of federal and provincial governments into three basic categories:

- removing obstacles;
- helping to build capacity and infrastructure; and
- supporting community plans.

Some of the main comments we heard on each one are set out below.

## Removing obstacles

First and foremost, our participants felt that much work still needs to be done on simply understanding the community approach. Many government departments still operate from the top down and their programs are designed and administered in ways that are often as much a deterrent to community-directed change as a support.

For example, even when the language of partnerships is used to define the relationship, there is still a strong tendency to micromanage projects or to explain away and excuse overly complex application and approval processes. While participants felt that accountability was essential, they thought that current practices are often a significant barrier to exploring innovative ways to access the New Economy. Reporting practices were seen as unnecessarily complex, restrictive and inflexible. All of this, they said, makes it difficult to plan and launch initiatives. The real challenge is to get governments to agree on a set of goals, priorities, standards and targets and then let communities operate within that framework.

---

To the extent that governments are unwilling to do that, the flexibility communities need to tap their own networks and resources disappears.

Duplication of services from different levels of government and jurisdictional squabbles were another irritant. They complicate community development. Greater coordination between governments combined with a shared commitment to support a bottom-up approach, we were told, would make it easier for different partners to find their own ways to organize around a common goal.

**While participants felt that accountability was essential, they thought that current practices are often a significant barrier to exploring innovative ways to access the New Economy.**

Program silos too were a concern. In particular, development programs are scattered across federal and provincial departments, making it hard to know which ones are available or appropriate. Moreover, they are often narrow in focus and time consuming to access. As a result, communities that develop a plan are often forced to deconstruct it and then try to piece together funding for the various parts. There is rarely a good fit so that even the pieces must be shoehorned into a program. The result, as one participant put it, is to make a camel out of what was originally a horse.

In one roundtable, participants expressed concern over what they called “drive-by funding.” Their point was that governments no longer provide core funding to community organizations. As a result, they are forced to cast about in search of projects that fit existing government programs so that they can fund their operations. This makes it very difficult for them to do long-term planning and means that much of their time, energy and resources are invested in simply keeping the organization afloat.

Another concern was over information resources. As we have seen, they are critical to communities and individuals in a knowledge economy. Participants looked to governments to play a critical role here. They felt that it had a natural role as a knowledge broker—a role which will grow rapidly as we move into the Information Age—but felt that it was often very difficult to get access to these resources. They urged governments to take steps to make them more readily available.

While these points sometimes revealed real frustration among our participants, they also recognized the considerable progress that some government departments have made in working closely with them and in redefining government’s role. Regional development departments in particular were singled out for praise. We heard that many of them have come to see themselves more as facilitators of community development and have often been very supportive of community organizations that are looking for more of a partnership approach with governments.

## Building capacity

We have already outlined the main issues around capacity-building that were raised in our sessions, from concerns over leadership to broadband access. We will only repeat them here in broad outline.

First, communities cannot participate fully in the New Economy without the right skills and infrastructure. These range from technical skills to build and maintain ICT infrastructure to the soft-skills around collaboration. Our participants felt strongly that governments must help them meet these needs. Rural and northern communities felt particularly ignored. Alberta’s SuperNet initiative was cited as an important and constructive step that other provinces and territories should emulate.

---

Second, the really big challenges around capacity-building lie in helping communities assume a hands-on role in the development of a community plan and in identifying and developing the skills and processes that would allow them to use the new technology to organize differently.

### Governments need to have sufficiently flexible policies and instruments to support community-driven approaches.

Third, if information is the critical resource that will help communities find a special place in the New Economy, federal and provincial governments must become the principal stewards of that resource. They must manage it in a way that makes it readily available to communities and businesses that will need it to develop the new relationships, products and services they need to prosper.

## Supporting the plan

Participants recognized that taking ownership of and responsibility for community development meant establishing a new relationship between citizens and communities, on one hand, and federal and provincial governments on the other. It was clear from our discussions that they also saw that this was as much a cultural change as an organizational one. Getting there will require a clear recognition of their mutual responsibilities and a high level of trust on both sides that these will be met.

Community organizations told us that, if their communities rise to the challenge by coming together as a team, reviewing the past, assessing the present and developing a realistic plan for the future, they must be confident that senior levels of government will respond in kind. They need to know that, while government is not the answer to all of their needs, it will meet its responsibilities as an enabler, facilitator, capacity builder and supporter.

For example, a community plan may call for regulatory changes that can only be brought about by government. We saw this in the Prince Rupert example. Governments must be willing to respond quickly, reasonably and fairly to such requests. Or, perhaps a community needs help in finding investment capital or acquiring technical expertise. Governments should be ready, able and willing to help them solve such questions. In short, they must be willing to come to the table as supportive and willing partners. Participants summed up what they thought this meant in practical terms through two key points.

First, governments need to have sufficiently flexible policies and instruments to support community-driven approaches. In some cases this will involve a significant change in how governments deal with communities. For example, insofar as various government programs are designed to support such initiatives, from funding to capacity building, they should be streamlined and made more easily accessible. The narrow, silo-type approach needs to be more open and many programs could be consolidated. Communities should not have to deconstruct their plans to make them fit into a range of narrowly focused programs.

Second, federal and provincial governments must be prepared to collaborate with one another to avoid the kind of jurisdictional barriers that often interfere with community efforts to launch a plan, from regulatory and licensing issues to training and income support. There should be more robust agreements between those governments that will permit front-line staff from different departments or levels of government to work together to provide support for community-directed initiatives.

In effect, our participants seemed to be calling for a new deal with federal and provincial governments, one in which they would take greater responsibility for solving their problems in exchange for a commitment from governments to work more collaboratively with each other to support them.

---

Participants went on to discuss what their own responsibilities might be like in such an arrangement. Notwithstanding the concerns over accountability, they agreed that governments had to feel confident that tax dollars were used wisely and properly accounted for. But they felt that many current practices were unnecessarily restrictive and that a more open-minded discussion of how to balance accountability with flexibility was possible and necessary.

A less clear conclusion flowed from their discussions of government's responsibility to fund such initiatives. While everyone thought that governments should continue to have some responsibility for this, views on the scope of that responsibility differed. On one hand, some participants emphasized the need for communities to take a strong entrepreneurial view of funding. They felt that a key challenge for them was to get beyond the view that governments should be the primary funding source of their initiatives. They felt that this was a critical step if the dependence on governments is to be overcome.

### The days of reliable and on-going government funding for economic development are gone.

One place this point surfaced was our Newfoundland roundtable. A participant complained that communities and organizations are constantly developing plans but then governments refuse to fund them, or radically under-fund them. He noted that this often happens after they have agreed to fund development of the plan. As a result, many people in community development organizations spend huge amounts of time developing proposals that never get implemented. The participant saw this as a failure on the part of governments to live up to their side of the deal.

However, another participant replied that such plans are starting from the assumption that governments should and will be the primary funder. He went on to argue that, if strategic plans for community economic development are supposed to be realistic, why do those who draft them keep assuming that government will fund them when it consistently does not? "Is that realistic?" he asked. "Wouldn't it be more realistic to develop plans that directed us to other avenues of support, such as private-sector partnerships?"

The participant told us about studies showing that using private money in a venture increases its chance of success by 15%. Motivation does matter, he said. When funding is coming out of your own pocket it makes you more responsible for the success of a project. He felt that if communities are to take responsibility for the project, it should include financial responsibility. The connections need to be made and business should be the driver of the economy, not government. The case of Prince Rupert, he noted, provides an impressive example of what can be achieved on this level through the right kind of community-directed approach.

In the end, most participants seemed to accept, if only reluctantly, that the days of reliable and on-going government funding for economic development are gone. It is therefore unrealistic to rely on them to meet this expectation. If economic development is to be sustainable, strategic plans must be based on innovative ways to attract investment or to market new products and services. While this does not exclude a role for government as a funder, it shifts the burden for major or long-term funding elsewhere.

# Income Support

---

We have already mentioned concerns over a culture of dependence in government. We heard more about it in our sessions than we expected. For example, we have just reported on the discussion we heard on whether government should be the principal funder of community development. But we also heard concerns about how in some communities citizens and businesses had become too dependent on income support—especially Employment Insurance. In some communities, it has become so intertwined with seasonal work that it is now virtually part of the way of life. For example, there are communities on PEI where over 75% of the population collects EI at some point during the year. Based on Census data for 2000, the twenty Census Divisions with the highest rates of seasonal employment are in the eastern provinces. The highest, in Newfoundland and Labrador, has a seasonal employment rate of just over 43% of the total workforce.

We recognized from the outset that it would be all but impossible not to discuss income support in a project such as this. Indeed, the issue would be conspicuous by its absence. At the same time, we were clear among ourselves that we did not want the project to become yet another consultation on EI. We worried that a direct focus on income support might sidetrack participants from the real discussion we wanted to have.

In particular, insofar as a community-directed approach requires different stakeholders in a community to overcome views that may set them at odds with one another we wanted to avoid getting stuck in the wheel-ruts of long-standing EI debates. In many communities much of the leadership energy goes into defending various forms of income support. Others feel that long-term reliance on programs such as EI only discourages their communities from pursuing other options, partly out of fear of losing these supports. Our goal was not to resolve these disagreements or to provide yet another set of recommendations for reform.

We certainly wanted to hear—and did hear—about how the EI system might impact on the kind of approach we were discussing. But we also wanted participants to feel free to imagine, consider and discuss a very different kind of community process, one that requires a high degree of collaboration, mutual trust and agreement on goals. So we tried to make clear to participants that the approach we were discussing does not call into question the importance of income support. We recognize that it is critical to the quality of life of people in seasonal economies.

Given our caution, we were a little surprised at what we heard. In areas of the country where EI is a critical issue participants were remarkably candid about their concerns over the impact on economic development. In Atlantic Canada, for example, many participants spoke frankly about an “EI culture” where employees are willing to work only as long as it takes to qualify for benefits. While no one thought that the answer was to simply end such benefits, there was much agreement that the situation is not sustainable and that changes to the system are needed. The discussions around change fell into two categories: immediate reforms to make the system more functional and a longer term strategy for moving beyond the cycle of dependence.

On the first point, we heard a number of ideas that participants thought might help EI and other income support programs provide more strategic support to efforts to diversify and strengthen the local economy.

In both P.E.I. and New Brunswick we heard that the problem with seasonal economies is the lack of value we put on workers in the industries. They are underpaid, over-worked and have very few benefits. One solution was to increase the minimum wage. Others wondered whether that solves the problem or simply transfers the cost to businesses in ways that would make them less competitive.

---

Another proposal had to do with ensuring that the incentives to work were not outweighed by the benefits of being on EI. At several sessions participants talked about the need for a more graduated scale between taking work to earn income and losing EI benefits. In the current system, they said, the penalty paid for earnings is too high and a disincentive to work.

Once communities have taken ownership of their own processes, a sense of solidarity and purpose emerges that makes them willing to make decisions and take action on issues that would otherwise be seen as the responsibility of government.

A different discussion occurred around what to do in the long-term to overcome dependency. A defining moment came in an eastern session where we discussed different strategies for dealing with seasonal workers. A participant was explaining a system devised by the community to move seasonal workers from one opportunity to another. The goal was to create a seamless seasonal workforce. For example, during the blueberry season this community agency would call up people from a list to inform them that work was available. When that was done, the agency would call them again to work on seeding fields; then perhaps to make Christmas wreaths for the Holiday Season, and so on. This way the people on the list could be employed most of the time.

The participant reported that getting workers out to the next job after they had accumulated enough weeks to collect EI was very difficult. As wages were low, there was little incentive to give up EI benefits for full-time work. He also noted that many of the workers were in their 50s or older, not well educated and had poor prospects for retraining.

Most people in the session felt that there was little real alternative but to accept the situation. They did not favour cancelling benefits. We heard from them that this practice was deeply entrenched and that some communities were highly dependent on it. Some income dependence, they concluded, is tolerable. It is a fact of life, especially in relation to older workers where retraining has proven impractical.

Then the discussion took a remarkable turn. Another participant told us about a community initiative that was aimed at diversifying the economy by expanding into aquaculture. Unfortunately, project managers found themselves in a quandary because they could not attract a constant labour supply, despite high levels of unemployment. Not enough people were willing to forgo their EI benefits to meet the need.<sup>3</sup>

A clear majority of participants in the room felt that this was unacceptable and that the community should be able to take some kind of action. Many of these people were the same ones that had resigned themselves to accepting the first situation. We pressed them for an explanation. Why was dependency tolerable in the first case but not the second? What was the difference? Our question provoked considerable debate.

In the end, participants concluded that they were willing to accept EI dependency in the first case for two reasons. First, it was mainly an older generation with few real prospects for retraining and redeployment. The only other option was to pull the rug out from under their feet, which no one wanted to do. Second, while they felt that the idea of a seamless seasonal workforce was a good one, the kind of work it involves contributes little to the goal of diversifying the local economy, while the efforts to build a new aquaculture industry does.

<sup>3</sup> It should be noted that labour supply issues are not endemic to Atlantic Canada. Whether it is struggling to find blueberry harvesters in B.C. or skilled trades-people for Northern Ontario mining operations, attracting and maintaining a steady labour supply is an issue of seasonal employment and not necessarily one of geography.

---

The aquaculture project was part of a concerted effort by the community to implement a long-term plan to diversify and innovate. It was an expression of the community's will to take responsibility for its own problems and work to solve them. Community members felt that their community's investment in this kind of enterprise was too important to be derailed by community members who were unwilling to work. They concluded that the community was justified in taking action to correct the situation.

We find a powerful lesson in this. In effect, community members were insisting that everyone in the community had a responsibility to help make the plan work, or, at the very least, not to interfere with its progress. This is a striking demonstration of what we regard as the central virtue of the community-directed approach. Once communities have taken ownership of their own processes, a sense of solidarity and purpose emerges that makes them willing to make decisions and take action on issues that would otherwise be seen as the responsibility of government. This includes efforts to deal with local cultural issues, such as dependency, which, over the long run, can be crippling.

This may be one of the most promising findings of our consultation. Over the years, federal and provincial governments have wrung their hands over how to solve such problems. Perhaps the real lesson here is that they are not in the right position to do so. They are best resolved at the level where they take hold. In this case, among neighbours who live on the same street, meet in the grocery store and converse at gatherings. This kind of dependency is a cultural thing. It is embedded in and reinforced by the day-to-day practices of the people one is surrounded by: one's community. That is the right place to launch a strategy to overcome it.

Having said that, we recognize that there will be no quick fix for the issue of dependency—no silver bullet. It took time to create it. It will take time to reverse it. But the right way, we believe, is to ensure that those best positioned to work to resolve it are given the tools, skills, supports and opportunities they need to do so—and as quickly as possible.

# Conclusion

---

If there is a basic idea behind this report it is that ***each community, urban or rural, has its own special resources, skills and assets, which are spread throughout the people and organizations that make it up.***

If there is a message of hope, it is that these resources, skills and assets can be consolidated and marshalled and that, when they are, they can become a powerful force for community development.

But it is important to be clear that even in the best circumstances economic development requires persistence, commitment and a long-term plan. It takes the right mix of community involvement, leadership, engagement from the private sector and support from governments.

It also takes something else, something that we have not mentioned yet: the will to survive and succeed. While we will make no deep psychological or sociological claims about what, exactly, creates or diminishes such a will, we heard over and over again from practitioners with many years in the field that, without it, real change and progress will not happen—and, sadly, that communities sometimes reach a point where they cease to exist.

There is no magic formula to solve such problems. If our participants were open to the idea that there is a new and exciting chapter opening in community development, they were also realistic about what is involved in overcoming many of the long-standing problems in community development. These are very early days.

We thought that the first step was just to see whether the approach we were proposing made sense. We heard from our participants that it does. As a result, the next step, which will be taken at our National Roundtable in October 2005, will draw on their expertise to help us move the thinking a step closer to action. We look forward to working further with them when we meet again in the fall.

# Appendix

## Participants from the Cross-Country Consultations

---

The following list includes the individuals who participated in the Working Group's eight cross-country consultations. Summaries from each of the sessions are available at [www.crossingboundaries.ca](http://www.crossingboundaries.ca). Click on to the Council Initiatives page.

Winnipeg, MB | January 26, 2005

**Tammy Abel**, Team Leader, Foreign Worker Unit, HRSDC, Government of Canada

**Fletcher Baragar**, Professor, Department of Economics, University of Manitoba

**Wes Barrett**, Economic Development Officer, Valley Inc.

**Cheryl Barsalou**, Executive Director, Manitoba Customer Contact Association, Government of Manitoba

**Dave Boldt**, Manager, Research and Analysis of Policy, Planning and External Relations, Western Economic Diversification

**Ken Carr**, Executive Director, Manitoba Aerospace Association Inc

**Cindy Coker**, Executive Director, SEED (Supporting Employment & Economic Development) Winnipeg

**Ian Cramer**, Senior Business Analyst, Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs

**Joanne Dyker**, Industry Human Resources Consultant, Industry Training Partnerships, Government of Manitoba

**Sid Frankel**, Professor, Department of Social Work, University of Manitoba

**Derek Pachal**, Senior Manager – CED, United Way Winnipeg

**Kevin Rebeck**, President and Regional VP, CUPE

**Valerie Shantz**, Executive Director, Film Training Manitoba

**Lori Slobodian**, Community Training Coordinator, Manitoba Tourism Education Council

**DJ Spence**, First Nation Employment & Training Program Coordinator, Government of Manitoba

**Harold Thomson**, Planning Coordinator, Policy, Planning & Coordination, Manitoba Industry, Economic Development and Mines, Government of Manitoba

**Claudette Toupin**, Executive Director, Employment Training Services Branch, Department of Advanced Education and Training, Government of Manitoba

**Sandy Trudel**, Economic Development Officer, Economic Development Brandon, City of Brandon

**Joseph Warbanski**, Special Assistant to the Minister of Industry, Economic Development & Mines, Government of Manitoba

Regina, SK | January 27, 2005

**Jim Dixon**, Moose Jaw Regional Economic Development Authority

**Jean Gabert**, Regional Manager, Labour Market Services, Government of Saskatchewan

**Susan Hetu**, Community Resources and Employment, Government of Saskatchewan

**Audrey Horkoff**, Co-Chair, Action Committee on Rural Economy (ACRE)

**Major Wayne McDonough**, Divisional Consultant for Social Services, and Executive Director, Waterston Centre/House, Salvation Army

**Richard Murray**, Information Technology Office, Government of Saskatchewan

**Lynette Park**, Communications Officer, Information Technology Office, Government of Saskatchewan

**Ian Peach**, Director, Saskatchewan Institute of Public Policy

**Conrad Pura**, Executive Director, Saskatchewan Labour Force Development Board

**Rochelle Smith**, Manager, Saskbiz.ca, Business and Co-operative Services, Saskatchewan Industry and Resources

**Alan Syhlonyk**, Director, Rural Issues Office Saskatchewan Agriculture, Food and Rural Revitalization, Government of Saskatchewan

---

**Cherylynn Walters**, Marieval Enterprise Centre

**Randy Winnitowy**, Manager, Policy and Analysis, Western Economic Diversification

Victoria, BC | January 31, 2005

**Don Allan**, Economic Development Manager, Powell River Economic Development

**Deborah Ainsworth**, Executive Director, Labour Market Initiatives and Partnerships Branch, Ministry of Human Resources, Government of British Columbia

**Ken Armour**, Director of Policy Planning and External Relations, Western Economic Diversification, Government of Canada

**Lori Camire**, Executive Director, Community Futures Development Corporation of Alberni-Clayoquot

**Gord Enemark**, Director, Ministry of Small Business and Economic Development, Government of British Columbia

**Dr. Elisabeth Gugl**, Department of Economics, University of Victoria

**Howie Hambleton**, Varns and Associates

**Vicki Holman**, Community Relations Manager, FutureCorp Cowichan

**Sandy Lockhart**, Associate, Centre for Community Enterprise

**Geoff Lyons**, CAO, Ucluelet Economic Development Corporation

**Janice Mansfield**, Manager, Ministry of Skills Development and Labour, Government of British Columbia

**Shellie MacDonald**, CEDCO Victoria

**Linda Myres**, Coordinator, Bamfield Community School Association

**Jacqui Stewart**, Director, Planning and Data Management, Ministry of Advanced Education, Government of British Columbia

**Riley Varns**, Varns and Associates

**Annette Wall**, Assistant Deputy Minister, Ministry of Skills Development and Labour, Government of British Columbia

**Sherree Walter**, Manager, Community Transition, Intergovernmental Relations & Planning, Ministry of Community, Aboriginal and Women's Services, Government of British Columbia

**Paul Wieringa**, A/Executive Director, Oil & Gas Policy Branch, Ministry of Energy & Mines, Government of British Columbia

Charlottetown, PE | February 24, 2005

**Dr. Godfrey Baldacchino**, Canada Research Chair in Island Studies

**Richard Brown**, MLA, Charlottetown-Kings Square

**Bridget Cairns**, Executive Director, PEI Association For Community Living

**Don Cudmore**, Executive Director, Tourism Industry Association of PEI

**David Daughton**, Senior Analyst, Healthy Community Partners

**Mike DesRoches**, Third Vice-President, Union of Public Sector Employees of PEI

**Brian Douglas**, Director, Agriculture Resource Division, Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Aquaculture

**Phil Ferraro**, Executive Director, PEI ADAPT Council

**Jean MacDonald**, Executive Director, PEI Aquaculture Alliance

**John MacDonald**, President, PEI Wild Blueberry Growers' Association

**Birt MacKinnon**, Director, Community and Labour Development, Department of Development and Technology, Government of New Brunswick

**Cathy MacKinnon**

**Wilhelmina Murphy**, Chair, Agricultural Human Resources Council

**Irene Novaczek**, Director, Institute of Island Studies

---

**Blair Penny**, Vice-President, PEI Federation of Labour

**Norman Peters**, Chairperson, Harbour Authority of North Rustico

**Erkki Pohjolainen**, Economic Development Officer, Resources West Inc.

**Michelle Ridgway**, Project Coordinator, Achieving Women's Economic Equality, Women's Network PEI

**Barry Schmidl**, Executive Director, PEI Council of the Disabled

**Wendy Weatherbie**, Executive Director, Agricultural Human Resources Council

Moncton, NB | February 25, 2005

**Rachel Bard**, DM, Training and Employment Development, Government of New Brunswick

**Kathryn Barnes**, Deputy Mayor, City of Moncton

**Peter Belliveau**, Moncton Industrial Development

**David Bruce**, Director, Rural and Small Town Programme, Adjunct Professor, Department of Geography, Mount Allison University

**Isabelle Elliott**, Labour Force Development Officer, Enterprise South East

**David Hanson**, Mayor, Rexdale

**Lisa Hrabluk**, Director, Next NB

**Jean Lambert**, Researcher and Analyst, Regional Office of the Rural Secretariat

**Marc Landry**, Town Manager, Bouctouche

**Gwen Lister**, Project Officer, Rural and Small Town Programme, Mount Allison University

**Douglas MacDonald**, Director, Dobson Entrepreneurship Centre

**Nancy McKay**, Owner, Management Dimensions

**Gary Melanson**, General Manager, Enterprise Carleton

**Raymond Murphy**, Executive Director, Union of Municipalities of New Brunswick

**Nicole Savoie**, Regional Director (TED), Acadian Peninsula

**Annette Vautour-Mackay**, Executive Director, Volunteer Centre of Southeastern New Brunswick Inc.

**Benoît A. Verreault**, Senior Program Consultant / Aboriginal and Youth Programs Directorate, HRSDC

Carbonear, NL | March 1, 2005

**Jim Anstey**, Director for the Avalon Region, Department of Innovation, Trade and Rural Development

**Andrea Bourne**, Human Resource Planner, Federation of Agriculture

**Mike Bruce**, Manager, Community Capacity Building, HRSDC, Government of Canada

**Joan Butler**, Conception Bay South Economic Development

**Glen Clarke**, Ministry of Natural Resources

**Karen Davis**, Capacity Building Officer, Mariner Resource Opportunities Network Inc.

**Shirley Dawe**, Policy Analyst, Policy and Coordination, Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency

**Ron Delaney**, Baccalieu Trail Board of Trade

**Peter Gill**, Community Services Council

**Bill Grandy**, Account Manager, Business Programs, Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency

**Leslie Hutchings**

**Jeff Mercer**, Executive Assistant to Minister of Natural Resources

**Kerry Murray**, Director of Economic and Social Policy, Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Labour

**Michael Murray**, Owner, Murray's Horticulture

**Cle Newhook**

**George Parsons**, Mariner Resource Opportunities Network

---

**Judy Pardy**, Southeastern Aurora  
Development Corporation

**Wayne Penney**, ADM, Department of  
Human Resources, Labour and Environment,  
Government of Newfoundland and Labrador

**Frank Reid**, Town of Clarke's Beach

**Beverly Rose**, NL Federation of Cooperatives

**Kathi Stacey**, Baccalieu Trail Tourism Assoc.

**Ted Hefford**, Lower Trinity South Regional  
Development Association

**Clyde Wells**, Owner, Skipper Bens Bed & Breakfast

**David Wells**, Consultant, Provincial Innovation Strategy

**Kirk Youden**, Senior Development Officer,  
Capital Coast Development Alliance

Sudbury, ON | March 7, 2005

**Claude Berthiaume**, City Councillor, Sudbury

**Darcia Brydges**, CEO, Nippissing First Nation

**Nancy Dubé**, Director, YMCA Employment Services

**Anna Frattini**, Business Development Officer,  
Greater Grand Sudbury Development Corporation

**Shawn Heard**, General Manager, East Algoma  
Community Futures Development Corporation

**David Leadbeater**, Professor, Laurentian University

**Beth Litchfield**, Northern Development Advisor – Natural  
Resources, Ministry of Northern Development and Mines

**Maureen Luoma**, Executive Director, Sudbury Metro  
Centre – Business Improvement Association

**James Micks**, Business Representative,  
IUPAT Local 1904

**Sharon Murdock**, Executive Director, Sudbury  
& Manitoulin Training and Adjustment Board

**Dan Newell**, Levert Personnel Resources

**Rene Quesnelle**, General Manager, Nickel Basin  
Community Futures Development Corporation

**Kevin Rose**, Business Develop Officer, Waubetek Inc.

**Arik Thejsmeijer**, CED Officer LAMBAC

**Christopher Thorpe**, General Manager, Muskoka  
Community Futures Development Corporation

Montreal, QC | March 24, 2005

**Michel Cantin**, Adjoint exécutif, Ministère de l'Emploi  
et de la Solidarité sociale, Gouvernement du Québec

**Yamina Chergui**, Conseillère en démarrage,  
ACEM – Association commuanutaire d'emprunt  
de Montréal

**Annalise Iten**, Employment Councillor,  
Youth Employment Services Montreal (YES Montreal)

**Ronald Ménard**, Coordonateur, CJE Avignon-Bonaventure

**Sylvie Coulogne**, Compagnie F

**THE  
CROSSING  
BOUNDARIES  
PAPERS**

**VOLUME 1**

**Parliament Today: Three Speeches on Governance**

By the Hon. Tony Valeri, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons

**VOLUME 2**

**Privacy in the Information Age: Government Services and You**

Available for download at [www.crossingboundaries.ca](http://www.crossingboundaries.ca)  
(Aussi disponible en français)

**The Crossing Boundaries National Council**

1354 Wellington Street, Ottawa, On, K1Y 3C3  
Tel: 613-594-4795 Fax: 613-594-5925  
[www.crossingboundaries.ca](http://www.crossingboundaries.ca)