

**Agriculture and  
Rural  
Restructuring  
Group**

**DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES FOR RURAL CANADA:  
EVALUATING PARTNERSHIPS, JOBS, AND  
COMMUNITIES**



**Proceedings from the 5th Annual ARRG Conference**

**13 - 16 October, 1993, Wolfville, Nova Scotia**

**ARRG WORKING PAPERS SERIES**

**NUMBER 6**

**1994**

**Rural  
Development  
Institute**

**ARRG WORKING PAPERS SERIES**

**NUMBER 6**

**SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS FROM THE 5TH ANNUAL  
ARRG NATIONAL CONFERENCE**

---

**DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES FOR RURAL CANADA:  
EVALUATING PARTNERSHIPS, JOBS, AND  
COMMUNITIES**

---

**Wolfville, Nova Scotia**

**13 - 16 October, 1993**

**Bill Reimer, Concordia University and Grace Young, McGill University, Editors**

**Richard Rounds, ARRG Series Editor**



**THE CANADIAN AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL RESTRUCTURING GROUP**

**1994**

"A program of research, dialogue and dissemination  
on the future of rural societies in western nations."

## **Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data**

ARRG National Conference (5th : 1993 : Wolfville, N.S.)

Development strategies for rural Canada

(ARRG working papers series ; no. 6)

Copublished by the Rural Development Institute.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 1-895397-32-4

1. Rural development - Canada - Congresses. 2. Canada - Economic policy - 1991- - Congresses. I. Reimer, William C., 1944- II. Young, Grace. III. Agriculture and Rural Restructuring Group (Canada). IV. Brandon University. Rural Development Institute. V. Title. VI. Series.

HN110.Z9C6 1993 307.72'0971 C94-920100-6

## INTRODUCTION TO ARRГ AND CRRF

In 1987, few Canadians were talking "rural." "Globalization" was rapidly becoming a buzzword to explain perplexing economic problems emerging for agriculture, forestry, mining and fishing. Problems continued to plague the efforts to diversify Canada's rural economy over many years. The consolidation of rural trade centres in predominantly agricultural economies had become a question of survival for many agro-rural communities. Benefits of technological change were being questioned.

A small meeting was held in Regina in October 1987, prompted by the concern that rural people, their businesses and communities required greater consideration in public policy, research and education. The topics were restructuring, globalization and technological change. Out of the papers and debates by the dozen or so people involved, a decision was taken to form the Agricultural and Rural Restructuring Group (ARRG). This network of academics, civil servants and rural practitioners dedicated itself to building new knowledge and applying the diverse educations and experience of its members to rural problem-solving.

The process adopted by the group centred around research, joint-venture education through conferences and workshops held in rural places, and the improvement of policy awareness about rural issues. Since then, four sets of national workshops and conferences have been held. Liaison has been established with similar interests in Europe and the United States. It has become apparent that in many countries a global change in the rural and policy mind-set is beginning to come about in the search for solutions and initiatives.

The main efforts of ARRG have been in organizing annual rural policy conferences which have provided forums for rural policy-makers and practitioners to meet and debate issues of mutual interest. Each national workshop has been preceded by a "think-tank" workshop where invited researchers have met to prepare the agenda and presentations for the conference. These conferences and workshops are reviewed in the Preface and the list of published ARRG papers and proceedings is found at the end of this document.

In 1992, the Canadian Rural Restructuring Foundation (CRRF) was formed. Its mandate is to garner resources and to facilitate creative responses to the effects of structural shifts in rural Canada. The purpose of the Foundation is to foster education and research among private enterprise, communities, governments and universities. This year's conference marks an important transition from ARRG to CRRF auspices. We will continue to identify them as "ARRG conferences" but are shifting the financial management to CRRF.

The topics for the next three years and their tentative locations are:

- 1994: **Social Networks and Institutional Restructuring**  
Spring Think-Tank: Rimouski, Québec  
Fall Conference: Grand Prairie, Alberta
  
- 1995: **International Perspectives on Rural Employment**  
Spring Think-Tank: Cornerbrook, Newfoundland  
Fall Conference: Québec
  
- 1996: **Effective Strategies for Rural Development**  
Spring Think-Tank: New Brunswick or B.C.  
Fall Conference: Manitoba



If you would like to become a member of CRRF or require further information about our activities, contact:

Tony Fuller, Secretary  
Canadian Rural Restructuring Foundation  
University School of Rural Planning and Development  
University of Guelph  
Guelph, ON  
N1G 2W1  
(519) 824-4120 ext. 6783

## **ABOUT RDI**

The Rural Development Institute of Brandon University commenced activities in 1989 with a mandate to coordinate and conduct research related to rural Canada. The Director was to work in a cooperative manner with all levels of government, rural groups and citizens, and the university community. RDI responds to information requests from five sectors of rural society: 1) an External Advisory Committee (EAC) comprised of representatives of rural organizations; 2) the Manitoba Department of Rural Development; 3) the University community; 4) federal and other provincial Departments dealing with rural issues; and 5) rural towns and villages. Once the research agenda is set, RDI develops proposals to address issues, recruits qualified researchers, acquires funding, assists the research process and publishes and disseminates results. In 1991, RDI assumed the responsibility of evaluating, editing and publishing proceedings or individual papers for ARR. A list of recent publications appears on the back cover of this paper.

## PREFACE

---

This publication is a summary of the proceedings of the 5th annual rural policy conference organized by ARRG. It is the culmination of a four-year series of seminars and conferences planned in 1989 at the first national conference in Saskatoon. Each year has added to our knowledge of rural Canada.

The Second National Conference (Ottawa, Ontario 1990) focused on the problem of evidence and data regarding rural Canada. The major conclusions were: that data were plentiful, but there was little interpretation; and that rural and urban Canada are converging with respect to the material standards of living, social services and cultural expression. Increasing regional disparity and rural impoverishment persist, however, despite large income-equalization payments (see *Rural and Small Town Canada*, edited by Ray Bollman, 1992).

The Third National Conference (Camrose, Alberta 1991) focused on the natural-resource economy. It concluded that "sectoral policies for agriculture, forestry, and other rural sectors no longer work to achieve rural economic and social objectives. Resource depletion, substitution of synthetics for natural commodities, substitution of capital for labour in production and low real prices on global markets are not mitigated by subsidies, trade protection, and business incentives. These are long-term structural trends. They also threaten continued expansion of the service sector and constitute a major part of the financial difficulties of municipal governments."

The Fourth National Conference (Goderich, Ontario 1992) focused on rural manufacturing and tradeable services. It highlighted the necessity for flexibility as service employment grows and markets open: flexibility in the structure of enterprises, in the products and services offered, and in the support structures they require. This can best be achieved through research and education to identify opportunities combined with social networking and strategic alliances to act on them.

This, the Fifth National Conference, focuses on policy options for rural Canada. Evaluation of past and present strategies forms the basis for proposals regarding the future. Three features of current policy have been chosen for particular attention: partnerships, jobs and communities. Each of these has been proposed by some as a promising basis for rural development, and each of them has been criticized by others as a diversion from real development in rural areas. As the following proceedings demonstrate, the controversy remains, but we continue to learn in the process.

It is fitting that our discussion this year takes place in Atlantic Canada. Maritimers have long been involved in the debates and programs regarding rural development, and they have felt the consequences of a wide variety of policies. They are also particularly hard-pressed by the collapse of groundfish stocks and the general economic recession, yet they come to these problems with a long history of resilience and innovation. If solutions are to be found, this is certainly the place to conduct our search.

This document is a record of what we have learned as part of that search, and it is a testimony to the value of bringing people together in an open and supportive context. Participants included policy makers, academics, business people, planners, workers, activists and rural people, in many cases meeting for the first time. It is our common concern for rural life which brought us here, and it is this common concern which holds the greatest hope for overcoming the problems we face.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Agricultural and Rural Restructuring Group gratefully acknowledges the support of the following people and organizations which have made this conference possible.

### PROGRAM COMMITTEE

Peter Apedaile, University of Alberta  
Ken Donnelly, Employment and Immigration Canada  
Philip Ehrensaft, Université du Québec à Montréal  
Dianne Looker, Acadia University

Ray Bollman, Statistics Canada  
Floyd Dykeman, Mount Allison University  
Tony Fuller, University of Guelph  
Bill Reimer, Concordia University

### LOCAL ARRANGEMENT SUPPORT

Gale Abbey, Old Orchard Inn  
Gwen Lister, Rural and Small Town Programme,  
Mount Allison University  
Margaret Whittle, Rural and Small Town Programme,  
Mount Allison University

Dale Gruchy, Acadia University  
Dianne Looker, Acadia University  
Bill Wallace, Old Orchard Inn

### FINANCIAL SPONSORS

Employment and Immigration Canada  
Nova Scotia Department of Economic Development  
Canadian Rural Restructuring Foundation

Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency  
Acadia University  
McCain Foods Ltd.

### LOCAL AREA TOUR AND COMMUNITY SUPPER SUPPORT

Gale Abbey, Old Orchard Inn  
The Anglican Church Women, Port Williams  
Dale Gruchy, Acadia University  
Mermaid Theatre  
Port Williams and District Lions Club  
Port Williams Village Commission  
Sainte Famille Wines Ltd.  
Rhea Smith  
Brian Tupper  
The Weave Shed

Acadia Post and Beam  
Canaan Mountain Knitwear  
King's Produce  
Noggins  
Port Williams Venturers  
Ann Rafuse  
Kaye Slipp  
The Tangled Gardens  
Victoria Historic Inn

### ENTERTAINMENT

The Rankin Sisters  
Tara Lynne Tousevard  
The Rhythm Method

### CONFERENCE ORGANIZER

Bill Reimer, Concordia University

### PROCEEDINGS SUPPORT

Grace Young, McGill University

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

### PLENARY

PARTNERSHIPS IN RURAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES: PAST AND PRESENT EXPERIENCES AND LESSONS FOR FUTURE POLICY ..... 1

*Chaired by Tony Fuller, University of Guelph*

- Papers:
- MANDATE FOR SMALL COMMUNITIES AND RURAL AREAS ..... 3  
*Heather Clemenson*
  - NATIONAL INITIATIVE ON RURAL AMERICA ..... 7  
*Shirley P. Dawe*
  - PARTNERSHIP MODELS FOR THE FEDERAL SMALL COMMUNITIES AND RURAL AREAS SECRETARIAT ..... 11  
*George Pearson*
  - PARTNERSHIPS AS DOUBLE-EDGED SWORDS ..... 15  
*Philip Ehrensaft*

### SESSION 2

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED ABOUT RURAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES? ..... 19

*Chaired by Gary Davidson, Huron County*

- Papers:
- WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED ABOUT RURAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES? ..... 21  
*Harold Baker*
  - BUILDING MULTI-COMMUNITY RURAL DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIPS ..... 23  
*Teresa MacNeil*

### SESSION 3

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED FROM JOB CREATION STRATEGIES? ..... 25

*Chaired by Andrew Hornsell, Acadia Centre for Small Business*

- Papers:
- IS LOCALLY CONTROLLED DEVELOPMENT POSSIBLE? THE EXPERIENCE OF THE GREAT NORTHERN PENINSULA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION ..... 27  
*Lawrence F. Felt and Peter R. Sinclair*
  - WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED ABOUT JOB CREATION STRATEGIES IN RURAL AREAS? ..... 29  
*Barrie MacGregor*

ANALYTICAL FIELD TRIP AND COMMUNITY DINNER ..... 30

#### **SESSION 4**

##### **ESTABLISHING AND MAINTAINING PARTNERSHIPS FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT .. 33**

*Chaired by Ken Donnelly, Labour Market Services, CEIC*

Papers:	NEW ROLES FOR CO-OPERATIVES IN RURAL DEVELOPMENT.....	35
	<i>Bob Allan</i>	
	ESTABLISHING AND MAINTAINING PARTNERSHIPS FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT .....	37
	<i>Maxine Connell</i>	
	FACTORS ENHANCING JOINT VENTURES IN RURAL REVITALIZATION .....	41
	<i>Tim O'Neill</i>	
	ESTABLISHING AND MAINTAINING PARTNERSHIPS.....	43
	<i>John Bryden</i>	

#### **SESSION 5**

##### **ESTABLISHING AND MAINTAINING PARTNERSHIPS FOR RURAL JOB CREATION ... 47**

*Chaired by Mike Grace, Employment and Immigration Canada*

Papers:	PARTNERSHIPS FOR JOB CREATION.....	49
	<i>Fraser Hunter</i>	
	PARTNERSHIPS IN PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS.....	50
	<i>Lavern Sorgaard</i>	
	BUILDING TRUST IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT: MUNICIPAL-RURAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION COOPERATION IN NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR .....	51
	<i>Dr. Robert Greenwood</i>	

#### **SESSION 6**

##### **WORKSHOPS: STRATEGIES FOR LOCAL PROBLEM SOLVING ..... 53**

Workshop 1:	Creating Partnerships Between Communities.....	53
	<i>Facilitator: Harold Baker</i>	
Workshop 2:	Establishing Partnerships with Government .....	54
	<i>Facilitator: Dennis MacDonald</i>	
Workshop 3:	Creating Partnerships for New Business.....	55
	<i>Facilitator: Janet Eaton</i>	
Workshop 4:	Creating Partnerships for Business Expansion .....	56
	<i>Facilitator: Chris Pelham</i>	
Workshop 5:	Resolving Conflicts in Partnership Arrangements.....	57
	<i>Facilitator: Gary Davidson</i>	

Workshop 6:	Enhancing Support Networks/Mettre en valeur les reseau de support .....	57
	<i>Facilitator: Rosaire Provencier</i>	
Workshop 7:	Community Adjustment to Economic Change .....	58
	<i>Facilitator: William W. Pardy</i>	
<b>SESSION 7</b>		
POLICY DIRECTIONS FOR THE FUTURE .....		63
	<i>Chaired by Ray Bollman, Statistics Canada</i>	
Papers:	POLICY FOR THE FUTURE.....	65
	<i>Floyd Dykeman</i>	
	POLICY DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RURAL DEVELOPMENT.....	67
	<i>Richard C. Rounds</i>	
<b>SESSION 8</b>		
SYNTHESIS.....		69
	<i>Chaired by Sally Shortall, Queen's University</i>	
Papers:	SYNTHESIS ON PARTNERSHIPS, JOBS AND COMMUNITY .....	71
	<i>Leonard (Peter) Apedaile</i>	
	DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES FOR RURAL CANADA: EVALUATING PARTNERSHIPS, JOBS AND COMMUNITIES .....	75
	<i>Barbara Thompson</i>	
	A CRITICAL SYNTHESIS .....	77
	<i>Barbara Neis</i>	
EVALUATIONS .....		81
PROGRAM.....		83
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS .....		89
LIST OF PUBLICATIONS.....		94

AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL  
RESTRUCTURING GROUP

---

**PARTNERSHIPS IN RURAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES: PAST  
AND PRESENT EXPERIENCES AND LESSONS FOR FUTURE  
POLICY**

**Heather Clemenson**, Small Communities and Rural Areas Secretariat  
**Shirley Dawe**, Small Communities and Rural Areas Secretariat  
**George Pearson**, Small Communities and Rural Areas Secretariat  
**Philip Ehrensaft**, Université du Québec à Montréal

The plenary opened with three speakers from the newly created Small Communities and Rural Areas Initiative. They provided conference participants with information about this new interdepartmental governmental initiative which was created on June 25th, 1993 and is headquartered in Winnipeg. Shortly after its creation, initiative members embarked on a consultation phase in which they talked with people working in rural economic development throughout Canada and within the U.S. . As a result of the consultation phase, they identified problems with programs due to duplication and overlap. They also found that the traditional approach of governmental transfer payments was not adequate to address the current problems facing rural Canada. Directions for a new approach suggest that wealth generation in rural areas is the key to long term sustainability; this requires rural diversification and a plan to marry the bottom-up approach with the top-down approach. The vision for the initiative is: To improve the economic opportunities and social conditions of people living in Canada's small communities and rural areas so that they may become sustainable and self-reliant contributors to Canada's economy.

The next speaker, Phil Ehrensaft, identified key aspects of successful community development programs. He pointed to the importance of an evolutionary process in partnership or alliance-building on the community level. In his analysis of three case studies where partnerships are working, he found that the strategic plan was viewed by planning participants to have been of real value in building networks among community members. He pointed to the importance of strengthening local political and social institutions. A politically quiescent community will not force a partnership from the community side, he argued. He also pointed to the private sector as being a weak link in the development process in Canada and raised the question as to why it is not involved.

Session Chaired by **Tony Fuller**, University School of Rural Planning, Guelph



## MANDATE FOR SMALL COMMUNITIES AND RURAL AREAS

**Heather Clemenson**, Small Communities and Rural Areas Secretariat

The mandate for this new federal government initiative is still evolving. This presentation contains the challenges and approaches as they are currently viewed. We are here at the conference both to share with you our ideas to date and to obtain your feedback on the course we are charting for the future of this new initiative.

Though action is needed in the operation of this mandate, the initial period will be largely process-oriented to put in place the necessary framework within which the mandate can operate. I will be describing five basic challenges that we see as the primary focus of the mandate and outlining four approaches to meeting these challenges that we have identified to date.

### The Five Major Challenges

The first two challenges basically describe a coordination role. In this role, the mandate will facilitate greater interdepartmental coordination at the federal level, provide a voice for rural areas at the Cabinet table and create a federal focal point for rural issues.

- **Preventative maintenance:** This challenge will involve examining existing and proposed federal government programs and policies to determine their impact on small communities and rural areas. This would entail, for example, identifying programs and policies targeted at small communities and rural areas and those that are not specifically targeted but that have an impact on development. Through the mandate, the federal government can work towards removing barriers or impediments to development resulting from existing programs. A longer term strategy would be to develop a screen, or a set of criteria, by which new programs and policies are reviewed for their impact on rural areas. A parallel can be seen in the present manner in which environmental concerns are examined in proposed federal programs.
- **Initiator:** Examination of programs and policies will also enable identification of possible duplication; i.e., overlap or conflicts between programs among federal government departments and between federal and provincial governments. In addition, possible gaps in program delivery or in existing policies can be examined. Through this challenge new, re-structured or re-focused federal programs and activities can help to address rural issues.
- **Communications:** A major challenge of the mandate is to increase and facilitate information-sharing between all levels of government, between government and local communities, between interest groups and aboriginal peoples. The proposed Secretariat, for example, could act as a clearing house for information on rural issues. The media by which this could be accomplished are varied, whether through use of existing printed publications such as Community Development Notes published by Human Resources and Labour, or through the development of an electronic information network. One objective is to raise the profile of rural issues and to highlight successes.



- **International interface:** There is need both to learn from others and to share with others experiences in rural development. The federal role in this context would be to foster information-sharing with other countries, to monitor developments and to communicate with other nations on rural issues.
- **Partnershiping:** This challenge is one reason why we are here today. The federal government can play a major role as a catalyst to develop a more holistic approach to dealing with the issues of rural Canada by building and maintaining partnerships with all stakeholders. There appears to be a duplication of rural development efforts and structures, a duplication that potentially consumes limited resources and creates confusion for client groups.

## **Four Approaches for Managing the Mandate**

To-date four approaches have been proposed for managing the mandate. These provide the operational framework through which the mandate will be delivered.

- **Create an Interdepartmental Secretariat** The proposed Secretariat is to be multi-sectoral and multi-disciplinary. The idea is not to create a large bureaucracy but through secondments and resource agreements among federal departments, to bring together from 10 to 20 individuals with expertise and interest in small community and rural issues. It should be re-emphasized that this initiative is not just for agriculture but crosses all sectors and departments.

The role of the Secretariat will be to support the Minister and to serve as a focal point for rural Canada by providing at the federal level a single window on rural issues. The Secretariat will assist in the coordination function by supporting the proposed committees (described below). In addition, it will manage a broadly based communications function and undertake project-specific research and policy analysis.

- **Create a Standing Interdepartmental ADM's Policy Committee** to facilitate federal policy coordination. Initial response from other federal departments shows support for this high-level committee.
- **Continue the Interdepartmental Committee on Rural and Remote Canada** This committee, organized through Human Resources and Labour, has been in operation since 1990 and has representation from 20 federal departments and agencies. To date, it has been the main federal interdepartmental group sharing information and undertaking research on rural issues and concerns.

Under the new mandate, this committee is seen as the technical group that will provide support to the ADM's Policy Committee. Its continuing role is to facilitate information-sharing and research coordination at the federal level. It will provide advice on research priorities and collaborative research projects and on the establishment of a resource centre as a clearing house to facilitate information-sharing. The creation of an associate membership to the committee to involve external stakeholders is being explored with the idea of possibly organizing quarterly meetings with associate members.

- **Partnership development** There is a need to develop options for the federal government so that it can play a catalytic role in facilitating a multi-level governmental partnership with community leaders in order to address rural issues. This is a key aspect of the success of the new mandate. It is not yet clear as to how this can be most effectively achieved.

Measures such as federal-provincial ministers' meetings and the development of federal-provincial agreements/Memoranda of Understanding (MOU's) can bring together two of the major players in the field. However, the major challenge is to provide a mechanism that involves a tri-level government/stakeholder partnership process. Local, regional and national forums and conferences, regional or provincial councils and/or other mechanisms are all being considered at this time. Initially, a number of pilot projects may be considered to evaluate the effectiveness of various mechanisms. We look forward to hearing innovative ideas from the discussions over the next few days.

Already we have learned about one mechanism in the United States, namely the recent development of the State Rural Development Councils.

## **NATIONAL INITIATIVE ON RURAL AMERICA**

**Shirley P. Dawe, Small Communities and Rural Areas Secretariat**

### **An overview of the State Rural Development Councils and their support structures**

As part of our consideration of appropriate "partnership" processes, we have had consultations with representatives from the United States concerning their federal approach to rural development. We have been particularly interested in the U.S. approach because of the similar realities and challenges of small communities and rural areas in the U.S. and in Canada. First, both countries are geographically large and this creates physical impediments for rural areas. The small communities and rural areas within each country are also defined by diversities of race, culture, interests and economies. Finally, both countries are currently experiencing problems of economic and social decline and/or crisis in their small communities and rural areas.

Throughout these consultations, we have also been aware of the differences between the two countries and the implications that these differences will have in designing of a Canadian approach. For instance, Canadian provinces are much more powerful, constitutionally, than the American states. The relative powers and responsibilities of the provinces will be significant factors in deciding the nature of a rural stakeholder partnership for Canada. As well, our American associates have reminded us that the U.S. approach is itself still evolving and they have not "figured it all out." Therefore, these consultations have been a process of "mutual learning" for both countries.

### **Background**

In the early 1990s, the Bush administration announced the launch of a new federal government effort to improve the well-being of rural Americans. The goal of this effort, now called the National Initiative on Rural America (NIRA), is the promotion of public/private collaborative partnerships within an entrepreneurial environment. Its purpose is to identify and implement innovative approaches to the social and economic problems of rural areas. The centrepiece of the Initiative was the formation of the State Rural Development Councils (SRDCs), state-level forums for partnership dialogue and collaboration on rural issues.

The Clinton administration has recognized the importance of this Initiative and has endorsed its continuance. In fact, because of the widespread public and bureaucratic support for the Initiative and the positive preliminary findings of the ongoing external evaluation, the current administration has plans to raise the profile of the Initiative by developing a direct link for the existing structures into the policy-formation level of government. The Initiative is also a successful example of many of the principles of "new governance" to which the Clinton administration is committed. Notably, it did not create new federal programs, it did not create the SRDCs as a new program delivery system and it did not increase total federal expenditures. As well, NIRA, while currently housed at USDA, is a federal whole-government interdepartmental effort rather than a single-department initiative.

## State Rural Development Councils

The State Rural Development Councils (SRDCs), the key element of the US National Initiative on Rural America, are the implementation sites for much of the collaborative partnership of the Initiative. The SRDCs are comprised of the heads of state offices of federal agencies with rural development responsibilities and representatives from federal regions, state government agencies, local or municipal governments, tribal government, and private for profit and not-for profit organizations.

The SRDCs are based on the premise that rural development must be "bottom-up" and, as such, state rather than federal level co-ordination is more appropriate and effective for building linkages between all levels of governmental and non-governmental partners. In brief, the SRDCs are intended to promote co-ordination, to identify possible impediments and to serve as a liaison body between all parties and interests. The SRDCs are explicitly not intended to be a vehicle for federal funding. Rather, Council members are encouraged to work within the available resource capacities of their member organizations.

Eight SRDCs were established as a pilot project in 1990. Today there are 33 councils in operation and, due to initial indications of success, it is anticipated that there will be councils established in all 50 states and five territories within the next two years.

The SRDCs have three key characteristics that offer important lessons for Canada. They are:

- **flexibility** - There is no single prescribed method for establishing and operating a state council. There are requirements that must be met, such as the actual formation of a stakeholder council or "body," the hiring of an executive director and the preparation of a long-term strategic plan. However, the mechanisms and time frames through which these may be achieved vary among states depending on the specific characteristics, needs or circumstances of each state. Consequently, each state council is quite distinct in terms of size, schedule and frequency of meeting. Even the names of the councils vary from "rural development council" to "rural opportunities council" to "rural development response council."
- **diversity** - By actively working to include all stakeholder interests, the councils are intended to reflect and embrace the diversity of each state. Their working definition of diversity is very broad and includes diversity of race, culture, gender, interests, politics, etc. This commitment to accurately reflecting diversity is evident in the title of the 1993 annual SRDCs leadership meeting, "Strength through Diversity."
- **collaboration** - The SRDCs have been formed with the philosophy that collaboration is a more effective and efficient tool for rural development than is competition; by collaborating efforts and resources rather than competing within a win/lose situation, rural areas and people can do more with less. Consequently, their structure, goals and whole "raison d'être" are based upon power-sharing, cooperation and the elimination of overlap and duplication.

## Support Structures

A system of support structures has evolved to assist the SRDCs. These structures have been integral to the successful formation and operation of the SRDCs by providing the Councils with a complement of policy, administrative, technical and financial support. I will now give a brief overview of a few of these structures.

### Monday Management Group (MMG)

Managerial support and coordination are provided by the Monday Management Group (MMG) named after its semi-monthly Monday meetings. The MMG is a government-wide forum to facilitate federal agencies' participation in the SRDC effort. It has a membership of approximately fifty federal

career officials and has been recently expanded to include representatives from public interest groups, the private sector and tribal groups.

The MMG is an important access point for the SRDCs to the upper echelons of the US government. However, the management level of its members inhibits its ability to serve a policy support function. This gap in "policy-level" support for the SRDCs is recognized by the new administration, and continued support for the Initiative will require the development of a policy-level link for the SRDCs.

## **National Rural Economic Development Institute**

To provide the SRDCs with technical assistance, the administration office of the National Initiative contracted with the University of Wisconsin at Madison in late 1990 to form the National Rural Economic Development Institute. The Institute is comprised of a consortium of academics, organizations, consultants and community development experts from across the U.S. The Institute provides assistance and advice during the initial organization of a council and offers leadership development and strategic planning assistance. Councils are not required to use the services of the Institute, and some councils have opted to use similar resources or services available within their own states.

## **Quarterly Leadership Meetings**

The Institute has been actively involved in the organization of the Annual National Conference each fall and the Quarterly Leadership Meetings for the SRCs. These meetings provide the opportunity for members from each state and from the support structures to come together in working sessions and share knowledge, concerns and advice.

## **Rural Information Center (RIC)**

A Rural Information Center (RIC) was established in 1987 as a co-operative effort between the National Agricultural Library (NAL) and the USDA extension service to fulfil the informational requirements of the 1985 Farm Bill. The RIC is located at the NAL building in Beltsville, Maryland. It is designed to provide customized information and referral services to local government officials, community and service organizations and cooperatives, libraries, businesses and rural citizens in response to specialized inquiries for the purpose of maintaining the rural quality of life.

Services provided by the RIC include data-base searches, referrals to topic experts or other sources, compilation of bibliographies and resource guides and assistance with document location and procurement. RIC is also helping to facilitate dialogue through electronic bulletin boards, directories and other services.

## **Conclusions**

The United States' National Initiative on Rural America is only one of several models that we are examining. We recognize that all models have their strengths and weaknesses and that any model must be adapted to meet the unique circumstances and needs of Canada's small communities and rural areas. However, we feel that there are definite benefits to the U.S. approach. In particular, it responds to Canada's requirements for an approach that will include and allow for the diversity of rural Canada; rural issues in Canada are multi-disciplinary, multi-sectoral and multi-faceted.

What we require now is input from you, the stakeholders. What do you believe we need in terms of a "collaborative partnership"? What do you think of the U.S. approach? Are there other models that we should be considering? We welcome your comments and look forward to the discussion over the next few days.



## **PARTNERSHIP MODELS FOR THE FEDERAL SMALL COMMUNITIES AND RURAL AREAS SECRETARIAT**

**George Pearson, Small Communities and Rural Areas Secretariat**

### **Introduction**

The proposed new federal Small Communities and Rural Areas Secretariat is currently at the concept stage. A small group of public servants from several federal government departments is working to assist the recently appointed Special Advisor in developing the concept and planning the response to the mandate.

This group is operating as an interim "secretariat" until authority is confirmed to proceed with implementation of the mandate. In addition to the Special Advisor, Heather Clemenson and Shirley Dawe are the initial full-time staff of the "secretariat" and they are supported by a half dozen other public servants including: George Pearson, Christine Burton and Cally Abraham from Agriculture and Agri-food Canada; Ray Bollman from Statistics Canada; and Ken Donnelly from Human Resources Development Canada.

The purpose of this presentation is to outline the approach being taken to respond to the new mandate for small communities and rural areas within the context of the "partnership model" theme of this session. The presentation will cover the background chronology of the initiative, the results of the initial consultations, constraining realities, the working vision, the key challenges and the approach to addressing the challenges and lessons from the United States' experience in rural development partnerships.

### **Background Chronology**

On May 25, 1993 during the leadership campaign, candidate Kim Campbell released a position paper on small communities and rural areas, outlining a 14-point program to address issues affecting rural Canada. One of the points in the paper was the creation of a voice in Cabinet on rural issues.

The initial approach on small communities and rural areas began on June 25 with the appointment by the Prime Minister of the Honourable Charles Mayer as Minister Responsible for Small Communities and Rural Areas in addition to his appointment as Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food. While agriculture is a major activity in many rural areas, the duties of this appointment were clearly separate from the duties respecting agriculture and food. The Minister was intended to provide a federal government focal point for management of rural issues, cutting across, but involving cooperation with, all federal government departments and agencies which have policies, programs or services with rural impacts or implications.

On July 21, Dennis Stephens, formerly Assistant Deputy Minister, National Grains Bureau, was named Special Advisor, Small Communities and Rural Areas, based in Winnipeg. The interim "secretariat" was formed shortly thereafter.

On July 27, he and several "secretariat" staff began a series of consultation meetings with representatives of provincial governments, municipal organizations, universities as well as private organizations and individuals with an interest in rural issues.

The purpose of the consultation was to identify issues and challenges facing rural areas and to invite ideas from people on how the Minister and the federal government could best fulfil the new mandate. The initial consultations involved a cross-section of organizations and, since then, every effort is being made to visit or to discuss ideas with as many people as possible from any organization wishing to be involved.

## Results of the Consultations

A number of common ideas and conclusions were expressed by people during the consultations. Some of the key results are summarized as follows with no particular weighting attached to them:

Barriers and impediments to rural development is a common perception. Examples differed from region to region but included: regulatory and zoning restrictions; interprovincial trade barriers; lack of access to risk capital; markets; availability of entrepreneurial expertise; and skills training.

Duplication and overlap of programs from all levels of government appear to be a problem, particularly in the area of business development. At the same time, there are often gaps in program eligibility criteria which exclude some types of businesses and activities in rural areas. Overall, there is the feeling that programs are too complicated to access and that program rules and planning area boundaries are different from program to program and keep changing. There was strong support for moving towards single-window, seamless approaches to delivery of government services. People generally seem to care little about which level of government provides services as long as access to them is simple, quick and fair.

Traditional approaches to rural development of governments "chasing smokestacks" may no longer be sustainable from a cost standpoint and aren't perceived as being very effective over the long-term. At the same time, traditional approaches of providing income transfer payments maintain employment only in the short term and don't help develop employment over the long term. In times of limited government budgets, funds may need to be re-directed into longer-term investments, human resources development, innovation and market development.

There needs to be an emphasis on marrying the "bottom-up" approach to rural development with the "top-down" policy framework approach. Macro-economic policies involving interest rates, exchange rates and taxation are critical to setting the stage for economic development, but so too are approaches that stimulate and facilitate locally-driven individual and community-based entrepreneurship and investment in small and medium-sized businesses. Too often there is an emphasis on one approach or the other without adequate recognition of the need for a balance of both approaches.

Finally, wealth generation in rural areas is seen as one key to the long-term sustainability of rural communities. Economic activities that build on local ideas and can be translated into growth and long-term local employment need to be encouraged. To enhance the potential for sustained economic growth and wealth generation, there needs to be an holistic focus on rural diversification, value-added economic activities, strategic alliances and partnerships, entrepreneurship, business development, infrastructure development, research, innovation and training.

One of the common features of the consultations was the enthusiasm of people and the commitment to the hope and future of rural Canada. There was strong support for a focal point for rural issues at the federal level and for establishment of stronger linkages and partnerships with provincial and municipal levels of government.

## Constraining Realities

At the same time, some important cautions and realities were expressed by people as follows:

- achieve results while not building unrealistic expectations;
- balance action with appropriate consultation processes;
- respect the jurisdiction and mandate of each level of government; and,
- fund new initiatives from reallocations, recognizing the tight fiscal situation facing all governments.

The "secretariat" has taken the results of the consultations and, in recognition of the constraining realities, has been developing the principles and elements of a proposed approach for managing the mandate. The approach will be further developed and discussed within the federal public service, with input from stakeholders, and presented for consideration by the new government following the forthcoming election.

The information being developed includes a preliminary working vision, five main challenges and a four-prong approach for addressing the challenges.

## Vision

The working vision is as follows:

"Improving the economic opportunities and social conditions of people living in Canada's small communities and rural areas so that they may become sustainable and self-reliant contributors to Canada's economy."

This is a draft vision to help focus the work of the "secretariat" and is subject to modification and refinement as suggestions are received. It helps to express the notion of an holistic approach to rural development, the facilitative role of government and the hope that rural people can access the tools and make the investments necessary to meet the challenge of contributing to economic growth and long-term local employment through wealth generation in rural communities.

## UPDATE - March 1, 1994:

Prime Minister Chretien has decided not to name a single, interdepartmental focal point for rural renewal at this time. However, he has asked Minister Goodale to promote and facilitate rural renewal, using the resources and the activities of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada and related agencies. The Prime Minister has also asked the Minister to work in conjunction with his cabinet colleagues and the relevant activities of other portfolios in a collaborative approach to rural renewal.

Minister Goodale is placing a high priority on rural renewal. On February 27, 1994 at the Canadian Federation of Agriculture's Annual General Meeting in Edmonton, Alberta, Minister Goodale announced that he is establishing a Rural Renewal Secretariat. The Secretariat will provide a clear departmental focal point to promote and facilitate rural renewal. It will also work with other departments and grassroots stakeholders to address the challenges facing rural Canada.



## **PARTNERSHIPS AS DOUBLE-EDGED SWORDS**

**Philip Ehrensaft, Université du Québec à Montréal**

"Partnerships" for local development is a ubiquitous buzzword in contemporary strategies to revitalize rural communities, a buzzword that rural citizens should approach with a good dose of caution. At its best, partnership involves real sharing of resources and decision-making between senior levels of government and rural communities, between the public and private sectors, and between the diversity of social groups living and working in rural areas. At its worst, the partnership buzzword is a sugar-coated way for the national and provincial governments to announce cuts in the programs and resources that can help rural communities to adapt and thrive in the face of world economic restructuring. The fact that rural communities will have to face bigger problems with fewer resources is presented as a positive virtue that purportedly brings about increased citizen participation and self-management. Partnerships are akin to doing push-ups: not immediately pleasant but ultimately very good for you.

Taking a hard look at existing and potential partnership strategies for local development is the focus of the Agricultural and Rural Restructuring Group's 1993 national conference on rural development. The Agricultural and Rural Restructuring Group, ARRG, is itself a tripartite partnership between university policy researchers, civil servants from departments with rural mandates and representatives of sectoral groups such as farm organizations or cooperatives. Our objective is to work with rural communities in order to understand the deep economic and social restructuring that is now under way across the diversity of Canada's rural regions and to think through new strategies for coping with this restructuring. Each year's conference focuses on a specific theme. In previous years, we have focused on: the impacts of world restructuring of primary production on Canadian communities that are dependent on agriculture, forestry, mining and fishing; rural manufacturing and business services; and rebuilding Canada's quite rusty data base on rural social and economic restructuring. Our conferences and seminars are organized in rural communities and rotate between different regions of the country.

The "restructuring" term in the name of our network should, in 1993, be approached with the same degree of caution as the term "partnership." When we started up, the word "restructuring" referred to the creation of new forms of organization and social relations in the face of major changes in technology and trade. In more recent years, the word "restructuring" has become a term that sends shivers up the spine of communities and work forces. "Restructuring" has become synonymous with large-scale layoffs and plant closures. It now connotes enterprises and governments that are very lean and, especially, very mean. That is not our model or our goal.

My comments this evening will distil the results of research on partnerships that has been jointly conducted with David Freshwater and Lynn Thurston. The research focused on the dynamics of successful local development partnerships in three communities that participate in Employment and Immigration Canada's Community Futures Program: Digby, Nova Scotia; Coaticook, Quebec; and Welland, Ontario. The experiences of these three communities served as the springboard for proposing a general model of productive partnerships between local communities and senior levels of government.

Local development has become an increasingly complex task for rural communities in recent years and will become more complex in the future. In past decades, the initiatives of a few highly motivated individuals or a delegated authority to an economic development corporation were often sufficient to accomplish most local development objectives. With the economic restructuring of North America in

recent decades, successful development efforts now require more systematic relations involving a broader set of participants. Partnerships between diverse interests have become the new watchword in community development.

Economic development is increasingly seen as one component of community development. Traditional efforts to improve income and employment are now weighed in a context that also includes quality of life, cultural stability and social issues. This brings a broader group of interests and perspectives to the development debate. Citizens expect and demand that their governments respond to this new situation, and this means governments moving towards more explicitly developmental policies. In turn, the new developmental policies require partnerships with representatives of diversified local labour forces and institutions in order to work.

In the last ten years, there has been a growing emphasis on the necessity for sustainable community development programs to be built upon locally-based initiatives. Evidence from the failure of "top-down" programs, once financial assistance from senior government was withdrawn, is the primary source of this emphasis. But, the limited number of success stories when communities are left solely to their own devices also suggests the need for some external support in developing local capacity to engage in development activity,

Paralleling the recognition of the intrinsic weakness of earlier "top-down" approaches has been a shift in responsibility from federal and provincial governments to local governments. In part, this reflects a fundamental rebalancing of powers and responsibility in the Canadian federal system of government; it also reflects the growing level of deficits in the national and provincial budgets. As a result, local governments are now in the position of being responsible for a greater share in the delivery of basic social and public services. But, local governments have not received a corresponding increase in revenue.

For the local community, economic growth becomes the only way for the increase in responsibility to be reconciled with flat or declining levels of direct support from senior levels of government and accompanying mandates for higher levels of services. Further, the primary impetus for economic growth has to come from within the community. The community has to find ways to mobilize its internal resources, combine these resources efficiently with whatever levels of external support are available and move toward generating a sustainable economic base. Forging strong community development partnerships turns out to be a critical element in achieving this task.

The concept of a partnership in a community development context, however, is imprecisely defined. It is understood that successful partnerships involve the participation of various levels of government, local community groups and individuals, and businesses and business organizations. How the diverse interests encompassed by this collection of entities are reconciled and organized to achieve common goals lies at the heart of the question of how successful partnerships are formed.

Goals in a community development context are less precise than those in a business partnership, in the sense that the former are more subjective. Enhancing the quality of life in a community is harder to define than, say, reaching a target rate of return on equity of 15 percent in a business. There is also a less apparent hierarchy of goals. It is harder to rank goals such as quality of life, population growth, higher levels of income and community stability. When goals conflict, it is a challenge, in a community development context, to determine how to proceed. The capacity to negotiate compromises and priorities between the different partners is a necessary component of successful community development.

From the three case communities and experience in other Community Futures locations, we believe that successful development partnerships entail moving from an approach that focuses on individual, discrete projects to a more integrated, planned approach that stresses the role of the Community Futures Committee as catalyst rather than as delivery agent. This is not an easy transition. One can expect it to result in clashes within the existing system of "ownership" of the community development process as the CFC begins to be seen as almost a "development coordinator" that, in essence, asks others to carry out the implementation.

If a new organization such as a CFC is to have any credibility in this role, it first has to earn its place in the local development process. This goes beyond being a conduit for funds from senior levels of government. It involves showing that the CFC can capture a development vision that is consistent with community values, is willing to assist others in working toward both their individual goals and this vision, and can continue to convince senior governments that it is also addressing their goals.

From the community perspective, it is important that the CFC be seen as an impartial advocate for community improvement. While other groups have their own agendas, they must not expect the CFC to embrace completely. They too have to recognize that, in a partnership, one may not get everything that is desired. What is important is that conditions are likely to be better as a result of participating in the partnership. As the CFC moves to more of a catalytic role, other groups have the opportunity to increase their profile in the community because they are the visible agents of change. In order for the community to get to this point, the different interests must be willing and able to negotiate working partnerships. It is precisely the varying capacity of different communities to negotiate working partnerships, rather than the standard economic variables, which makes or breaks local development strategies.

## BIO-SKETCHES

**Heather A. Clemenson** is with the Department of Agriculture and Agri-Food and has recently been seconded to the new Small Communities and Rural Areas Secretariat. She has a B.Sc. in economics and a Masters and Ph.D. in geography from the University of Hull, England. Heather spent thirteen years at University of Guelph undertaking research on agricultural and rural issues. She has worked in the Agriculture Division as well as in the Labour and Household Survey Analysis Division of Statistics Canada and, over the past three years, has been with the Program Evaluation Division in the Department of Agriculture and Agri-Food in Ottawa. She has written a book on English Country Houses and Landed Estates, published articles and co-authored reports on various aspects of agricultural structure, rural development and single industry towns.

**Shirley P. Dawe** is currently working with the Small Communities and Rural Areas Secretariat under contract with Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada. She has a B.A. in political science from Memorial University of Newfoundland and a M.Sc. from the University School of Rural Planning and Development at the University of Guelph. While doing graduate work, she worked as an organizational assistant for the Agriculture and Rural Restructuring Group. She has worked on several contracts with Employment and Immigration Canada in support of the federal Interdepartmental Committee on Rural and Remote Canada. Most recently, she coordinated the Rural Exchange 1993. She has conducted research and community outreach on small-area data collection and use.

**George G. Pearson** is a professional agrologist currently serving a dual role, supporting the Special Advisor in development of the federal Small Communities and Rural Areas Secretariat and as the newly appointed Director of Strategic Directions for Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada based in Ottawa. In the latter role, he is responsible for management of future-oriented studies, strategic planning and long-term policy formulation at the departmental level. Previously, he worked on grain policy issues as Acting Director of Impact Analysis for the Grains and Oilseeds Branch, Agriculture Canada, and on soil, water and environmental sustainability issues in various capacities with the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration both in Ottawa and Regina. He has also held several senior management positions in agricultural marketing, economic analysis and policy development with the provinces of British Columbia and Saskatchewan. He was raised in rural Saskatchewan, graduated in political science and agricultural economics from the University of Saskatchewan, received an MSc in agricultural marketing from the University of Alberta in 1971 and continues to maintain an active interest in his family farm near Regina.

**Philip Ehrensaft** is a sociologist at l'Université du Québec à Montréal. His research focuses on economic and social restructuring in rural regions, local development policy and program evaluation.



**AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL  
RESTRUCTURING GROUP**

---

**WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED ABOUT RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
STRATEGIES?**

**Harold Baker**, University of Saskatchewan  
**Teresa MacNeil**, Nova Scotia Council of Higher Education

Harold Baker reported on his research of multi-community collaboration in the U.S. and in Europe. He identified 12 guiding principles which lead to successful collaboration among communities. A brief review of the 12 points follows. First, the communities must have a reason to collaborate and, second, they must see the benefits to collaboration beyond strictly financial incentives or rewards. Third, there must be time for the process to evolve. Fourth, the best collaborative projects involve communities of similar size which recognize the importance of each of the participating communities. Fifth, the project needs a sound funding base which frees the process of a central worry. Six, local governments tend to be a weak member of the collaborative effort, and questions arise as to how to involve them. Seven, shared leadership is key to these projects, as is initiating leadership development in a timely manner. Eight, there seems to be a crucial point in each collaborative process for bringing staff support on board. Recognizing this and implementing it is important. External support systems, designing win-win strategies and celebrating successes are the last three elements of successful multi-community collaboration.

Teresa MacNeil was the second presenter, and she argued that the government's approach to regional development has moved in the last few years from one of rigid, hierarchical programs to one of more flexibility for local areas, allowing for the decentralization of responsibility to the local community. Having said this, she outlined six elements that are still needed for effective community development. First, legislation is needed which, through the political process, will encourage local development. Second, people must be encouraged to participate. Third, on-going consultative systems must be built into the process. Fourth, development programs must be educative. Fifth, development programs must strengthen local institutions such as churches and cooperatives. Six, development must encompass all systems, weaving in social aspects as well as economic ones. She stated that communities and groups do not typically choose to join partnerships but are forced to. There are basic fears of losing ground and turf issues that are ever present. She illustrated this with an example of a recently formed coastal communities network of fisheries which organized a three-day conference about shared community issues. Nothing has yet come of the initial efforts, and the question remains as to whether the group will survive.

Discussion groups were then formed to address the question of what we have learned about rural development strategies. A clear message from the discussions was that learning and education, in and for the community, are key in order to get people talking about their communities. A process is needed which encourages all people and groups with different approaches to get involved, and which draws and develops leadership from the community. Good quality people are often overlooked. People with business sense are needed as well as those with a solid, community-level sense. Some discussion groups felt that governmental support through transfer payments takes away people's incentive and is detrimental to development strategies. Everyone agreed that the top-down strategy does not work. The top and bottom levels must be brought together. In this manner, accountability and the community process can be better merged. One group said that a process of reeducation is needed so that people can begin to think about what a new economic future would look like. At the governmental levels, re-education about what "success" means is, therefore, necessary. Finally, communities thinking about what we can do for ourselves is critical.

Session chaired by **Gary Davidson**, Huron County Planning and Development

## WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED ABOUT RURAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES?

Harold Baker, University of Saskatchewan

In examining both old and existing programs and strategies used by governments and enterprises for economic development and job creation, one might conclude that we have **learned** the following (though consensus might be difficult to attain):

- Learned:** That sustainable development calls for continuous human capacity building.  
**Implications:** Adult education must become much more systematic and better grounded in the community development process (learning integrated with community action), with considerable emphasis on leadership and managerial development.
- Learned:** Development happens best as an effort planned at community and micro-regional levels. Top-down development is too often ineffective.  
**Implications:** Planning at community and micro-regional levels should be integrated with that of larger jurisdictions. Central governments and other central organizations play a facilitative and supportive role rather than a sponsoring one.
- Learned:** That programs that encourage the continuous exploitation of primary resources may be viable for relatively short periods.  
**Implications:** Programs must retain our fish, wild life, forest and soil resources.
- Learned:** Production activities in the primary sector provide an insufficient base for rural development.  
**Implications:** Much more attention must be given to the marketing and consumption functions as well as to national and international connections.
- Learned:** That both megaprojects and single product enterprises (single industry communities and monoculture agronomic enterprises) have serious limitations in sustainable development.  
**Implications:** We should continuously work at diversification as a key rural development strategy.
- Learned:** That centrally-sponsored public programs and community-based programs at all levels should be integrated.  
**Implications:** New paradigms in development planning are called for, an improved interface between government and community levels is essential, and there must be a reduction in the financial "seduction" tendencies of governments in fostering development efforts.

7. **Learned:** Single community efforts in development have severe limitations; a critical mass is required involving people, leadership, tax base and so on. At the same time, the concept of growth-centre theory is in some question, especially if the growth centre is metropolitan in nature.  
**Implications:** Much more attention must be given to networking, collaborating and partnering processes, especially in leadership development. The growth centre concept calls for further refinement to ensure its viability for rural areas.
8. **Learned:** Due to their short tenure as development disciplines and their relative under-funding, the social sciences and humanities are underrated as a basis for rural development planning. As yet, they have limited guidance to offer rural development leaders.  
**Implications:** A much improved balance in funding between the physical and biological sciences and the social sciences and humanities is called for in public policy.
9. **Learned:** Communications' technology holds the promise of speeding up development efforts in numerous ways.  
**Implications:** More research is required to determine its more valuable functions.

## **BUILDING MULTI-COMMUNITY RURAL DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIPS**

**Teresa MacNeil**, Nova Scotia Council for Higher Education

The paper provides (1) a brief outline and analysis of some of the major approaches to regional development and then (2) presents some conclusions about what we have learned from these approaches. It concludes with (3) some guidelines for building multi-community rural development partnerships.

### **Development Approaches**

Thirty years of federal government development programs reveal a shift in strategies and steady movement from rather rigid programs characterized by carefully-crafted, uniform specifications, accompanied by firm regulations. The movement continues through to today's broadly-stated program goals which, by comparison, allow considerable flexibility to fit the particular circumstances of localities.

### **What We Have Learned?**

Because rhetoric tends to outstrip behaviour, it is difficult to be certain about what has in fact been learned. Following are six general points which we might reasonably claim to have learned:

1. that the political process can provide legislation of a general kind in order to lend necessary support for development initiatives;
2. that development policy can encourage people to be active in the development of their own communities;
3. that an ongoing consultative system should be undertaken through rural development agencies to determine the strengths and weaknesses of their policies/programs as they are being experienced within various rural circumstances;
4. that development programs are educative for everyone involved at every level;
5. that development strengthens local institutions so they can provide sustaining support for development initiatives;
6. that rural development is a phenomenon that encompasses all systems, not just the economic.

### **Implications for Inter-Community Partnerships**

1. Strong intercommunity collaboration requires each community as partner to be deeply committed to local transformation, to be financially strong in its own right; and, as needed, to behave in a corporatist way.
2. Vertical partnerships (e.g., a small local community related to larger, more complex entities), formed to achieve change in the local community, are unlikely to be effective without

corresponding horizontal local partnerships to work collaboratively for change with the external entities.

3. Over the long term, the prospects for lasting change are increased by highly integrated partnership which incorporates the range of public, private and neighbourhood interests within and across communities.

## **BIO-SKETCHES**

**Harold Baker** is Professor of Extension in the Extension Division at the University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon. He obtained his M.A. from the University of Wisconsin, and his Ph.D. from Cornell University. In 1990-91, he spent a sabbatical year researching multi-community collaboration in the U.S. and in Europe. He currently directs rural development programs in education and in leadership development and training.

**Teresa MacNeil** is Professor of Adult Education. She has been at St. Francis Xavier University since 1970 and has served for the last 10 years as Director of Extension of that University. She is currently on a one-year assignment to the Nova Scotia Council on Higher Education as Policy Advisor. Her recent research activities relate to the role of citizens in determining regional economic policy and practice.

Her current participation in national organizations includes: the Canadian Association for Adult Education as member of the Board and Executive Committee; the Canadian Co-operative Association as member of the Board and Chair of the Public Policy Committee; the Canadian Co-operatives Secretariat as member of the Advisory Committee to the Minister; and the Canadian Labour Force Development Board as member of the Board as appointee from the Training and Education sector.

Her association with regional economic development work includes: Chair and (for one year) Acting President of the Cape Breton Development Corporation (1985-1988); Vice Chair of Enterprise Cape Breton (1985-1988); and Chair of the Federal-Provincial Task Force on the Economy of Cape Breton, 1985.



AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL  
RESTRUCTURING GROUP

---

**WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED FROM JOB CREATION STRATEGIES?**

**Peter Sinclair**, Memorial University  
**Barry McGregor**, YMCA Enterprise Centre, Yarmouth

Peter Sinclair and Barrie MacGregor gave presentations during this session. Peter Sinclair related findings from his and Lawrence Felt's research on the Great Northern Peninsula Development Corporation in Newfoundland (GNPDC). They found that mass communication and mobilization are necessary for successful economic development. Without this, tensions that are created between private business and the community, between the GNPDC and private business, and between the GNPDC and other state organizations may not be resolvable. They found that inherent problems exist with following a strictly business/economic model for community development. Therefore, mass mobilization is necessary to ensure that the GNPDC represents the community and can survive economic crises.

Barrie MacGregor spoke from his experience working in economic and social development in Yarmouth in the last 15 years. He stated that intervention works if the community buys into the project with its money, time and resources. The YMCA Enterprise Center has found that management with objectives is a successful approach. Each time a new program is set up, the YMCA Enterprise Center "scores." But, such intervention requires that those involved get down and get their hands dirty. Real intervention produces tangible results, he stated. Programs must change and evolve to be successful, and job creation strategies, in particular, must be tied to the community. Examples of some of the successes at the YMCA Enterprise Center include: job finding clubs; chamber maids; job entry projects; the enterprise center; and business development centres. MacGregor argued that the government's use of consolidated revenue funds (CRF) for job creation was a better strategy than the present one of utilizing the Unemployment Insurance Commission (UIC) for job training.

Participants in the discussion round tables that were formed following these presentations raised a number of interesting issues. One group pointed to the importance of having representation from all parts of the community and of creating community pride and cooperation in developing job-creation strategies. Before strategies can be developed, they stated, a community evaluation of needs must take place. Another group raised the issue of linking programs. Such linkages occur when job training is customized to small groups with leaders. Another group reported that income-assistance programs mitigate against community-training programs because they lead people to look for private solutions in training, as can be seen in the example of people leaving the fisheries. This group also argued that job creation should be linked to job retention.

Session chaired by **Andrew Hornsell**, Acadia Centre for Small Business

## **IS LOCALLY CONTROLLED DEVELOPMENT POSSIBLE? THE EXPERIENCE OF THE GREAT NORTHERN PENINSULA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION**

**Lawrence F. Felt and Peter R. Sinclair, Memorial University**

Until the late 1980's, innovative, locally initiated action to combat unemployment has been rare, not only on the Northern Peninsula but throughout the province of Newfoundland as well. In this paper we examine the attempt to create a locally controlled community development corporation, the Great Northern Peninsula Development Corporation (GNPDC), as a vehicle to increase employment opportunities in the region.

CDCs inevitably confront difficult situations, and many fail to meet their objectives, whether through lack of funds, inadequate political support, the intractability of the problems they were formed to resolve, incompatible demands, inexperienced personnel or other factors. Yet the idea that impoverished groups, people who are in some sense marginalized, can mobilize resources under their own control to help themselves is powerful enough to continue to motivate people to form organizations like CDCs. In this paper, we explore how the GNPDC, which was formed in 1987, has fared as an experiment in community-controlled, regional economic development. Although some of its activities have been successful, the GNPDC has encountered serious problems that threaten its very survival. We examine three critical issues: 1) the tension between the desire to act as a flexible, private sector economic actor on the one hand and the ideology of democratic, community-controlled action on the other; 2) the conflicting interests of the GNPDC and local private entrepreneurs; and 3) competition between the GNPDC and other state or para-state organizations with broadly similar goals. The paper demonstrates that the short-term strategy to cope with the first problem, an emphasis on economic action with minimum community input, left the GNPDC vulnerable and seriously threatened as the other problems became increasingly difficult to handle. The GNPDC depended on state financial support in the short-term, but without mass mobilization on its behalf, it was in a weak position to obtain that support when opposed by local entrepreneurs and politicians who stressed private sector economic development.

We show the structural problems that confront the GNPDC and argue that mass communication and mobilization are not optional luxuries, but prime requirements in order that the GNPDC could be said truly to represent the community and to give it more hope of surviving economic crises. Our analysis is consistent with a recent study of 106 rural CDCs in North and South Dakota where the strength of local attachments and support was found to be central to the success of the CDCs in meeting their objective of expanding economic opportunities. The message is important, sociologically and practically, in so far as the GNPDC represents an important model for community economic development. This paper draws on our knowledge of the region acquired over a decade of conducting research, but, more specifically, it rests on yearly evaluation reports of the GNPDC's activities.

**AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL  
RESTRUCTURING GROUP**

---

**WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED ABOUT JOB CREATION STRATEGIES  
IN RURAL AREAS?**

**Barrie MacGregor, YMCA Enterprise Centre, Yarmouth**

**So--What have we learned?**

1. Intervention Works.
2. Communities/individuals must "buy in" for a program to work.
3. Management by objectives is okay.
4. Success depends upon hands on direct work with the community.
5. Real intervention is a public investment and generates tangible returns to the whole community.
6. Programs have to evolve and change and sometimes be terminated to remain successful.
7. Job creation cannot be an end in itself; a program must be tied to some other aspect of the community's fabric.

**Programs That Have Worked!**

1. Co-op housing
2. Mainstreet program
3. Job finding clubs
4. Job entry projects
5. Enterprise centres

**Programs That Have Not Worked.**

1. Using UIC funds for training and diminishing the CRF funds.
2. Any of the above programs if not following the principles listed above.
3. Establishment of too many economic development agencies in small communities= turf wars and inefficiency.

**BIO-SKETCHES**

**Peter Sinclair** is Professor of Sociology at Memorial University in St. John's, Nfld. He earned his M.A. at Aberdeen, and his Ph.D. at Edinburgh. His research interests are in the areas of fisheries' policy and social change in fishing areas, in the household division of labour and household economic strategies, as in regional development and inequality as well as in environmental sociology.

**Barrie MacGregor** is the Director of the YMCA of Yarmouth Enterprise Center, PEI, a training facility for prospective entrepreneurs. He is a native of Prince Edward Island, and he received his early education in Summerside, PEI. He was educated at the University of New Brunswick, at Springfield College, Massachusetts, and at Leeds University in England in the area of Health, Recreation and Physical Education. He has participated actively in many economic development projects in Yarmouth over the past ten years and has worked to implement many of the job-creation strategies sponsored by provincial and federal governments in Yarmouth over the past thirteen years.

## ANALYTICAL FIELD TRIP AND COMMUNITY DINNER

The practice of taking a local area tour evolved slowly as an important feature of the ARRG seminars and conferences. Having decided to hold our meetings in rural locations, we found it a natural extension of that principle to organize local area tours. These tours began as an adjunct to the seminars, at first occurring after the seminar was officially over. They were so informative, however, that we added them to our conferences. Last year we integrated a community theatre and supper experience with the conference and were so pleased with the result that we have finally moved to integrate a local area tour and community supper as a central feature of the conference activities.

These tours provide an opportunity for participants to see first-hand the activities and projects which are part of the local scene. They afford them a chance to speak to those who are directly engaged in those activities and to compare experiences. They have also proved to be an excellent context for discussion among conference participants as an alternative to the more formal presentations.

At Wolfville, three tours were organized. Each bus was sent to three different locations before meeting at the Port William Community Hall for dinner. Reports from each tour were provided at the dinner before we heard from several speakers from the region.

The tours visited the following locations.

### TOUR A

#### *The Tangled Gardens*

This is a fascinating small business venture started almost eight years ago by a talented woman and her husband. She harvested flowers for artistic arrangements while her husband worked as a carpenter and fine artist. Along the way, they also produced herb vinegars and jellies. This business is part of *Studio Rally*, an undertaking of Tourism Nova Scotia which promotes local artists.

#### *Sainte Famille Wines Ltd.*

This is a new local winery producing quality wines for both domestic and export markets. Susan Corkum is the owner and operator of this business venture. She is seen both in the front of the scene, marketing her product, and in the back, checking quality levels and corking the bottles. While small, this business is continuing to grow.

#### *Mermaid Theatre of Nova Scotia*

Now in its twenty-second season, the *Mermaid's* focus is on puppetry and promotion of local talent. The company incorporates its commitment to the enhancement of puppetry art in Canada. This business does not have a theatre located at its head office but travels throughout Canada, the USA, and the world.

### TOUR B

#### *Noggins, Greenwich, NS*

*Noggins* is one of the many family owned farm markets located in the Annapolis Valley. Andrew Bishop, one of the owners and operators of *Noggins*, grows a variety of crops that are sold on site or exported. In the area surrounding the farm, there are at least three other similar operations.

#### *The Weave Shed*

This cooperative craft store features the work of five local women. Other items included in the store are sold on a consignment basis. The responsibility for all aspects of the business are handled on a cooperative basis.

### *King's Produce*

This is a small business that brings together the efforts of seven local farmers. The operation provides storage and marketing for their products, making it possible for them to sell their goods throughout the Maritimes and the eastern USA. It illustrates the power of joint marketing and shared resources.

## **TOUR C**

### *Victoria Historic Inn*

The inns in the Wolfville area are splendid and offer visitors an exciting variety of experiences. The Victoria Inn epitomizes the type of inn available in the area. The restored Victorian architecture provides a setting for both lodging and fine dining.

### *Acadia Post and Beam*

This is a local manufacturer of both residential and commercial houses in the traditional post and beam construction. This business has been in operation for a number of years and has contributed immensely to the construction industry in the Annapolis Valley. It is presently exporting its product to European markets.

### *Canaan Mountain Knitwear*

Phyllis Brosius has been in operation since 1982 and has expanded on a number of occasions. She features original designs in natural fibres. Her workshop creates sweaters, jackets, mittens and hats. This small business employs a number of women who knit and finish all the sweaters. She presently markets her products to private customers in many parts of Canada and the U.S.A.

## **COMMUNITY DINNER**

The community dinner was cooked by the Port William Anglican Church Women and served by the Port William Venturers. As we arrived for the dinner, we were greeted by Rhea Smith, piping us into the Port Williams Community Hall. Before dinner, drinks were served by the Port Williams Lions Club.

After the dinner we heard from the following local people:

### **Barry Moody, Acadia University**

Professor Moody provided a brief and entertaining historical background to the Wolfville area.

### **Phyllis Broskins, Weave Shed Craft Co-op**

Ms Broskins spoke to us about her experience as a small business person in rural Nova Scotia.

### **Gord Cunningham, Cal Meadows**

Mr. Cunningham spoke about Cal Meadows, a business development project in the region.

### **Diane Casey, Casey's Lighthouse Harbour Tours**

Ms Casey outlined the circumstances which led her to begin a Harbour Tour business when the fishing and pilot business in the region declined.

### **Joe Casey, Nova Scotia MLA**

Mr. Casey entertained us with local stories and tales.



## BIO-SKETCHES

**Phyllis Broskins** is a local craftswoman and businesswoman in Wolfville, N.S. She is the owner of her own knitwear company and is co-owner of the Weave Shed Craft Co-op in Wolfville. She has been knitting since she was four years old and has been in business since 1980, selling her self-designed sweaters in Canada and in the U.S.

**Diane Casey** is the owner of Casey's Lighthouse Harbour Tours, Ltd. It is a four person business which takes people out in their boat to learn about the area and to try live scallop shucking and cooking.

**Joe Casey** is a man of many pursuits; they include working as a fisher, fish plant owner and operator, a hotel owner and operator, and a steamship pilot. He was elected to the House of Assembly in 1970 and was reelected this year for the sixth time.

**Gordon Cunningham** is the Coordinator of the Partnership Assistance for Rural Development. He works for Cal Meadows which is a non-profit organization. His project involves opening up credit for self-employed people.

**Barry Moody** is Professor of History at Acadia University. He is a local historian with expertise in various aspects of local history of the Annapolis Basin Area.

**AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL  
RESTRUCTURING GROUP**

---

**ESTABLISHING AND MAINTAINING PARTNERSHIPS FOR RURAL  
DEVELOPMENT**

**Robert Allan**, Co-op Atlantic  
**Maxine Connell**, Digby County Community Futures  
**Tim O'Neill**, Bank of Montreal  
**Jim Stanley**, Cumberland Development Authority \*  
**John Bryden**, Arkleton Trust

The first speaker, Robert Allan, reported on areas of innovation that co-operatives are currently undertaking in the Atlantic region. The co-operative system is looking within itself to provide support to new groups that want to create co-ops through the local business development councils. In addition, capital formation for co-op development is now being sought from the co-op system itself. The co-op system is also experimenting with ways to set up multi-stakeholder co-ops, ones from which both board members and, for example, employees can benefit.

The next speaker, Maxime Connell, described the current community futures' projects occurring in Digby County. She stressed the difficulty of creating good partnerships in light of the current municipal restructuring policies of government. She stated that relationships must be built with local and provincial governments and with local organizations. It is only through the community that service, partnership and leadership through empowerment can be attained.

The third speaker, Tim O'Neill, stated that bankers like himself should be included in community development projects for a number of reasons. First, bankers are not being transferred from community to community as much as they used to be and are therefore becoming more tied to their communities. Secondly, banks are making profit from small business activity now and are putting more emphasis on credit. Therefore, the focus must be on the creation of wealth in the community and must have an outward looking approach for creating new markets or finding new resources, etc.

The next speaker, Jim Stanley, described economic development projects in Cumberland County. He outlined four reasons for groups to become involved in partnerships: to get more influence, to share resources, to deal with complexity better, and to more effectively fight a common foe. At the same time, there are reasons not to enter into partnerships. He stated that they require people and groups to change. Egos must be kept in check if they are to work. He has seen the devastating effect that failed partnerships can have on people in communities; therefore, it is important to build in from the start a means to deal with conflict. Finally, benefits from partnerships may be distributed unequally to the different groups, so it is necessary to look at the benefit to the whole group.

John Bryden highlighted the dominant issues addressed in this session. He pointed to the differences identified between partnerships which are horizontal, involving local actors, and those which are vertical, involving local, provincial and governmental players. He pointed to the concern expressed by all speakers as to whether groups are actually equal in practice, and whether some are totally excluded from the process. He also pointed to the means by which the state keeps control over the process, and he questioned whether the state can be an equal partner. He brought up the issue of representative democracy

and the implications for it given the current practice of provincial governments restructuring and centralizing local governments.

Bryden also raised the issue of knowledge generation and dissemination. He made the analogy that knowledge is like business now--highly technological and not easily accessible or available to people. Though ideas exist on the local level, local people often do not know how to move forward to implement these ideas because knowledge has become a scarce resource which is monopolized. He argued that we must recreate knowledge on the local level. Finally, he addressed the dichotomy of accountability and community or local control. He stated that when creating accountability or evaluation criteria, we must remember that performance indicators change behaviour. Accountability systems will affect priorities and action, so we must be very careful when we create evaluative criteria.

\* There is no summary included for Mr. Stanley's presentation.

Session chaired by **Ken Donnelly**, Employment and Immigration Canada



## **NEW ROLES FOR CO-OPERATIVES IN RURAL DEVELOPMENT**

**Bob Allan, Co-op Atlantic**

The story of Co-op Atlantic is one of rural success and of change. Despite the recession and rural restructuring, it is the story of a rural-based business with growing sales, profits, membership and employment. It is also the story of a business that has recognized the need for major changes and innovation.

The Initiatives for Renewal, which I coordinate, is about change and innovation. It is an effort to play a pro-active role in the restructuring now taking place in Atlantic Canada. The strategies which we are developing involve new partnerships within the co-op movement. Today I will outline four of these strategies and our progress to date.

Let me begin with an overview of our existing operations. Co-op Atlantic is a widely-diversified, regional, co-operative wholesaler. It provides a variety of business services to some 161 member-owned co-operatives in the Atlantic Region and the Magdalen Islands. Co-op Atlantic is a 'partnership.' We are a 'joint venture' owned by 161 community businesses.

Co-op Atlantic has wholesale sales of more than \$418 million, while its member co-ops have sales totalling more than \$975 million. Combined, they create more than 5,000 jobs. Perhaps the most important fact is that more than 650,000 Atlantic Canadians are members of co-ops and credit unions.

Co-ops as community businesses both develop local business skills and keep capital in the community. A local board of directors oversees each co-op. More than 1,500 individuals sit on the boards of local co-ops in Atlantic Canada. Each co-op decides yearly how to use its surplus. It may choose to retain it, to invest in expanding the co-op, or to make payments to its members. In each case the funds are not exported.

It appears that the current corporate strategy of our major competitors, Irving and Sobeys, is to export profits to finance developments in New England. This is something that will not happen with co-ops because of the way they are structured. If border states were to offer us tax incentives or cheap loans, we would not even debate moving.

Since the late 1980's we have been experiencing a renewal process in which we are witnessing the rapid growth of 'emerging co-ops.' These are in the areas of housing, worker co-ops, funerals, and child-care. These emerging co-ops are being led by the next generation of co-op leaders; their average age is perhaps 35 versus 55 for leaders of established co-ops. In emerging co-ops, more of the leaders are women.

As a means to respond to these emerging co-ops and to the process of rural restructuring, the 1991 annual general meeting unanimously passed resolution 11 which contains a new mission statement and an action plan for innovation. This action plan is called the Initiatives for Renewal. The plan includes four items, which I will address today:

1. Local Co-operative Development Councils
2. Integrated Co-op Development
3. Capital Formation
4. The Stakeholder Co-op

## **Local Co-operative Development Councils**

In Atlantic Canada, 16 local co-op development councils are in various stages of formation. These councils group the existing Co-ops and Credit unions in a given region. They are the co-op equivalent of a Community Business Development Corporation. Their aim is to provide support for the development of new co-ops. This becomes a mechanism to identify opportunities for new co-op development, to do the promotional work and to provide some support.

## **Integrated Co-operative Development**

This involves using the business links between co-ops to strengthen existing and new co-ops. The object is to create a growing network of trade among co-ops through structured links and strategic alliances. Co-op Atlantic sees the potential to increasingly develop co-ops as "Network Organizations." This is occurring in Newfoundland between a community development co-op in Bell Island and City Consumers Co-op in St. John's. Co-op forums will continue to discuss innovative networking options.

## **Capital Formation**

The initiative on capital formation aims to accumulate investment capital for new co-ops and the growth of existing co-ops. The goal is to increase the co-op movement's ability to finance itself through its own institutions. One of the most exciting projects is the New Brunswick Community Bonds for Co-operatives program in which the local co-operative development councils will act as the bond agencies. Thus co-op bond agencies will tap local, successful community business expertise and make the bond program truly a community program. This is in contrast to the common pattern of community bond projects being negotiated by civil servants in the capital.

## **Stakeholder Concept**

The stakeholder concept recognizes that in co-ops there are stakeholders other than the traditional members. In a co-op, the members are the users of its services. The 'customer' is the member of a consumer co-op. The 'tenant' is the member of a housing co-op. The 'farmer' is the member of a producer co-op. However, there are other stakeholders, the major one being the employees. In the fishing and producer co-ops currently undergoing restructuring, the workers have as much at stake as, if not more than, the current members.

In stakeholder plans, co-ops have one class of membership for each type of stakeholder. The different classes may include two or more of the consumers, producers, suppliers or workers. Each class of membership has voting rights and rights to patronage dividends. The Fogo Fishing Co-op is the largest Atlantic Canada stakeholder example, and we expect to see a growing number of stakeholder co-ops. The Employee Ownership Plan in Nova Scotia is currently testing the possibility of the stakeholder concept.

## **Conclusion**

This returns us to the question: "How important is local participation in economic development?" The common road block to adopting participatory systems is an unwillingness to give up 'substantial influence.' The evidence shows "participation is more likely to produce a significant, long-lasting increase in productivity when it involves decision-making processes of substantial influence rather than consultative arrangements."

Successful co-op development requires and teaches participation. Our new approaches, such as local co-operative development councils and the stakeholder concept, will increase the levels of participation. Co-ops, while not always practising participatory styles, are designed to operate as community organizations and are rooted in democratic principles. Rural communities with successful co-ops are likely to have the participatory skills necessary to create both the organizations of the future and an economic competitive advantage.

**AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL  
RESTRUCTURING GROUP**

---

**ESTABLISHING AND MAINTAINING PARTNERSHIPS FOR RURAL  
DEVELOPMENT**

**Maxine Connell, Digby County Community Futures**

The extent of my training in Community Economic Development comes from "hands on experience" as Chair of Digby County Community Futures.

There are no major solutions. What works for one area may not work for another. My personal motto is: "TRY IT." If it works, use it. If it doesn't, then try something else.

To begin, I will outline steps taken to build partnerships, elaborating briefly on a few.

I am convinced that PARTNERING is one of the most powerful forces we have to bring about economic, social and institutional change and is a key element to the success of the Community Futures program.

We use the TRIPLE "C" - communication, cooperation and coordination theory.

**Step 1:** Our strategy begins with communication through public consultation as the first ACTION taken toward building successful partnerships. This action raises community awareness and leads to cooperation in, and coordination of, local community economic development.

One of the first Community Futures Committees in Nova Scotia was established in 1987. It was not until November 1992 that a strategic plan of action was developed and implemented.

A brief history: Digby County is comprised of a diverse population of approximately 28,000 which includes the Town of 2,500. The Town of Digby, which itself has a mixed population, is flanked on either side by an anglo-phone and franco-phone population, in addition, there is a black community and a relatively small native population in the area.

Our main industries are fishing, tourism and forestry.

Each of the two major municipalities has its own Economic Development organization, further hampered by internal divisions of responsibility.

We are pleased, therefore, to have overcome this inherent difficult context and become one of Nova Scotia's success stories in partnerships for local development.

**Step 2** From the public consultation sessions, and through compiling our strategic action plan, we proceeded to lay the ground work. This action was achieved through workshops conducted county-wide - by area, by sector, by interest and by business - AND with our three municipal units.

From this process evolved two main priorities of concern: 1. business and 2. education and training.

The process of developing the plan integrates the Community Futures Committee more fully into the community. PEOPLE, our greatest resource, now know WHO we are.

**Step 3** - We use our strategic plan of action as a workbook for committees. Sub-committee chairs "shore-up" their respective groups by writing definite mandates, selecting goals and going after these goals - ONE at a time.

**Step 4** - Now that we have established goals, how do we implement them?

In our case, the decline in the fishery and a decreasing funding formula dictated the need. The answer to the "how," then, is to form partnerships.

In October 1993, funding for a pilot Fisheries Resource Centre was running out. Some 300 clients had become confident that we were a positive initiative and could help.

We had to find the means to continue.

This entailed a labour-intensive process of six to eight months, working with multiple departments, each of which had its own administrative procedures and time frames.

On February 28, 1993 we were successful. This success we attribute to:

1. identification of need;
2. conviction that we could effect change prior to attempting "to sell" to other partners;
3. recognition of a common goal;
4. selection of proper partners;
5. agreement on how to reach that goal;
6. becoming organized ourselves;
7. bringing our resources to the table;
8. requiring a measure of performance and accountability for resources used.

Simply put - "run a tight ship."

This partnership is our largest to date with a specific, broad mandate: to provide training and skills development; to support efforts to increase the value-added concept; to consult and to refer to other agencies; and to assist those desirous of leaving the traditional fishery.

Our most recent partnership came about in early spring, just prior to the provincial election, when aquaculture cages were "pushed down from on high" and the fishing community nearly went wild. Cages were hauled out and operations halted.

The glaring need became most apparent, and in September an aquaculture symposium was needed to set out ideas, concerns, opinions and proposals with the objective of increasing understanding of all concerned as a first step in working toward a consensus on the issues and how to address them.

## Other partnerships

**"I want to be a Millionaire"** involved students from Grades 6-12, aged 11-16, who, as young entrepreneurs, were given seed money to experience setting up and running their own businesses.

**Sidewalk Construction** involved mobilizing a community campaign to build a sidewalk over a new highway, so that a minority group could gain access to the community.

**Sea-Sell Participation.** A linkage was established with various tourism associations which previously had been a fragmented sector. This exercise in persistence resulted in a successful county-wide representation.

**Generic Marketing and Promotion** effort with the Board of Trade made it possible to present a full county-wide promotional package.

**Provincial Heritage Designation** is now possible as a result of mobilizing local interests in lobbying the Town of Digby to adopt a municipal by-law in support of provincial heritage designation, an effort which had begun in 1985 and which had previously met with little success .

**Stay-In-School Initiative.** Successful lobby of local school boards and educators in both the anglo-phone and franco-phone districts of the County. (Two separate school systems to implement the Stay-In-School initiative.)

**Buy in Digby County.** A partnership between our Business Development Centre and Community Futures Committee consisting of a coupon booklet with the express purpose of developing local shopping habits.

**Our latest partnering effort** comes in the form of a Needs Assessment to determine the need for an Adult Learning Centre to address literacy, upgrading and life skills concerns, in addition to filling the need to make space available for community college courses and to promote the lifetime learning concept.

This very important partnership which has the possibility of changing the face of our community for generations to come evolved from hosting meetings between community leaders county-wide, councils, education school boards, Provincial Department of Community Services, concerned groups and Department of Education officials. The purpose was to search for training programs leading to long-term, year-round employment.

A partnership is **expected to come together** in the near future as a result of a submission to the Environmental Partners Fund for an eco-tourism project directly related to forestry in the Acadian district of our county.

**Our slowest moving partnership**, one which we are presently working on, involves: our three municipal units; two Industrial Commissions; local development agencies and our Business Development Centre; and the Provincial Department of Economic Development. The objective is the formation of a Development Services Board to provide development services to all elements of the community. The concept promotes the pooling of resources, talents, ideas and support services whereby all partners sit around a level playing table to make decisions.

Past and present uncertainty about municipal reform in Nova Scotia, (which is understandable) reduces incentives for potential partners to engage in any long-term planning activity.

Past action on this concept and which is to be continued, includes:

1. meetings with heads of Council, each separately;
2. meetings with our three municipal units together;
3. meetings with the Joint Expenditure Board.

Follow-up took the form of presentations and discussion with representation from the Provincial Department of Economic Development, and information sessions. Further, the Community Futures Committee hosted and helped to organize Premier Savage's 60 - of the 30-60-90. Immediately following Provincial Minister of Municipal Affairs further clarified Regional Reform issues.



**Future partnerships** looming on the horizon -

1. Fisheries Resource Centre (Funding 1994 February - 1995 February)
2. Adult Learning Centre.

To return to the steps in forming successful partnerships, we are continuing to work to build relationships with local and provincial governments as well as with organizations.

Without their direct cooperation, there is little hope of accomplishing substantive and ongoing community economic development efforts.

We will continue to conduct workshops, training programs and information sessions, and to invite councils, Community Economic Development agencies, Boards of Trade, Chambers of Commerce and Business Development Centres to take part in them.

We will continue to be flexible and to get the message out there that together we can effect change!

More importantly, and not to be overlooked, is the supportive role played by our Employment and Immigration Canada consultants.

In Digby County, we are fortunate in that our consultants (Richard Deveau, Mike Bauer, Paul Innes, Mike Hayes) encourage us to move further into the community and always provide new information that can facilitate the operation of the program in the community as it becomes available. Also, they are always there for us in an advisory capacity. I see this as vitally important, a very valuable resource for our Community Futures Committee, whether it be in the formation of partnerships or in the everyday operation of our program.

In closing, service, partnership and leadership through empowerment are the essence of the development role of Community Futures Committees. Only the community can create that force.

So - let us exercise common sense and just get out there and "DO IT!"



## FACTORS ENHANCING JOINT VENTURES IN RURAL REVITALIZATION

Tim O'Neill, Senior Vice-President and Deputy Chief Economist: The Bank of Montreal

The discussion of partnership in community-based economic development, especially focused on rural restructuring, requires establishment of a broader economic context or framework. Five major trends are of critical importance: 1) the decline in relative importance (jobs and output) of resource-based industries (Canada and worldwide); 2) the largely urban orientation of services sector growth with dynamic services industry growth concentrated in large urban centres; 3) the shrinking role in the economy of governments due to privatization, deregulation and deficit/debt-related downsizing; 4) the process of freer global trade providing more opportunities for smaller, specialized firms; and 5) technological innovation, reducing communications and transportation costs and further encouraging specialized international trade.

These trends provide both challenges and opportunities for long-term growth and development in rural communities. Efforts at developing partnerships to revitalize rural economies can't proceed effectively without recognizing the consequences of these patterns. They also require a willingness to innovatively consider what joint activities are likely to be most effective, ranging from community and consultation through coordination and cooperation to full "cohabitation" (formal partnerships).

The choice of participants for joint development activities, along with the form of activity, will vary depending upon the circumstances of the community, its past experiences with joint ventures, and the quality and availability of its resources. The key is to start the process unhampered by preconception of who should/should not be included as possible private sector partners, which levels of government are appropriate/inappropriate or what institutional arrangements do/do not make sense. However, certain patterns seem to have emerged in distinguishing successful from failed attempts at community economic development.

First, the scarce commodity in smaller, at-risk communities is not access to financial resources or enthusiastic volunteers or knowledge of the range of human and physical resources available to the community. Rather the one critical component that often is in short supply is ideas and, in particular, ideas backed up with knowledge of: applicable production and marketing information; appropriate financial planning; and skills and training requirements.

Second, the most successful partnerships in community development are ones in which all the participants have a financial stake (equity) in the venture. The risk - taking entrepreneurial effort made by the community - forces it to realistically but innovatively consider the options available.

It also forces those involved in the development venture to be outward-looking in carrying out their projects - outward-looking for ideas and information, for financing and, most importantly for markets for output. A key ingredient in the wealth-creating process in any community is the expansion of markets into which its products are sold.

The role of government in community development efforts can vary, but it is typically more effective if the public sector participates rather than directs. Often, the participation is more useful if the government contribution is of infrastructure, information and/or expertise rather than direct financial involvement. One of the difficulties with public funding is that the need for accountability in the use of public funds can compromise the extent of the community control over the joint ventures.

## ESTABLISHING AND MAINTAINING PARTNERSHIPS

John Bryden, Arkleton Trust

1. Partnerships are methods of maximizing cooperation between rural development actors and minimizing or mediating conflict. Sometimes they take the form of cooperatives, and Robert Allan's examples make clear that this can be a very effective form of partnership. However, they also take other forms. Last night we heard from Professor Moody, the local historian, about the disappearance of traditional modes of collaboration and cooperation in rural communities. He raised the question as to whether and how this vacuum can be filled - local development partnerships are a new means of reinventing cooperation within communities in the modern context.
2. How are the partners selected, elected or chosen? Who are the 'stakeholders'? Are they all represented? Who decides who represents them? Are there 'excluded groups'? Are the choices made politically and with what results? It seems to me to be useful to distinguish between partnerships which are local development agencies and those which tackle particular aspects of local development such as the aquaculture groups referred to by Maxine Connell.
3. Are the partners 'equal' both in principal and practice? Robert Allan referred to the 'equal partnerships' conflict in cooperative organizations. However, as social organizations, partnerships presumably function through some kind of negotiation and bargaining. Can we be sure that this process is not dominated by one or a few of the partners? In state-local partnerships, does the state try to regain control through rules of procedure, critics, selection of partners, finance, etc.? Such questions are the stuff of social science, but they are also important for the establishment and maintenance of partnerships, and they result in terms of cooperation and coordination. Jim Stanley referred to his experience of excellent cooperation from funding agencies and maybe our fears here are justified.
4. What differences do partnerships make both to the "big picture" and to the "small picture" in terms of rural development agendas? It seems to me that we are seeing new agendas emerging at local levels. For example, we are hearing not just about support for individual business and decent job creation, but also about joint things and projects which are not directly (in conventional terms) 'economic.' For example, Bob referred to 'childcare,' and others to village renewal, joint promoters and marketing of localities as products, group labelling and sign posting, venture capital for micro-enterprise, cooperatives amongst craftworkers and farmers. We are also hearing about the ability to deal with locally specific problems at local levels (aquaculture, tourism, fishing).
5. 'Partnershiping' does not stop at the Local Development Agency. Jim referred to 50 different partnerships in Cumberland. Cooperation is essential at all levels if 'bottom-up' development is to be a reality - and I mean cooperation, and not only (or necessarily) cooperatives - and joint goals are to be realized. We had the example yesterday of the company set up by eight vegetable

farmers, resulting in considerable diversification of their production and expansion of their sales and market penetration. We had the example of the apple farmers with direct marketing who wanted to get others to cooperate over signposting, and the example of the craft workers who cooperated to sell their own and other local craft produce.

6. Partnerships and participation. Maxine Connell stressed the 'three C's.' Until recently, 'participation' was often viewed cynically by some people including local authorities. We are seeing new approaches to partnerships and participation.
7. Relations between local development agency partnerships and local government. This seems to be a problem area. I sometimes sense a strong dissatisfaction with local government and often not without reason. Yet local government is supposed to be democratically representative; if we are not careful, we will lose local levels of democracy by default. If they are not functioning, then we should ask why and what needs to be reformed. I was glad to note a very realistic approach to getting municipalities involved. We have a residual concern about underlying attitudes and problems here.
8. "Empowerment." There seem to be at least two aspects of empowerment arising from the presentations. The first concerns institutional change. Jim referred to the increasing ability to influence the levers of change. The second concerns the generation, control and dissemination of knowledge. Tim O'Neill referred to this as a scarce resource and I think he is right. There are often very good ideas at local levels, but transfer of idea into action is hampered by lack of relevant and accessible knowledge. This raises questions about knowledge systems for rural development.
9. Tim also mentioned important benefits from partnerships related to the sharing of resources and the influence of understanding of change, new alternatives, etc.
10. Evaluator and Performance Indicators (PI). Evaluation is important and was mentioned by a number of speakers. Jim referred to the pressure from funders for PIs. However, the selection of PIs alters behaviour and can affect both priorities and actions. Great care is therefore needed in decisions about, and use of, PIs.
11. Economic Context. I have heard Tim O'Neill on this before, and he was good value then too! Yes, we are all concerned about the future of natural resource industries and the concentration of high-value service sector growth in and around cities. However, at the risk of slight exaggeration, there are few places with no opportunities, only those without vision. To put this another way, there is always, in principle, some good or service in which a locality has a cooperative advantage. The challenge is to discover what this is, how it is changing and why as well as to have the institutions, knowledge and levers of power to make change and exploit it. Local development partnerships, in principle, provide the means whereby this can be done. Recently in S.W. Scotland, I had an interesting experience of this issue with young people (school age 16/17), almost all of whom had a very negative vision of future possibilities in their own locality and could think only of getting as far away as possible from it when they left school. After a couple of days of hearing both about how things were elsewhere and from local entrepreneurs who had returned to exploit alternatives and of working together, they had a different view. This basis of 'partnership' - involving the young and their leaders - is also important.
12. I have been very excited by all the examples and experiences of partnerships being generated and shared here, despite the problem raised by Teresa and Jim. We also have examples and

experiences on the other side of the Atlantic, and I believe that it is very fruitful to exchange experiences on such new approaches.

## BIO-SKETCHES

**Robert Allan** is co-ordinator of Initiatives for Renewal at Co-op Atlantic in Moncton, N.B. His work involves coordinating the renewal process of co-ops to facilitate their on-going development through capital formation and stakeholder initiatives. He earned his M.B.A. from McGill. From 1985 to 1992, he worked as a consultant to emerging co-ops such as organic industry co-ops, worker co-ops and university co-ops. He specialized in start-up work and turn around management. He also helped facilitate co-op creation internationally, in New Guinea and Indonesia, for example.

**Maxine Connell** is currently chair of Digby County Community Futures. She has held the position for two years and acts as a coordinator and administrator of the office. In her overseeing capacity, she has been actively involved in Digby County Community Futures' recent projects. First, the group has begun to form a partnership with the provincial government Department of Education to create an Adult Learning Center. Secondly, it is conducting research on how literacy impacts on community economic development in order to write a manual on how to promote literacy in the rural area.

Prior to her position at Digby, she ran in the provincial election for the PC but was defeated. For 15 years prior to 1988 when she retired, she and her husband owned and managed a hotel accommodation business. Prior to this, she held a number of positions in office work and in accounting. She also attended the Nova Scotia Arts and Design school and was a teacher for a number of years. She has always been a very active member of the community, serving on numerous boards and working within the church. She always chose to involve herself in community work depending on the needs identified by her children's experience as they were growing up.

**Tim O'Neill** joined the Bank of Montreal in 1993. Prior to joining the Bank, he held the position of President of the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council from 1988 to 1993. For 12 years before that, he taught in the Department of Economics at St. Mary's University in Halifax and has also taught at the University of Prince Edward Island. He has been a consultant to governments of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island as well as to several Canadian federal government departments. Dr. O'Neill is a native of Sydney, N.S. He received his B.A. degree (with Honours) at St. Francis Xavier University, his M.A. at the University of British Columbia, and his Ph.D. at Duke University, North Carolina. His academic awards include the Mackenzie King Scholarship and the Donner Foundation.

In his teaching, research and consulting activities, Dr. O'Neill has focused extensively on the structure and performance of the Canadian economy. Areas covered in his publications have ranged from examination of key primary sectors and processing/manufacturing activities to examination of broader themes such as the employment effects of technological change, the role of local community economic development initiatives and the economic impact of illiteracy.

Dr. O'Neill's current professional associations include the Canadian Economics Association, the Institute of Public Affairs of Canada and the Regional Studies Association. He is Director of both the Canadian Association for Business Economics and the Canadian Foundation for Economic Education, is a member of the National Statistics Council and serves on the Board of Governors of the University College of Cape Breton.

**Jim Stanley** is Executive Director of the Cumberland Development Authority located in Amherst, Nova Scotia. This is the lead agency for sustaining the pilot local economic development program established for the Cumberland Region of Nova Scotia. Prior to his current work, he worked with the Environmental Education Program of the Nova Scotia Teachers' College (1970-1975), with the Maritime Resource Management Service Inc. (1978-1988), in a Study Team for the Neilsen Task Force in Ottawa



(1976-1978), developing a natural resources management agreement between Canada and Thailand (1988), and initiating the Cumberland Futures Committee (1986-1988).

**John Bryden** obtained a B.Sc. (Hons) in Political Economy and Agricultural Economics at the University of Glasgow in 1965. He continued studies at the University of the West Indies where he held a post-graduate studentship 1965-1966. In 1973 he was awarded a Ph.D. in Development Economics from the University of East Anglia. He is currently Research Director of the Arkleton Trust, Scotland. The research is designed with two objectives in mind: 1) to study new approaches to rural development and education; and 2) to bring academics, practitioners and policy workers into closer contact. His current research involves a longitudinal study of 7,000 farm households. He is also involved with examining the successes and failures in bottom-up rural development and rural change issues.



**AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL  
RESTRUCTURING GROUP**

---

**ESTABLISHING AND MAINTAINING PARTNERSHIPS FOR RURAL  
JOB CREATION**

**Fraser Hunter**, InRich Business Development Centre  
**Lavern Sorgaard**, Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties  
**Robert Greenwood**, Economic Recovery Commission  
**Chief Douglas Brooks**, MicMac Maliseet Development Corp. \*

Fraser Hunter of InRich in Inverness County began this session with comments about the rural sector. He stated that there is a need for restructuring in rural areas so that the primary producer receives a return on the product commensurate with the time and money invested in that product. He argued that rural areas will be sustainable in an on-going manner only through agriculture, forestry and fishing. Tourism provides jobs that are too low paying, and too much must be invested in this sector for the low return it yields in economic development for communities. He argued for socio-economic development, not just economic development. Jobs which allow for the integration of family and work rather than for the segmentation of the two provide for good socio-economic development. As a farmer himself, he stated that family farming allows parents to see their children at breakfast, lunch and dinner. He asks what other jobs allow such family integration.

He then discussed the work he does as director of InRich. InRich is located on Cape Breton Island and covers 300 square kilometres with a population of 32,000. The area has been deeply affected by the downturn in the fisheries. The Business Development Centre of InRich provides technical advice and loans to people in the area. By means of its partnership with CEIC, InRich has partnerships through loans with 130 individuals. While the area that InRich covers is served by 17 quasi-governmental agencies with which it has associations, it has legal binding agreements only with CEIC and with the 130 people receiving its loans. Hunter feels strongly that 17 groups serving the area is far too many, causing problems of duplication of service and turf battles.

Lavern Sorgaard of the Association of Municipal Districts and Counties spoke next about the health care system in Alberta. He is chairman of the 400-bed hospital facility. It is experiencing serious health care cuts. In this year alone, the hospital has experienced the fourth cut in its budget. Alberta has recently closed 52 hospitals, mostly in rural areas. Given the cuts and the threats of regionalization, Mr. Sorgaard stressed the importance of effective rural emergency services staffed by volunteers or professionals. He personally helped create an advanced life-support ambulance service in the area. It was created through a partnership of five municipalities. The ambulance paramedics are now training people in other rural areas in emergency assistance. Collaboration is working despite initial difficulties of intransigence on the part of the six unions representing workers in the hospital. Mr. Sorgaard stated that good quality health care should be guaranteed for all rural people. This will occur if turf barriers are removed and skilled, multi-task people are involved.

In his comments, Robert Greenwood of the Economic Recovery Commission stressed the importance of including unions in revising community economic development. He has been involved with the Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Municipalities and is witnessing members becoming involved in a gradual process of talking with one another about political and economic development.

\* Chief Brooks was unable to attend due to illness.

Session chaired by **Mike Grace**, Employment and Immigration Canada

## **AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL RESTRUCTURING GROUP**

---

### **PARTNERSHIPS FOR JOB CREATION**

**Fraser Hunter, InRich Business Development Centre**

With respect to its role in job creation, InRich is not in any form of legal partnership with any agency or government department other than CEIC. InRich does not create jobs; it acts as a catalyst in aiding and abetting individuals who wish to start a business and thereafter create jobs.

InRich's service area has as its mainstay industries farming, fishing and forestry with supplementary seasonal income from tourism. In many instances, a combination of income from all industries produces a rural income for an individual and his/her family.

Partnerships (legal) must be created between agencies and within government departments, provincially, federally and municipally in order

1. to avoid duplication;
2. to provide a perception of organization;
3. to facilitate socio-economic development;
4. to ease the life of individuals in business when dealing with Government;
5. to create network hubs.

InRich is a legal partner with its loan clients.

Partnerships may work and will work, but one must remember that one does give up some control when one is a partner. With a common vision/goal, though, success can be achieved more easily with a partner.

## PARTNERSHIPS IN PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

Lavern Sorgaard, County of Grand Prairie

It is an honour to be asked to speak to the ARRG again. I was asked to speak on my health concerns for rural Canada and what is happening during the restructuring that our country is undergoing.

Every province is undergoing changes and restructuring; every government seems to be groping for formulas and plans for action to cut dollars.

We face a real dilemma: can we afford the layoffs? Can we just throw away the skills and knowledge that these people have? The moral and social impact will affect every community and person, and I have no doubt but that the rurals will be impacted the most.

The small rural hospitals' role has changed drastically and must change and adapt, but so must the professionals and unions. We cannot afford the turf protection of today. In the U.S., we are starting to see skilled, multi-task workers in some of the rural hospitals and this arrangement works.

With today's technology, trained ambulance personnel can revive, stabilize and transport people safely. The problem is we have large areas with mediocre service because of costs, community priorities and the lack of trained manpower, volunteer or otherwise.

The Province of Alberta has a new, excellent training program that is built on a stepping stone curriculum starting at the volunteer level. The Province subsidizes this program which is provided in the various communities.

We must strive to make sure our rural areas have protection; that is where the most dangerous of all primary industries is located.

Next I want to point out another concern in Canada. We have a relatively young country with 11% of our population over 65, a large percentage of which live in rural areas. Those 65 and over own 66% of our wealth and are the most heavily subsidized group in the health care industry. Since I have become a senior citizen, I have been amazed at all the benefits available to me, ranging from tax benefits through health, transportation, food, merchandise, etc. These are all things someone else must pay for.

In the U.S., in 1960 less than 1% of the population was over 85. By 1990, this had risen to 3%, and by the year 2000 it will be over 4.6%. It is estimated the U.S. Treasury spent \$51 billion on health [in 1990] for the population over 80 years old.

Sweden has had old age pension since 1913. Now that country feels it may have to raise the age at which its citizens start to receive a pension to 66 years because 18% of the population is over 65. The way in which this country looked after its aged has had a real impact on its financial crisis today. All of this has happened because of the advances of social conditions and the modern health care we have enjoyed. Differences within the elderly population have become so marked it is not possible to treat us seniors as a single category; we are spread over a 35 year age difference. The fact that we have areas in rural Canada with over 30% seniors is a challenge for ARRG to look at when we are looking at restructuring health and job opportunities in rural Canada.

Because I am a Municipal Councillor, I must also comment on the role of municipalities in development. Several speakers here have had very little good to say about municipal involvement in economic development. We are talking partnerships. If your municipality has not got economic development as a priority, then it is up to you as citizens to see to it that you get Councillors with the emphatic vision to see jobs and wealth creation as the pillars for a stable community.

Municipal government has been the most stable government we have had in Canada, probably because political lines have not been a factor. We must encourage our municipalities to create a favourable environment for our entrepreneurs by eliminating bureaucracy and unnecessary stumbling blocks.

In closing, I congratulate the organizers of this conference for an excellent forum for diverse people who otherwise do not have the opportunity to share views that ultimately bring forth solutions that can enrich the lives of our rural Canadians.

# **BUILDING TRUST IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT: MUNICIPAL- RURAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION COOPERATION IN NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR**

**Dr. Robert Greenwood, Memorial University and ERC**

Establishing and maintaining partnerships for rural development require recognition of shared goals and complementary resources, but processes must allow for trust to be established between partnering groups before proceeding to tangible job-creation initiatives. Economic development is an inherently political process, involving decisions over sometimes conflicting possible futures. Individual communities, community-based organizations and private sector firms - not to mention federal and provincial government development agencies - often recognize their individual weaknesses but are unaccustomed to working together systematically. Initial cooperative ventures should allow for a gradual building of trust through relatively non-threatening activities. Once individuals and groups are accustomed to working together, areas of common interest can be explored more openly, allowing a division of labour and projects in more concrete economic development activities.

This approach has been taken over the past two years in a partnership process involving the Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Municipalities (NLFM) and the Newfoundland and Labrador Rural Development Council (NLRDC). These umbrella organizations, representing municipal governments and Rural Development Associations, have traditionally operated in isolation. With an increased interest by municipalities in economic development, however, the two umbrella organizations formed a joint economic development committee to explore potential cooperative efforts. The first tangible outcome from this process was a joint economic development conference, held in June 1993, attended by representatives of all types of development groups throughout the province. Organizing the joint conference constituted a joint project in itself. This built trust between the two organizations and their members while exploring the potential for further cooperative processes on the local level.

## BIO-SKETCHES

**Fraser Hunter** is currently director of the InRich Business Development Center in Inverness, Cape Breton. He immigrated to Canada from the U.K. in 1978 and worked for the 10 years prior to joining InRich at the Cape Breton Development Corporation in agriculture and land use development. In the U.K., he was involved in agriculture, managing beef and sheep farms. He attended the Agricultural College in Essex and lectured at the Northumberland College of Agriculture. In 1990, he and his wife attained their goal of buying a dairy farm in Cape Breton.

**Lavern Sorgaard** is County Councillor of the County of Grand Prairie, Alberta, and Chairman of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital which is a 400 bed facility. He is also a grain farmer on the homestead that his father started in 1913. Through working in the oil fields and in home construction he graduated from the school of hard knocks. He has also worked as a School Trustee for the County of Grand Prairie. He is now semi-retired.

**Dr. Robert Greenwood** holds a joint appointment as an Assistant Professor, Faculty of Business Administration, Memorial University of Newfoundland, and Senior Consultant, Economic Planning and Development, Economic Recovery Commission (ERC), Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. He received his Ph.D. in Industrial and Business Studies from the University of Warwick in 1991, with the thesis "The Local State and Economic Development in Peripheral Regions: A Comparative Study of Newfoundland and Northern Norway." He teaches courses on "Small Enterprise and Regional Development" and "Business-Government Relations." He has published articles and cases on small business networks and globalization, entrepreneurship development, and community development. His forthcoming book entitled Lessons for the Edge: Local Development in Newfoundland and Northern Norway is to be published by the Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial University.

At the ERC, Dr. Greenwood has facilitated a partnership process between municipalities and rural development associations and consults on regional development and small business policy. He offers workshops on 'Structures and Strategies for Local Development,' and delivers the Community Futures 'Community Economic Development and Strategic Planning' training program.



**AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL  
RESTRUCTURING GROUP**

---

**WORKSHOPS: STRATEGIES FOR LOCAL PROBLEM SOLVING**

**Workshop 1: Creating Partnerships Between Communities**

**Facilitator: Harold Baker, University of Saskatchewan**

Multicommunity collaboration is normally undertaken to achieve something no partner community is able to achieve working on its own. Also, by working together, smaller communities can compete more effectively with jurisdictions around them such as a large city or another region. The principles outlined below were formulated through consultation with community leaders and community specialists working with multicommunity clusters in the United States and Europe.

1. There is a clear and important reason for communities to become partners in collaboration.
2. Benefits from collaboration are identified and appreciated by all community partners.
3. Adequate orientation and time exist for planning the collaborative arrangement and the related development program.
4. There are reasonable boundaries relating to the development interests of the area.
5. There is a sound funding base.
6. Support from local government officials is established early in the multicommunity collaboration process.
7. There is a concerted effort to share leadership among the community partners.
8. There is an adequate arrangement for staff support.
9. Leadership training is viewed as an essential and ongoing part of the collaborative effort.
10. External support systems (governments, educational institutions, consultants, etc.) play an essential but temporary or periodic role.
11. "Win/win" strategies/results are emphasized in dealing with issues/problems/needs/opportunities.
12. Following evaluation, successes are celebrated and failures are a source of learning.

**Summary of Discussion in Workshop #1: Creating Partnerships Between Communities**

Our workshop group divided into two sub-groups of six individuals to identify the problems associated with creating partnerships between communities and to find solutions. Together we identified twelve problems, and we have suggested one or more solutions for several of the problems. However, time did not permit us to respond in a comprehensive manner.

In discussing what policies would contribute to the solution of these problems, our participants did not seem inclined to suggest specific policies in response to the solutions suggested. Rather, most people stressed problems associated with governments setting policies. In essence, the suggestions centred around three themes. First, rural leaders should become empowered and establish their own policies, for example in determining how and when to invest their financial resources. Secondly, governments should consult with rural people when setting their policies, and thirdly, governments should be flexible enough to allow rural people to adapt policies to their specific circumstances.

Examples of general workshop ideas also included:

- a basic problem is overcoming the resistance to change;
- we need greater capacity for visioning;
- central government consultation should not be confused with community development;
- central policies should foster the community development process.

## **Workshop 2: Establishing Partnerships with Government**

**Facilitator: Dennis MacDonald, Human Resources and Labour Canada**

Critical Questions:

- What are the crucial problems relating to the theme?
- How can these problems be solved?
- What policies would contribute to the solution of these problems?

Some introductory remarks to, perhaps, set context and trigger discussion:

- Government: Federal, provincial and municipal
- What do we mean by "partnerships?" Do we really mean "partnering" or a "working relationship"?
- Let's come out of here with action-oriented conclusions
- Crucial "problems."

"Who" is government: an individual, an MP, MPP or Minister, a local office, a department? How does one pin down the individual, authority, will and accountability and set of agreed actions or outcomes (departmental, interdepartmental, intergovernmental; political, ministerial, bureaucratic, public servant)?

Language, culture (both partners)

- How solved?

"Have your act together" - people consensus, critical mass, information, intelligence, expectations.

Capitalize on timing-will and resources.

Reward and reinforce, examples.

Don't assume immediate congruence between words and behaviour/action.

- Policies to contribute to solution:

Policies exist.

Translate rhetoric into policies.

Translate into actions, projects, examples.

## **Summary of Discussion in Workshop #2: Establishing Partnerships with Government**

The workshop was introduced by Dennis MacDonald who delineated his position on the requirements for successful partnerships: a clear articulation of the conditions of the relationship; reference to how outcomes are to be achieved; agreement between equals "of some sort"; mutual benefit and mutual risk; mutual adherence to the conditions of agreement; and mutually agreed upon means to change conditions. He suggested that we know more than we credit ourselves with knowing that the challenge for CED practitioners and ARRG is to translate this knowledge into action.

The discussion revealed a great deal about this knowledge, but no consensus emerged to direct the action clearly in the form of proposed solutions or policies. It did establish the need for rigour in defining

and evaluating partnerships but without confining what are to be considered "partnerships" too narrowly. Some workshop members expressed a concern with defining partnerships so narrowly that some partnering relationships are excluded which may actually be very successful, but which have quite different conditions or a combination of conditions than those that were delineated by Dennis MacDonald.

Defining who was to be considered "the community" and who was "government" was also seen to be multi-faceted, as different community groups exist and federal and provincial agencies have independent relationships with community groups. Greater local autonomy, including in training and in democratic accountability, was seen as crucial for community groups.

## **Workshop 3: Creating Partnerships for New Business**

**Facilitator: Janet Eaton, J.M. Eaton Associates**

### **Summary of Discussion in Workshop #3: Creating Partnerships for New Business**

Discussed global forces impacting on creating context for new business development:

- emergence of trading blocks, international forces shifting control away from nation; e.g., NAFTA;
- technology as driver of change;
- global economic restructuring emergence; e.g., newly industrialized countries, decline of primary resource, manufacturing sector in North America;
- emphasis on new economy, new engines of economic growth;
- emergence of small business as greater source of new jobs; response to downsizing; demise of primary resource and manufacturing.

National Factors:

- rural urban shift;
- depletion of fish stocks;
- dismantling of traditional transportation infrastructure;
- emphasis on information highways to ensure competitiveness;
- government restructuring; reduction of spending, devolving responsibility, little money;
- low growth rate, less to distribute;
- environmental concerns-green plan; animal rights, food safety, socio-political correctness.

Considerations re. new business:

- various modes of business; e.g., self-employment, incorporated, CDC's, co-ops;
- various target groups; e.g., youth, women, unemployed general population.

Due to the diversity of group members (from different parts of the country, some from sectoral perspectives; e.g., agriculture, natural resources, fisheries, community futures, federal policy initiatives and provincial entrepreneurial programs), it was difficult to focus the discussion. The group tried to balance a discussion of concrete programs with broader policy implications.

## Workshop 4: Creating Partnerships for Business Expansion

**Facilitator:** Chris Pelham, Acadia Centre of Small Business and Entrepreneurship

Questions to be addressed:

- What are the critical problems relating to the creation of partnerships for business expansion?
- How can these problems be solved?
- What policies would contribute to the solution of these problems?

Some thoughts for discussion:

- Much energy and effort are being spent on job creation through business start up. The creation or recreation of the entrepreneurial spirit is seen as the focus of economic recovery. Does this leave enough energy and effort to support the existing businesses, the existing entrepreneurs and to encourage job creation through expansion of existing business? Is it important for us to concentrate on expansion opportunities?
- The expansion of an existing business does not garner the same level of interest in the community as does the creation of a new entity. This is primarily due to the mentality of the CED agency and the kudos received from most funding agencies for the creation of a "statistic." The visibility of an expansion does not normally change with an expansion. A new company with two employees is more likely to receive public attention than a two-person firm expanding to four, yet the job creation effect is the same in terms of creation and likely greater in terms of stability.
- If Community Economic Development Agencies are serious about the effective utilization of community resources, the most obvious resource to be utilized is the existing business base. Any economic development strategy worth its salt will have analyzed the strengths and weaknesses of the business mix, identified the appropriate gaps and opportunities, and developed some sort of matrix marrying the two before assuming that new business creation is the appropriate course.
- Although the romance of new business far outweighs expansion, the efficiency of expansion seems evident: EXPERIENCE; MARKET CONTACTS; SUPPLIER CONTACTS; BANKABILITY; ETC.
- What about "turnarounds," job retention or maintenance through the retention of existing companies in trouble?

Who are the partners?

Strategic Planners:

Business Community:

CED Agencies:

Funding/Financing Agencies:

Education Institutions:

Sociologists

Municipal Planners

CFC type Agencies

Boards of Trade

Individual Businesses

?

BDC's

FBDB and other Crown Corps

Universities

Community Colleges

- What is the role of government? (if any)

ADVISOR?; FUNDER?; IMPLEMENTOR?

## **Summary of Discussion in Workshop #4: Creating Partnerships for Business Expansion**

In this workshop, participants discussed many problems associated with creating partnerships for business expansion. At the community level, it was argued that there is little strategic planning, despite the fact that the planners are the people who live in the community. A good business was identified as something that responds to the needs of the community and does not compete. It was noted that it is better to start new businesses rather than to expand businesses because new businesses can apply for two programs: an employees' program and the new business program. Many participants spoke of disincentives of government programs and the lack of incentives to get people to work.

## **Workshop 5: Resolving Conflicts in Partnership Arrangements**

**Facilitator: Gary Davidson, Huron County Planning and Development Department**

## **Summary of Discussion in Workshop #5: Resolving Conflicts in Partnership Arrangements**

Partnerships must explicitly recognize that conflicts will invariably exist. Indeed, the more diverse the groups involved in the process, the more likely conflict will exist over either issues, personalities or institutional domains. It is, however, this diversity that will make more likely the long-term success of the partnership. These conflicts have to be recognized, discussed openly and dealt with effectively--at all stages of the partnership process.

## **Workshop 6: Enhancing Support Networks/Mettre en valeur les réseau de support.**

**Facilitator: Rosaire Provencier, CLSC, Coaticook**

### **Stratégies pour la solution des problèmes locaux.**

Quand on parle de réseaux de support il est possible que plusieurs d'entre nous aient une compréhension très différente de ce que constitue un réseau de support. Il serait sans doute intéressant de tenter de se donner une compréhension commune de ce qu'est un réseau de support.

Habituellement, un réseau de support se caractérise par les affinités des gens qui sont reliés à ce réseau. A titre d'exemple un ensemble de personnes préoccupées par une même problématique vont souvent s'associer pour tenter de trouver une solution à leur problème. Cette solution permet généralement une meilleure réponse que la solution individuelle que chacun peut apporter à son problème. (Plusieurs fondations et/ou groupes d'entraide se sont ainsi formés).

Ces réseaux de support s'incorporent souvent comme entreprise à but non lucratif ou oeuvre charitable et se dotent d'une permanence comprenant une ou des personnes ressources et des locaux pour tenir leurs rencontres. La plupart du temps, ils ont un conseil d'administration qui est formé majoritairement de personnes directement concernées par la problématique. Ces réseaux peuvent avoir des associations provinciales, nationales et parfois internationales.

Qu'est-ce que l'impact de ces réseaux de support sur le développement d'une communauté? Dans quelle mesure l'expertise acquise par ces réseaux de support peut-elle inspirer le développement rural? Quelles sont les conséquences de l'existence de ces réseaux de support sur les individus qui y consacrent de leur temps? Est-il souhaitable de favoriser l'émergence de ces groupes de support et quel en est l'effet à long terme pour la communauté?



Tout nous porte à croire qu'il y a lieu de porter un intérêt majeur à ce type d'organisation, et que les effets pour le développement sont beaucoup plus important qu'on ne le croirait à première vue. L'impact sur les individus et les groupes nous laisse entrevoir de grandes possibilités de prise en charge des individus par eux-même et peuvent être l'occasion de beaucoup de créativité.

## **Summary of Discussion in Workshop #6: Enhancing Support Networks**

Comments included:

- networks are continually evolving; therefore, there is a need to build in awareness, capacity for change, and ongoing development of leadership skills;
- networks for community development need to take into account social as well as economic concerns;
- early critical moment in development of support network occurs when moving from support to action;
- later critical moment occurs when peer support groups or network is formalized and/or becomes accountable in some way to a larger hierarchical system.

## **Workshop 7: Community Adjustment to Economic Change**

**Facilitator: William W. Pardy, Canadian Public Service Commission**

### **The Context**

Economic change, the result of a technology and telecommunications revolution, is culminating in phenomenal challenges to individuals and communities everywhere. This is most evident and visible in underdeveloped rural areas and regions such as Atlantic Canada. Having built up expectations on the importance of resource industries, we have concluded that they are key to our survival. As such, economic shifts of the magnitude that we are experiencing are scary at best, life threatening at worst.

When you review a recent visual presentation developed by the province of Nova Scotia for its 30-60-90 process, you will find some very interesting observations. In 1911, approximately 59% of the population worked in manufacturing and resource industries (48% in the resource sectors of forestry, fishery, mining and agriculture) while in 1986 only 21% worked in these sectors (7% in the resource sectors). This indicates economic shifts and trends that have been ongoing for an extended period of time.

These figures diminish neither the economic value of resource industries nor the beneficial aspects of rural lifestyles. What they do is demonstrate that the way we gain economic benefits as individuals and as communities has dramatically changed. Thus, our thinking and understanding of the economy and its make-up have to adjust as well.

### **Change**

Change such as we are witnessing is inevitable yet is slow moving and is often-times intangible until it accumulates and causes major shifts. It is fearsome because the traditional means of activity and thinking no longer fit. The reaction is most often to resist the change and spend considerable energy and resources to maintain the status quo. We have been conditioned to try and control such shifts not take advantage of them. Systems become rigid, reaction is often volatile, and the rhetoric grows. We try and salvage what we have by trimming and cutting programs, approaches and economies rather than

re-evaluating the purpose of these efforts and their real outcomes. This trimming creates only unease and further rigidity, and ultimately generates more fear.

## **Awareness**

A better approach would entail raising awareness of what is transpiring in our economy and society. Examining the historical shifts that we have already experienced allows us to develop strategies that are more stable and transitions that are less fearful. For instance, if we were to examine the fishery over the last 50 years we would find that we have gone through several evolutions as great as that we are witnessing today both in harvesting and processing (employment statistics provide the evidence). Planning new directions will entail a number of attitudinal changes, including how we approach involving people in communication processes that will lead to alternate methods of development. But, first there is a need to get people's attention before meaningful discussions about the economy and its evolution can occur. Policy makers have to understand that economies are about people and that development evolves from aware, confident and involved citizenry. There is a necessity to create a more supportive environment that allays the fears and provides opportunity for all those who can be encouraged to participate in a process which facilitates an understanding of our present circumstance.

## **The Challenge**

The greatest challenge is in reaching people and involving them in an awareness program that creates an understanding of the relevant issues and their impacts. The development of strategies that lessen the negative aspects of change and explore opportunities that evolve from economies in transition is imperative. The creation of a communications' process that allows true reflection and sharing while providing policy makers with proper input is critical.

## **Summary of Discussion in Workshop #7: Community Adjustment to Economic Change**

Change has been happening as long as communities have been around. Communication and transportation have taken us on a road back to isolation even though we live close together. In 1911, farms, mines, fisheries, forestry and manufacturing constituted 69% of employment. Now they constitute only 7% of employment. This demonstrates that the way we gain our economic livelihood in rural areas has changed.

Some argue that high technology is supposed to be a bright light, but it is not, in fact, counteracting the loss of jobs in other sectors. Policies must change to reflect these shifts. However, change is a fearful process. There is a rush to maintain the status quo regarding human resource and support systems. Governments have gone rigid. There is an attempt to maintain the status quo by trimming and cutting rather than by looking at where we are going.

A better approach to the whole concept is to raise awareness, to look at historical shifts, and to develop strategies that are stable. Attitudinal changes involve education and awareness; they require an involved citizenry. In order to encourage citizens to become involved, it is necessary to create a more secure environment to settle their fears and to allow them to get involved and learn. It is necessary to reach out and pull people in. A communication process must be created that allows people to share and provide input to policy makers. It is also necessary to develop strategies to lessen the negative impacts which are inevitable with change. But, one must also look at the opportunities that exist.

## BIO-SKETCHES

**Gary Davidson** has worked in rural community planning and development for over twenty years. The main vantage point for this endeavour has been as a professional planner with wide ranging experience in Nova Scotia and Ontario. At present, Dr. Davidson is the Director of Planning and Development in Huron County and acts as a special policy advisor to the Ontario Minister of Agriculture and Food on matters of rural affairs. Huron County is a rural community in the agricultural heartland.

Dr. Davidson's interests have expanded beyond one based solely on practice to encompass concerns with research, teaching and the profession of community economic development. Several research projects on rural planning and development have been undertaken at the local, national and international levels. Dr. Davidson has participated in university teaching across Canada since the 1970's and at present is an Adjunct Professor at the University of Waterloo. Dr. Davidson has been active on a continuing basis with the planning profession and in 1987 was elected as the President of the Canadian Institute of Planners which represents the professional body of planners in Canada. Dr. Davidson was the first "rural planner" to hold this position. He is a Fellow of the Canadian Institute of Planners, one of only 19 in Canada to hold this position.

**Janet Eaton**, President of J.M. Eaton Associates, has a very broad background in community education, adult education, human resource development, youth education and community economic development. Her experience includes: research; teaching at a university level; workshop facilitation; program and project design and development; resource development; policy analysis; local, national and international experience in educational and community development networks; educating and training for global thinking and local action. She has a particular interest in rural development and was involved in rural women's network development some years ago. More recently, she has served in a consulting capacity in some Community Futures groups.

For the past four years, Dr. Eaton has been an Honourary Research Associate in the School of Education at Dalhousie University. Before that, she was Director for eight years of the Community Education Research and Development Program at Dalhousie. She has recently been appointed Adjunct Professor. Current initiatives there include: involvement in development of interdisciplinary research projects; teaching part-time in the graduate program; and directing one of 40 national Stay-in-School Demonstration projects in the country - Project PALS (Parents Assist Learning and Schooling). For the latter, she is researching and writing an education/training manual for parents focusing on parenting skills linked to learning, parents supporting learning at home, and parents involvement in school and community for enhancing the learning and achievement of their children.

She is a member of the Nova Scotia Labour Force Development Board and served on Nova Scotia's Voluntary Planning Board - an economic strategy team which developed the strategy "Creating Our Future." She has served as a consultant to numerous government departments at all levels.

**Dennis MacDonald** is Director of Community Development and Employment Policies at the Department of Human Resources and Labour, formerly known as Employment and Immigration Canada (EIC). He provides policy support for community futures programs and support for EIC's involvement in local economic development projects. He has been with the EIC for 27 years and has held his current position for seven years. He received an M.A. in Philosophy from Gonzaga University in Spokane, Washington.

**William W. Pardy** is presently working as a development consultant, having recently completed a two-year executive interchange with the Canadian Public Service Commission. He was engaged as the Director of Community Development with the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency (the Agency charged with regional development in the Atlantic Region of Canada). He has a 20-year background working in community and development activities which recently culminated in establishing and developing Newfoundland's first business incubator, The Venture Centre at Pasadena. While at the Venture Centre, he developed a series of initiatives utilizing video, community television and Satellite Communications.

His present involvement includes membership with the Industrial Developers Association of Canada and the National Business Incubation Association of the United States. He serves as a Member of the Western Community College's (Newfoundland) entrepreneurial advisory committee and is a member of the Province of Newfoundland's Enterprise Education Committee. He is actively involved in the Hong Kong Canada Association through its branches in Newfoundland and Nova Scotia.

**Chris Pelham** is Director of the Acadia Centre of Small Business and Entrepreneurship. He has been involved in Community Economic Development since graduating from St. Mary's University (BCOMM) in 1969. With the City of Halifax, he has been involved in the Urban Renewal, Neighbourhood Improvement Program and the Residential Rehabilitation Program. He has worked with the Heritage Canada Foundation, the Nova Scotia Main Street Program, the Community Futures Program, the Business Development Centre Program and the Board of Trade Program in Windsor/West Hants.

**Rosaire Provencier** is Director of the CLSC (Center for Local Service to the Community) in Coaticook, Quebec. He is also Chair of the Community Development Program of the CLSC, President of the Table of General Directors of the CLSC of the Eastern Township Region, and President of the CLSC Commission for the Eastern Township Region. He received his Bachelor in Sociology with a minor in Labour Relations from the University of Montreal.

**AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL  
RESTRUCTURING GROUP**

---

**POLICY DIRECTIONS FOR THE FUTURE**

**Floyd Dykeman**, Rural and Small Town Research and Studies Program

**Richard Rounds**, Rural Development Institute

**Derm English**, Nova Scotia Federation of Agriculture \*

Speakers in this session provided summaries of future policy directions which were identified in the previous session's workshops. Accessibility of information and effective training were identified as two important policy directions that governmental agencies should adopt in dealing with local areas. This would involve: leadership training; seminars on the use of technology in rural development; awareness workshops about how communities can maintain or gain self-confidence and self-esteem during this period of change; and massive information campaigns to link people seeking information with those who can provide it.

A third policy direction that many of the workshops identified was the need for a review of governmental accountability systems to ensure that local communities have more control over the development process. Community control was identified in many different ways. It means that programs are client driven, that community decision making occurs, that the purse strings are controlled more from the local level, that a transfer of power to the common citizenry occurs.

Comments during this session focused on two issues. The first set focused on the involvement of municipal government in economic development. The degree to which municipal governments are impediments to rural development was discussed as well as possible policy directions for moving intransigent municipal governments into action. The second set of comments questioned whether information is being produced that can actually be used on the local level. It was argued that academics must become aware of the type of information they are creating. Rather than imposing ideas and values on communities, researchers must focus on what people are talking about in their daily lives and this must be moulded to help them take these issues and move toward action. For example, if economic development stresses the creation of wealth-producing activities, then there needs to be a public debate about what wealth is.

\* No summary is included for Mr. English's presentation.

Session chaired by **Ray Bollman**, Statistics Canada



## **POLICY FOR THE FUTURE**

**Floyd Dykeman, Rural and Small Town Research and Studies Program**

### **Introduction**

1. Community Economic Development Characteristics:
  - bottom-up process;
  - locally driven;
  - leaders with training;
  - community self-esteem;
  - managing change;
  - conflict resolution;
  - visioning: knowing what direction you are headed;
  - partnering with others;
  - participation;
  - leveraging local resources;
  - doing more with less.
2. Problems facing rural communities:
  - reference Tim O'Neill's economic context remarks:
3. Policy: When we talk about policy we don't necessarily mean government. It means a lot of other things such as:
  - private sector;
  - educational institutes;
  - professional organizations;
  - industrial organizations;
  - labour movement.

### **Policy Issues**

What are the key policy issues?

1. How do we deliver training to the local level community development worker and bureaucrats?
  - A. What is appropriate content for training?
  - B. What are the necessary and desirable skills?
2. Information and training:
  - A. Access and dissemination: availability of government information to the greater public;
  - B. use of technology by local level communities and organizations to access this greater availability of information from the government;
  - C. through training, help local level community organizations know their information needs.
3. Control over senior government funding:

- A. accountability yes, control no;
  - B. community Development block grants: U.S.;
  - C. use performance agreements;
  - D. make better use of evaluation approaches.
4. Education and awareness:
- A. An environment must be created that will allow those affected by economic transitions to understand the changes in order to take charge of decision making and planning for their futures.
  - B. Awareness must promote the fact that you can adapt to change and still maintain self-esteem and community identity.
  - C. Values have to form the foundation for vision, and vision forms the foundation for action; therefore, we have to spend some time exploring community values which serve as a foundation for making policy choices.
  - D. Awareness and education programs must be tailored to meet lower education levels of adults and developed for the layperson to comprehend.
5. Small is beautiful: micro enterprise development!!!
- A. micro-enterprise and home-based business;
  - B. understanding of needs which leads to new programs: not just government but:
    - Chamber of Commerce;
    - business associations;
    - labour movements;
  - C. making entrepreneurship-training programs available to users who are not on UI (i.e., attending for stamps) but who are sincerely interested but due to cost or scheduling. Why not in evening? Distance ed. ?
    - Cal-Meadows Foundation provides an example of how to get cheap money without a lot of front end charges.
    - Why the need for so much capital by lending institutions? Why not sweat equity?
6. Removing barriers in order to allow women to participate in the community development process:
- A. provision of daycare services so single-parents can be freed-up to become more involved in the community development process.
7. Standardization of application forms: saves time and is more convenient.
8. One stop shopping provides a window to diverse support services: the video store example. Instead of horror and drama, you would be looking for topics such as agriculture.  
info. kiosk - like the insta-bank tellers
9. The role of educational institutes.
10. What about these other bodies: Chamber, labour, co-op etc.?  
What role policies could they be formulating themselves?
11. What are the appropriate role and responsibility of municipal governments as we move into the next century?
12. What skills do municipal officials need to fulfil these roles?  
A lot of dissatisfaction with the role of municipal government. It is to the point that groups no longer seek to involve that level of government.
13. Economic development and human resources development have to be linked for an effective return on investment.

## POLICY DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Richard C. Rounds, Rural Development Institute

Perhaps the most agreed upon message from participants at this conference is that process is as important as program in rural development. The significance of effective partnering was stressed repeatedly. The criterion of establishing a clear definition of responsibilities during both the formation and the application of programs supersedes the details of the final programs owing to the fact that all parties must "buy" in before success will be achieved. People often do not know what policies they want, but they do know that careful identification of the "actors" is essential. An improperly defined community creates unnecessary conflict because of inclusion of too many agendas. Primary distinctions center upon who constitutes "community" and who constitutes "government" within the development process.

Several speakers and two discussion groups directly or indirectly suggested that the multitude of current programs often produce less than anticipated results because senior governments are not "really buying into" the bottom-up process. This somewhat cynical view of the sincerity of government stems from the perception that two key elements in local empowerment are not being transferred to citizen groups: 1) information; and 2) fiscal resources. Of the two elements, the greatest identifiable gap occurs in the transfer of information that may be needed to formulate workable plans. Indeed, several people suggested that money is not a problem if clearly focused development projects can be defined. The credibility of government would increase considerably if representatives would openly share program purposes, procedural restraints, as well as previous successes and failures and assist people in accessing needed information.

An associated problem in vertical partnerships in development is that of identifying the "bottom" in a bottom-up process. Federal governments can be top-down to any level from provincial governments (e.g., transfer payments) to community groups (e.g., Community Futures). In turn, provincial governments can act in a top-down manner with municipal governments (e.g., financial matters) or community groups (e.g., round tables). Even within a community there may be top-down potentials from local government, powerful groups (e.g., Chambers of Commerce), or individuals who have developed dominant positions within the socio-political network. Identifying the "bottom," therefore, requires progressive empowerment throughout the vertical chain in our complex society. An insincere actor or group with vested interest may hijack the process at any level.

Solution to problems involved in transfer of information requires two actions. First, governments, universities and colleges must work together to augment extension activities needed by rural people. This may include forming new partnerships and over-coming "turf" problems and should involve modern telecommunications. Second, universities should place new emphasis on research that directly addresses all aspects of the information needs of communities. Nothing short of a massive awareness and extension program is required across Canada.

Several other significant issues were identified by workshop participants. First, people are beginning to recognize the depth of inter- and intra-governmental "turf wars" and the problems that such protectionism injects into the development process. People are becoming less tolerant of the bureaucratic hindrances that are brought into the process of rural development. Second, municipal governments often are restricted by legislation in their role within development but are powerful local forces that often are left out of the process. Their involvement is critical in the long run.

A third issue discussed was the need to further define and differentiate among community development, community consultation, rural development, business development and agricultural development. Each of these has its own agenda, procedures and mandates. Mixing the areas of development may impede progress.

Finally, many registrants agreed that partnerships may not be appropriate under all circumstances. In fact, some felt that the prerequisite of equal partners may never be reached because of the fiscal and information advantages that always favour governments. Within that context, horizontal partnerships (e.g., multicomunity collaboration) are deemed more functional than vertical partnerships.

In summary, it appears that several key elements require further attention in refining community development. First, sectoral policies should not be viewed as rural policies. Second, business development policies should encourage entrepreneurs by reducing "red tape." There may be little need for partnerships in business development. Third, community development should involve formation of horizontal partnerships when they more effectively service rural people or regions. Once horizontal partnerships are in place, vertical partnerships will be more likely to succeed. Finally, every program should have built-in periodic reviews that assess progress and long-term viability.

## BIO-SKETCHES

**Floyd Dykeman** is Director of the Rural and Small Town Research and Studies Program. He is responsible for program development, fundraising, publications, community outreach and research. He received his Masters in Planning from Queens University and his B.A. in Political Science from St. Thomas University.

**Dermot E. English** is the Executive Director of the Nova Scotia Federation of Agriculture and of the Nova Scotia Milk Producers Association. He has been involved in policy development in Nova Scotia since 1978 and before that in Ontario. He is a native of Newfoundland, completed his B.A. at St. Francis Xavier and attended the graduate program in geography at the University of Western Ontario.

**Richard C. Rounds** accepted his current position as Director of the Rural Development Institute in 1989. He served the previous 19 years at Brandon University in the Department of Geography as a natural resources and planning specialist. His training includes a B.Sc. in Biological Sciences and a M.Sc. in Earth Sciences from Illinois State and a Ph.D. in Geography from the University of Colorado. As director of RDI, he serves as both the administrator and major researcher for research projects suggested by rural constituents and governments.

**AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL  
RESTRUCTURING GROUP**

---

**SYNTHESIS**

**Peter Apedaile**, University of Alberta  
**Barbara Thompson**, West Cumberland Development Commission  
**Barbara Neis**, Memorial University

The final session of the conference raised critical issues about the conference and led to a prolonged comment and discussion period after the presentations. Peter Apedaile provided a synthesis of the partnership theme that had been identified throughout the conference. He stressed the importance of partnerships as a surrender of turf or of turf busting. Partnerships are not a first choice but a transitory strategy which should act to enrich and empower those allied members.

Barbara Thompson highlighted those critical aspects of the conference which she will take back with her to her community for their future projects. She also identified problems in the conference with regard to the lack of integration between social issues and economic development issues. For example, she missed discussion about child care, transport, services for aged parents as well as discussion about the role of the volunteer and how to keep community volunteers active and participating in an ongoing way.

Barbara Neis provided a passionate critique of the conference for its top down flavour. She argued that the conference too easily accepts a comfortable word like "partnerships" which essentially masks the manner in which those involved in economic development are engineering people's lives without actually speaking with the individuals themselves. She questioned the sincerity of those talking about "inclusive communities" when the conference itself lacked representatives from groups such as youth, trade unionists, disabled, and gays and lesbians. She argued that economic development strategists are involved with giving out charity, not with dealing with this "profound time of challenge" in a manner which would seek to address the underlying, fundamental sources of that change.

Session chaired by **Sally Shortall**, Queen's University of Belfast



## SYNTHESIS ON PARTNERSHIPS, JOBS AND COMMUNITY

Leonard (Peter) Apedaile, University of Alberta

### Setting up the main points

Every conference synthesis needs a framework. Communities are human systems relating to each other. Jobs are activities within each of the smaller subsystems which form a community. Partnerships are a particular form of relationship happening at the boundaries of systems. Partnerships form a basis for transactions between the whole community system and other human systems such as counties, municipalities, provinces, the federal government and the world economy. Partnerships are a way to fudge the jurisdictional rigidity of these relationships

Humans at work add value to other community resources. Communities have all kinds of formal and informal rules about adding and distributing this value. That is to say, community institutions govern opportunity and opportunism. Partnerships to improve the governance of economic, social and political transactions are the focus of this conference.

I want to bring together several themes which kept reappearing at this conference. The first is that partnerships involve surrender of jurisdictional authority by both partners. The second is about partnerships as democratizing arrangements. The third theme is that the type of partnership does matter because it affects property rights and access to, or denial of, economic rents. The fourth is that partnerships for purposes of change should involve all governing institutions. The fifth theme is that partnerships are not exempt from perverse predatory behaviour. Downloading and restructuring jurisdictional responsibilities can happen in partnerships. The sixth and last theme, reiterated over and over again, is that no amount of partnership can buy off people who become disengaged from jobs and economic opportunity. I will end with observations about the turf-busting opportunities in new partnerships and the problems of institutional residue in defunct partnerships.

### Surrendering authority

As Theresa MacNeil put it, partnerships are not the first choice for entertainment in a community. They mean surrendering governance over opportunity and opportunism. They are not even entertaining for senior levels of government. Surrender on their part gets caught up in the tensions between central authority and the ambitions of federalism. For junior levels of government, surrender may be interpreted as loss of autonomy and interference.

We learned that, to govern opportunism in transactions effectively, partnerships among levels of government should be transitory. Opportunism shifts gains from progress away from those who work and take risk. This opportunism shows up in many ways, for example tax grabs, politically discriminatory local development grants and adverse rural terms of trade.

A problem for communities arises when governments try to overlay permanence on partnerships, thereby freezing shifts in control over development. Economic, social and political relations across community boundaries need to be as living and dynamic as the people who make up the communities.

Efforts to make one of these types of relationships permanent disables leadership, reduces flexibility in seizing opportunity and creates room for further opportunism.

## Democratizing alliances

Standard points were raised by many who spoke about democracy in relationships. Partnerships should be democratic and at the same time enhance democratic behaviour across the broad spectrum of governance. The conditions for achieving greater democracy are remarkably like those which ensure perfect and free competition in markets -- free entry and exit, no partner powerful enough to dominate the exchanges, and perfect information. The recurring reference to democracy underscores a deep concern over the violation of these conditions in partnerships when unequally empowered jurisdictions, such as governments and large firms and communities and NGOs, come together.

Interesting observations were raised in this regard by Bob Greenwood and John Bryden in relation to education and youth. I would rephrase their points in the form of a question. Should partnerships among state/private sector/church/union/municipal and volunteer agencies in communities be instituted to keep people in the community? At issue here is the idea that job training, especially in artisan skills for in-place employment, often denies room for strategic manoeuvre by youth, not to mention the jobless. Training may run dangerously close to trapping, by reducing mobility (free entry and exit) and widening the power gap between the educated and trained (favours domination types of alliances). Training is often associated with low levels of functional literacy and numeracy (favours imperfect information). These problems with job training in the absence of education set people up for a career as prey in predatory relationships.

Escape from rural communities has always been a vision for rural youth who see their economic and social opportunities constrained. They have watched their parents for the most part labour hard without getting ahead. Even school children understand education to be a way out. School/family/business partnerships could be used to alter the coercive and often arbitrary aspects of rural life, offering instead joint learning about the opportunities in structural change. Partnerships to democratize relationships seem to be a necessary part of developing alternatives to outmigration. However, the door must also be opened wider to success in jobs elsewhere in the economy.

## Type of partnership matters

Partnerships need to go beyond surrender to sharing. The economic focus once again is human well-being. Partnerships can enhance productivity and add value by improving the sense of "partnership" in the rewards. However, partnerships must go beyond jurisdictional power-sharing to mobilize assets and provide for incomes that exceed a basic wage. Put another way, partnerships must create the basis for economic rents from talent, skill, intellectual and real property. The field trips on the first day of the conference provided evidence of just how much the rent orientation of partnership matters.

The business partnerships visited on the tours were forms of alliance which allowed partners to specialize and improve their individual cost structures by gaining access to wider and more stable demand. At the same time, these partnerships diversified the business opportunities for each partner, reducing uncertainty and allowing them to capture more of the rent contained in the value of their product by eliminating middlemen. The partnerships among female artisans, in particular, improved their flexibility to enter and exit business activity according to household circumstances.

In partnerships, intellectual property is becoming more important than real property. Partnerships are increasingly about knowledge, skills and talent, their positioning for economic enterprise and the ways people distribute the fruits of their mental effort. The challenge for modern partnerships in rural development is, thus, to improve the option of fully engaging all kinds of intellectual property in the economic life of a rural community while maintaining portability of the rent earning capability of its inhabitants.

In summary, an economic partnership improves well-being in the community when it is the type that generates entitlements to economic rents created by new markets, market power, income transfers, business security and flexibility to manoeuvre.

## **Partnerships as governing institutions**

Peter Sinclair raised the issue of partnerships in governance when he explained the traditional role of unions in communities with fish plants. His point was that unions must be brought into the development process in the same way that management is. The larger point is that in every community a number of institutions, such as unions, have been set up over the years to govern the access to resources and the sharing of the value added among the members of the community. As circumstances change, so the form of governance needs to change.

Partnerships among community institutions play two roles in a development process. First, they can rearrange the relationships among these governing institutions. For example, unions and management can become partners instead of adversaries in an economic enterprise. Second, partnerships with institutions outside the community can change the relationships that govern the economy of that community, including moving the goal posts. For example, a group of farmers, like the King produce organization in the Annapolis Valley, can partner with an off-shore distribution network leading to business expansion, although possibly at the cost of weaker community economic multipliers.

Governance of economic and social transactions in a community can be enhanced by partnerships which make more room for mutual interest to emerge between employers and employees. The trick is to maintain the interest of job holders in their work, the interest of investors in re-investing and their joint interest in keeping people employed. Whenever partnerships are considered as one of the strategies for development, their potential to alter the governance of and enhance perceptions of mutual interest in community activities and relationships should be well understood.

## **Partnerships as predation**

Partnerships have been alluded to already as being quite naturally another form of predator-prey arrangement in community relationships. I contend that transactions among humans always involve an element of predation in the efforts of the parties to maximize the outcome for themselves. Consider the four themes summarized so far. They are all about predation. Recall that these themes are: surrendering authority, democratization, relation to economic entitlements, and participation in governance (setting the rules). Partnerships may result in predatory when they provide for greater mutualism in transactions. Partnerships offer great opportunity for win/win outcomes.

Partnerships may also intensify predation, worsening conditions for the prey half of a partnership. The example given by Phil Ehrensaft on the opening night was down loading responsibility for social services and the maintenance of infrastructure without also downloading the tax base. Partnerships among levels of government are part of a process in which public goods and services are in search of both a lost tax base and a readjustment of standards and quality of service. Nevertheless, predatory behaviour by senior governments in the form of down loading poses major problems for rural counties and municipalities whose real needs are for revenue sharing partnerships. Development, for many rural places and people, has become a matter of survival and crisis management rather than genuine development.

Understanding partnerships in this predatory context could form the basis for renegotiating the relationships between rural communities, their resource and job base, the rest of the economy, and higher levels of government. But the redistributive nature of partnerships and opportunities for mutualism must be kept firmly in mind in this negotiation.

## Partnerships to re-engage people with work

The sixth and last theme follows from the previous five. Unemployment and underemployment of people tend to be somewhat irreversible. Once people are disengaged from useful productive rewarding activity for some period of time, it is very difficult to mobilize their energies again. This difficulty increases with age and the length of time out of work. Paradoxically, the massive shutdown of the cod fisheries to reverse the decline of cod stocks will likely be at the cost of the irreversible disengagement of fishing communities and their people from active economic life.

The conference found no keys to this problem. However, it is worth noting that the recent dramatic loss of jobs from the fisheries is a more sudden version of the decline in employment on farms and in mines since the Second World War. Thus, another lesson about effective partnerships is revealed. They should aim to prevent sudden and irreversible job dislocation beyond the coping capability of the wider economy.

Rural communities are on the front line of learning about environmental impacts of industrialization, especially the class of impacts now dubbed "over-fishing." It seems to me that new partnerships or other forms of rural alliances with the rest of the economy are needed to prepare for repeat failures, perhaps next on the Prairies, and to learn early enough about improving human relationships with the environment.

## Concluding comments

Partnerships offer great potential as turf-busters and trust-builders, to echo Theresa MacNeil and Richard Rounds. They are interesting and potentially useful within the many relationships possible among economic and social interests in a community. A successful partnership implies a certain degree of perfect competition in the pursuit by partners of the fruits of their partnerships, not featured in other forms of alliance. The ideal partnership is among equals; surrender is offset by sharing.

In every partnership, it is the governance of transactions among the partners that is being changed. The transactions include everything from hand-crafted sweaters to cauliflowers, tax revenues and the costs of health services as explained by Lavern Sorgaard. The reason partnerships can make a difference is that they go to the roots of human motivation to work and take risk, that is to the roots of the distribution of value added by workers and investors. Partnerships are a vehicle for dynamic mediation of mutual interest in every predatory transaction that affects rural communities.

The partnership theme of this conference leads directly to the theme of next year's conference in Grande Prairie, Alberta. Formation of partnerships is a process for restructuring rural institutions. Institutional restructuring is the theme next year because it is widely accepted as necessary to keep up with global economic restructuring.

The need for institutional change is felt by all levels of government as their tax base stagnates or slips away into the underground economy. At the same time, the need for social support grows when the economy down-sizes its workforce by dumping it without provision for pensions, and with few prospects for re-engagement due to a lack of continuing education by employers. The mounting social costs of meeting standards defined during the decades of affluence are now unaffordable. Rural communities are struggling to reorganize their institutions to enable them to continue health care, education, maintenance of infrastructure and cultural heritage as well as to assist business development and provide basic needs for the poor.

The principal lesson from this conference about partnerships is that they are part of a dynamic process of reorganization of relationships, not ends in themselves. Care should be taken not to try to institutionalize partnerships, but rather to institutionalize the process of democratic flexible re-alignments of relationships, some of which may take the form of partnerships. The focus should be on the well-being of people rather than on the place in which they work and live.



**DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES FOR RURAL CANADA:  
EVALUATING PARTNERSHIPS, JOBS AND COMMUNITIES**

**Barbara Thompson, West Cumberland Development Commission**

The following is a synopsis of a session prepared by Barb Thompson and Debbie Mattatall-Dobson of Women and the Economy, Amherst, NS.

Women and the Economy is a program involving six women. It provides training and implementation of a community economic development assessment of Cumberland County and is planning a conference for 1994. Sponsors in this program include: the Cumberland Women's Advisory Association; the NS Advisory Council on the Status of Women; and Gender Equality Management Studies, School of Public Administration at Dalhousie University. This program was funded by CEIC.

What have we learned at this conference that we can use in our own community economic development work?

We have asked ourselves how the Small Communities and Rural Areas Secretariat can benefit us. We see it can provide us with an opportunity for a voice on international issues. How my voice will be heard is not yet clear to me.

**Top-Down versus Bottom-Up:**

This topic was mentioned repeatedly throughout the conference. If we must choose between accountability and allowing communities to define their own future, we should err on the side of bottom up. Let our community define our own needs and learn from our own mistakes when spending our tax dollar.

**Duplication of Service:**

It is good to hear others are also grappling with duplication. It is important to ensure services are easily available to me. We must be constantly vigilant to ensure a diversity of involvement in community economic development and provide ways to reduce barriers that discourages this involvement in decision-making.

I am reminded by various issues raised in the conference that I must avoid strategies providing financial incentives that do not meet my community's goals.

I believe the conference would have been enhanced by greater discussion about volunteer roles and volunteer involvement in the economic development of rural communities. Development both strengthens and is strengthened by local organizations and institutions. These directly affect my life, my community and thus my economic contribution.



I would have liked to have seen greater emphasis on the relationship between community economic development and social issues. It is impossible to separate these issues in my life. We cannot talk about job strategies without addressing such issues as child care, transportation, care of aging parents.

The field trips, Cal Meadows and Co-op Atlantic have provided valuable information for us to take home with us.

In hearing from these presenters, I am reminded to be sure to venture into partnerships that are wanted. Failure in partnerships has proven to be devastating to our communities. We caution that we must ensure new partnerships do not undermine the informal partnerships that currently exist in our community and that are already working well.

I am also reminded of the effective tool that exploring the vision of children in their community can be. What that tells us and how we can enhance their vision is a necessary step in community.

In summary, there are three most important ideas I will go home with:

1. Involve as diverse and as many people as possible in economic development practices.
2. Spread the word about what makes partnerships work.
3. Always remember that what we are talking about affects people's lives. Focus on community must be the focus on people. This is not a luxury or afterthought, but a necessity.

## A CRITICAL SYNTHESIS

Barbara Neis, Memorial University

Thanks for the invitation to the conference. I am not a rural development expert, but rural and regional development are central themes in my work. However, I have not done extensive research on development issues at the micro-level of the many government and community programmes that exist in the region today, the focus of this conference. For this reason, the conference has provided an important learning context for me that I have appreciated. It is difficult for an outsider like myself to provide a critical synthesis of a conference when it is obviously part of an annual series. I don't know what kinds of issues have been addressed previously. But \$800 of taxpayers' money has been spent to bring me to this conference, and in the few minutes I have been given to speak, I am going to concentrate on several criticisms that I have of the conference. If my criticisms seem harsh, it is because I find complacency and even hope rather odd in the current context I am studying, that of the collapse of the Atlantic fishery.

As you no doubt know, the Atlantic Canadian fisheries are in a state of deep and profound crisis. The apparent collapse of the groundfish stocks has thrown 40,000 or more people out of work and threatens the survival of hundreds of fishing communities. Because I feel that profound failures in the institutional structures of government, academe, industry and communities contributed to the development of this crisis, I was pleased to hear that the federal government has set up an interdepartmental secretariat to address the problems of rural communities. I am a supporter of interdisciplinary research within my own university, and I feel that disciplinary/departmental boundaries contributed to our failure as academics to provide the research basis for a sustainable fishery. Federal mismanagement of the fishery resources points to similar problems within government. But a small secretariat of three people is hardly grounds for applause. It is hardly evidence that the fishery crises, as well as the deepening crisis in our forest industries and in our farming communities have prompted a serious re-examination of either federal policies that affect rural communities or the institutional structures that shape the relationship between government and communities.

I was also struck by the claims of some community development workers that there have been important changes in community development programmes, making them less rigid, more adaptable and more available for "community" control. While this is certainly possible, I also heard (over lunch) that community futures boards are still often controlled by old boys' networks. Is community control, control by community elites? Much of the money that is being provided for community development appears to be going to small business. We heard about some examples of successful small businesses during this conference. Recent research on community development initiatives in a Newfoundland community suggested, however, that many of the new small businesses created by an IAS were owned by the traditional service elite and not by the fishery workers the programme was supposed to help. Their proposals were largely turned down. Small businesses often provide employment for the family members of the owners and are generally nonunionized. This is a very different thing from a unionized state or private sector employer where access to work is, at least in principle, based on experience and skill and not on whom you are related to. As I listened to the small business people make their presentations, I found myself wondering if a woman who sets up a small sweater making industry is making a greater contribution to community development than a woman who teaches knitting and marketing in a nearby technical college but whose position may have been cut in recent cutbacks to postsecondary education. If our goal is community development, we need to monitor both cutbacks and new initiatives. On several

occasions at this conference, I heard unions identified as a barrier to community economic development, but there seemed to be no trade unionists here to present their point of view.

If there has been a major change in the direction of community development initiatives, why have governments continued financing major megaprojects such as Hibernia, the fixed link, James Bay Hydro Development Project? These projects leave me wondering just how much government money, in relative terms, is actually going into community economic development. Has anyone done a comparative analysis? If the same \$5 billion that will go into Hibernia had been set aside to provide the basis for a major overhaul of the Atlantic fishing industry designed to rebuild it, with broad input from community groups, how much might have been achieved? Almost a billion dollars has been pumped into fishing communities in response to the crisis, but the government has not adopted a flexible, community-based or even community development approach, and there has been no public assessment of the adequacy of their response programmes or of their effects.

Perhaps because my background is not in community development, I found I had to struggle throughout the conference to understand what was meant by "Community Futures," "Community Economic Development Officers" and "Partnerships". As a feminist academic, I have been trained to listen, but also to be sceptical. When I hear people talking about "partnerships," communities," and "stakeholders," I find myself asking: partnerships between whom? what kinds of communities? whom are they defining as stakeholders? Since most speakers did not really define what they meant by these key concepts, I found myself trying to intuit their latent meaning. Generally speaking, it seemed as though community economic development meant job creation, particularly through the setting up of small businesses, and partnerships were partnerships between business and government. There were many new jobs created in the fishing industry during the 1980's. This industry is now in crisis. Job creation is not necessarily evidence of community economic development. The fishery crisis also reminds us of the central importance of considering the ecological basis of rural communities in assessing proposals for community economic development. Environmental issues have been largely absent from discussions at this conference.

As I suggested in one workshop, new partnerships can erode older ones. Research on women and development has shown that new "development" initiatives have often strengthened the power base of men while eroding that of women. Placing the issue of domestic violence in farming families in a plenary session rather than locating it off to the side during the "free time" might have made the relationship between community development and relations of power more central to discussions at this conference. Marriages are a perfect example of "partnerships" that have not always been equally beneficial for all participants. As I found out in a private conversation over lunch, Nova Scotia's rural development organizations have not made pay equity a priority. The glowing rhetoric of "partnerships" that we heard from the Chairpersons of Community Futures might not be echoed in the comments of some of their workers, if they felt free to speak openly and publicly about their working conditions and if they were invited to do so.

The marginalization of women's issues and the absence of young people, the disabled, gays and lesbians and visible minorities at this conference has made me wonder what kind of communities you are referring to when you talk about "community economic development" and whether they will meet the needs of these groups better than rural communities of the past. Nova Scotia has a large black population -- how have "community development" initiatives affected them? Are these groups part of the "bottom-up" approach to community development? I question, therefore, one speaker's assertion that you have defined what is meant by community Economic Development and it is time to move on.

## BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES

**Leonard (Peter) Apedaile** is a professor in the Department of Rural Economy at the University of Alberta. He obtained a B.Sc. in agriculture at McGill University in 1960 and a Ph.D. in economics at Iowa State University in 1968. His principal professional interest is agricultural and rural development from a public policy perspective based on systems analysis. Dr. Apedaile has practised in this field for extended periods in Canada, Zambia and Nepal, and has carried out research on various agricultural development topics in countries of Europe, Africa, Asia and South America. He directed work in China on institution building for higher education in agriculture for four years during the period of family farm reforms. In 1990, he conducted studies on the topic of systems theory at the Montpellier research station of the Institut National de Recherche Agronomique in France. He is working on complex dynamical systems and the modelling of structure, technology and subsidy issues for rural economies. His current research includes a comparative study of structural change in agriculture between the United States and Canada, improving tradeable business activity in rural economies, economic governance of agricultural development in Taiwan, China, and Canada. He is actively involved in the Agricultural and Rural Restructuring Research Network and the Canadian Rural Restructuring Foundation.

**Barbara Neis** is Professor of Sociology at Memorial University in St. John's, Nfld. Her research interests include the fisheries and fishers' ecological knowledge, women in the fishery, and fisheries crises and response. She received her B.A. from York University, her M.A. from Memorial University and her Ph.D. from the University of Toronto.

**Barbara Thompson** is a member of the West Cumberland Development Commission . She has been involved with their program, Women in the Economy. The first portion of their work involved a community economic development assessment to evaluate the impact of current programs on their community and, in particular, on women. In conjunction with the Cumberland Women's Association and Dalhousie University, they are currently planning a conference for April 1994 entitled "Women in the Economy".

## BIO-SKETCHES

**E. Diane Looker** is Professor of Sociology and Director of Research and Graduate Studies at Acadia University. Her research interests include youth in rural areas with emphasis on their educational and occupational plans, and gender issues. She has received SSHRC grants to carry out a survey on rural youth. She received her B.A. from Carleton University, her M.A. from Waterloo University and her Ph.D. from McMaster University.

**Bill Reimer** is an Associate Professor of Sociology at Concordia University in Montreal. He is currently working on a three-year study of poverty and deprivation in rural Canada. He has been involved in ARRG activities from its inception.

**Grace E. Young** is a Ph.D. student in Sociology at McGill University. She is currently involved in the data-gathering phase of her dissertation research on the survival strategies of low income mothers in a village in Quebec. Her Master's research at the University of Chicago was an investigation of the situation of domestic servants in Lima, Peru.



## EVALUATIONS

### Common Themes

Of the sixteen participants from whom we received evaluations, the majority were either professors, teachers, students or government officials. The evaluators found the balance of the conference to be, on the whole, quite good. In general, they felt that the activities or sessions which provided for informal contact among participants were the most useful. They identified the workshops and the round tables as well as breaktime as important for allowing maximum participation through informal information exchange. Evidently, some workshops and round tables were particularly fruitful while others were not. This was reflected in either quite positive or quite negative comments regarding specific roundtables or workshops. A couple of people felt the initial plenary session was not very useful, but quite a number of evaluators found the concluding session to be very thought provoking and challenging.

A common critique of the conference was that it tried to pack too much into a short period of time without allowing for enough rest and relaxation. In particular, people felt that Friday's sessions and activities became too long. Included were such comments as: "more free time;" "expand meal times to one and a half hours;" "do not schedule any issues during free time -- otherwise they become marginal;" and some people get no free time;" and, finally, "by Friday we were brain dead."

The vast majority of the evaluators felt the location was beautiful, and there was unanimous praise for the tours.

### Comments from Peter Sinclair

**Received: October 18, 1993**

...Now that I am home, I am trying to reflect a bit more about rural development or community development in relation to what I have heard, so I thought I would send along these comments.

Basically, I do not notice much change in either the problems or the positions taken since I first became interested in these issues as a student in the late 60s, except that the radical leftist views are less evident and the 'let's turn entrepreneurship free' approach is more evident,

It seems to me that the academics interested in the problems are still likely to be radical or liberal 'lefties' who want a 'bottom-up' approach. Let's start from what people are actually experiencing and with their wishes for the future. Well yes, but what if we, the professionals and activists, are uncomfortable with what the people want? Somehow we seem to slip into the position that the people think as we do. Yet, this is highly questionable, unless we take our evidence from only the most articulate key informants (and even then it is questionable). What about the conservatism of rural people who flock to populist movements like Reform? What about the people who think government should not be involved in providing collective security? On the Great Northern Peninsula, most people were satisfied with their lives when we asked a representative sample a general question on this topic. Does that mean there is no need for rural/community development? If the people know best, then surely it does. Now press a bit and respondents do tell us what they like least and what the big problems are. People want more jobs,

better jobs, better transportation facilities and access to education. Hardly anyone mentions the issues raised by feminists and other representatives of the new social movements - child care, environmental protection, women's rights, care for the elderly - none of this. Perhaps they assume that these are second level problems or that they are inconsequential or that they can be handled by informal arrangements as in the past. Whatever the case, the point I want to make is that people's perception of their needs may not fit with our values or assessments. This suggests a pro-active, educational approach (no news here) in which rural/community development involves learning where people are starting from and adding to that base so that what they want is expressed from a position of greater understanding. If people are to be empowered, that process should begin with understanding. This is NOT a bottom-up position because it does not start from the assumption that the people always know best - but it is not a dominating position either because it says that people should choose from knowledge of what exists and of what might be possible or ought to be possible.

I would like to support one or two people who raised questions about the concepts of community and partnership. I find it remarkable that so many people continue to talk about the community as if they are referring to a homogeneous entity in which people have the same values and goals. Is it not surprising, at least paradoxical, that the academics are the ones who are, in my view, more realistic when it comes to this problem of perception? Unless the different interests of people in different social locations are explicitly recognized and addressed, I believe that many well-meaning efforts to change conditions will fail. There are certainly areas in which people have common interests, but they are also divided. Let's recognize that again.

In one session, I asked a group what was their image of a developed community. Nobody wanted to answer. Someone said that development was a process, not an end. Perhaps a good point, but if development is a process of acting for change, do we simply empower people to act regardless of where they want to go? Surely not. In the extreme case, I am sure no one in ARRГ would want to empower people who think that the solution to our problems is racial homogeneity. I think we HAVE to take seriously the question of what counts as a developed society or community or unit of some other kind. Then I think questions of distribution of goods and services, not only of wealth creation, will be forced back on the agenda. Are we to be limited to what seems fundable in the current political climate or should we provide space for more demanding thought? It is understandable that non-academics are pushed to the former, if only to survive, but academics have the privilege of an independent position and should not surrender their right to be critical because they are afraid of being called impractical, ivory tower dwellers. Let me step back again. When the discussion is one of expansion of wealth or protection of services, it appears that everyone has the same interest, everyone wins; it is the question of distribution and control (regardless of the level of wealth or services) that causes political problems - but this is too critical to be hidden by consensus notions of community or partnership.

A minor point now. Many people mentioned duplication of programs or organizations concerned with change as a major problem. Perhaps it is in so far as a person with a problem or idea is unsure who to approach. However, I shudder at the thought of a perfectly integrated, 'one stop' location for rural/community development. What power these decision-makers would then hold over what was possible! At least, today, with some skill and guidance, there is a chance that an innovative idea can be tried out, even if it is rejected at the first stop.

Please share these comments with other group members, if you think they are worthwhile.

...I think you are selecting about the right number of people and about the correct mix of academics, practitioners and government people. I don't think you can do much better than that.

---

---

## **PROGRAM**

---

---

### **Development Strategies for Rural Canada: Evaluating Partnerships, Jobs, and Communities**

**ARRG National Conference  
1993  
Wolfville, Nova Scotia**



#### **Sponsors**

**Employment and Immigration Canada  
Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency  
Nova Scotia Department of Economic Development  
Acadia University  
Canadian Rural Restructuring Foundation  
McCain Foods Ltd.**

### **Conference Organizers and Activists**

**Bill Reimer (Concordia University)**  
**Dianne Looker (Acadia University)**  
**Margaret Whitla (Rural and Small Town Research and Studies Program)**  
**Floyd Dykeman (Mount Allison University)**  
**William Wallace (Old Orchard Inn)**  
**Dale Gruchy (Acadia University)**  
**Gale Abbey (Old Orchard Inn)**

### **Agricultural and Rural Restructuring Group**



ARRG is a non-profit group of rural social scientists, policy analysts and rural development practitioners, with a particular commitment to improvements in the economic and social conditions of rural Canadians. This commitment is expressed in research, program design and conferences. The focus is on households, businesses, industries, communities and governments to develop economic opportunities and to create policy awareness.

ARRG maintains active liaisons with researchers and policy makers in the United States and Europe for purposes of comparative research and sharing ideas and experiences in rural development.

#### **Future ARRG Seminar and Conference Themes**

- 1994 Social Networks and Institutional Restructuring
- 1995 International Perspectives on Rural Employment
- 1995 Effective Strategies for Rural Development

#### **For further information contact one of the people below:**

**Peter Apedaile, Fax (403) 492-1071**  
**Ray Bollman, Fax (613) 951-3868**  
**Phil Ehrensaft, Fax (514) 844-5826**  
**Tony Fuller, Fax (519) 767-1692**

Wednesday, October 13th, 1993

- 15:30-16:30 Registration in Front Lobby of Old Orchard Inn (registration continues until 19:30)
- 16:45-17:45 Reception and Welcoming Remarks (Old Orchard Inn - Heritage Barn - cash bar)
- **Gwen Phillips** (Mayor of Wolfville) and **Dianne Looker** (Acadia University)
- 18:00-19:30 Dinner (Old Orchard Inn - Heritage Barn)
- NOTE:** Guests who have purchased a meal ticket must make it available to serving staff for each meal.
- 19:30-21:30 Plenary: *Partnerships in Rural Development Strategies: Past and Present Experiences and Lessons for Future Policy*. (Heritage Barn)
- **Objectives:** To identify the major strategies for rural development which have been used in the past. To identify the problems which we face, and introduce the conceptual tools for dealing with those problems in the discussions to follow.
  - Chair: **Tony Fuller** (University School of Rural Planning, Guelph)
  - Speakers: **Heather Clemenson**, **Shirley Dawe**, and **George Pearson** (Small Communities and Rural Areas Secretariat), **Phil Ehrensaft** (UQAM)
  - questions and discussion from the floor

Thursday, October 14th, 1993

- 7:30-8:30 Breakfast (buffet - Old Orchard Inn Dining Rooms)
- 8:30-10:30 Session 2: *What Have We Learned About Rural Development Strategies?* (Heritage Barn)
- **Objectives:** To examine old and existing programs and strategies used by governments and enterprises for economic development and job creation. To evaluate what we have learned from them: when they succeed and when they fail. To identify implications for future strategies.
  - Chair: **Gary Davidson** (Planner and Community Developer)
  - Speakers: **Harold Baker** (U. of Sask.), **Teresa MacNeil** (N.S. Council of Higher Education)
  - round table discussions: focus on participants' experiences and what we can learn from them
  - reports from round tables to plenary
- 10:30-10:45 Refreshment Break



- 10:45-12:30      Session 3: *What Have We Learned About Job Creation Strategies in Rural Areas?* (Heritage Barn)
- **Objectives:** To identify what types of job-creation strategies have been used, when they succeed and when they fail. To identify implications for future strategies.
  - Chair: **Andrew Hornsell** (Acadia Centre for Small Business)
  - Speakers: **Peter Sinclair** (Memorial U.), **Barry McGregor** (YMCA Enterprise Centre, Yarmouth)
  - round table discussions: focus on experiences and what we can learn from them
  - reports from round tables to plenary
- 12:30-13:30      Lunch (Old Orchard Inn - Acadian room)
- 13:30-17:30      *Analytical Field Trip*
- Three tours will depart from the Old Orchard Inn to visit development projects in the region. Each bus will visit different sites. Buses will return to the Old Orchard Inn at 17:30 and depart at 18:00 for dinner at the Port Williams Community Hall.
- 18:00-21:00      Community Dinner (Port Williams Community Hall)
- Presentations: *Atlantic Partnerships*
- **Objectives:** To discuss experiences in Atlantic Canada and suggestions which arise from those experiences.
  - Chair: **Dianne Looker** (Acadia University)
  - Speakers: reports from bus tours, **Barry Moody** (Acadia University), local speakers
  - questions and discussion from the floor

Friday, October 15th, 1993

- 7:30-8:30      Breakfast (buffet - Old Orchard Dining Rooms): Participants are asked to breakfast with those in their workshop as identified at registration. The objective of this breakfast meeting is to introduce each of the persons in the group.
- 8:30-10:30      Session 4: *Establishing and Maintaining Partnerships for Rural Development.* (Heritage Barn)
- **Objectives:** To discuss ways to establish and maintain partnerships between governments, business, communities and community groups.
  - Chair: **Ken Donnelly** (Employment and Immigration Canada)
  - Speakers: **Robert Allan** (Coop Atlantic), **Maxine Connell** (Digby County CFC), **Tim O'Neill** (Atlantic Provinces Economic Council), **Jim Stanley** (Amherst, N.S.)
  - Comments: **John Bryden** (Arkleton Trust, Scotland)
  - questions and discussion from the floor
- 10:30-10:45      Refreshment Break

- 10:45-12:30      Session 5: *Establishing and Maintaining Partnerships for Rural Job Creation.*  
(Heritage Barn)
- **Objectives:** Continuation of session 4.
  - Chair: **Mike Grace** (Employment and Immigration Canada, Atlantic)
  - Speakers: **Fraser Hunter** (InRich, Inverness), **Chief Douglas Brooks** (Micmac Maliseet Development Corp.), **Lavern Sorgaard** (Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties)
  - Comments: **Rob Greenwood** (Economic Recovery Commission)
  - questions and discussion from the floor
- 12:30-14:00      Lunch (Old Orchard Inn - Acadian room)
- 14:00-16:00      Session 6: *Strategies for Local Problem Solving* (Workshops)
- **Objectives:** To apply the principles identified above to specific problems.
  - Topics:
    1. Creating Partnerships Between Communities (**Harold Baker**, U. of Sask.) - Convention room
    2. Establishing Partnerships With Government (**Dennis MacDonald**, EIC) - Heritage Barn, Ski Shop
    3. Creating Partnerships for New Business (**Janet Eaton**, Education and Development Consultant) - Blomidon Room
    4. Creating Partnerships for Business Expansion (**Chris Pelham**, Atlantic Entrepreneurial Institute) - Heritage Barn, 2nd floor office
    5. Resolving Conflicts in Partnership Arrangements (**Gary Davidson**, Huron County Planning and Development Department) - Heritage Barn - main level
    6. Enhancing Support Networks (**Rosaire Provencier**, CLSC Coaticook) - Salon 304
    7. Community Adjustment to Economic Change (**Bill Pardy**, APEC) - Boardroom 226
  - Workshops will be asked to answer the following questions:
    - ?What are the crucial problems relating to your topic?
    - ?How can these problems be solved?
    - ?What policies would contribute to the solution of those problems?
  - Written materials are to be prepared and copies passed to the speakers in session 7.
- 16:00-18:00      Free Time (Farm Women and Pluriactivity project - Room 226, Old Orchard Inn)
- 18:00-20:00      Dinner (Heritage Barn)
- 20:00-22:00      Entertainment and Dance (Heritage Barn)
- The Rhythm Method
  - The Rankin Sisters
  - Tara Lynne Tousevard

Saturday, October 16th, 1993

- 7:30-8:30 Breakfast (buffet - Old Orchard Dining Rooms)  
**NOTE:** Checkout time at the Old Orchard Inn is 11:00 AM. The Inn will make space available for storing your luggage - ask at the main desk.
- 8:30-10:30 Session 7: *Policy Directions for the Future* (Heritage Barn)
- **Objectives:** To identify policy priorities which are most promising for enterprise and community development. To specify how they might be implemented.
  - **Chair:** **Ray Bollman** (Statistics Canada)
  - **Speakers:** **Floyd Dykeman** (Rural and Small Town Research and Studies Program, Mt. Allison), **Derm English** (Nova Scotia Federation of Agriculture), **Richard Rounds** (Rural Development Institute, Brandon)
  - discussion from the floor
- 10:30-10:45 Refreshment Break
- 10:45-12:15 Session 8: *Synthesis* (Heritage Barn)
- **Objectives:** To suggest ways in which the conference discussions might be integrated
  - **Chair:** **Sally Shortall** (Queen's University of Belfast)
  - **Speakers:** **Peter Apedaile** (U. of Alberta), **Barbara Thompson** (West Cumberland Development Commission), **Barbara Neis** (Memorial University)
  - discussion from the floor
- 12:15-12:30 Wrap-up
- Post Conference Events**
- 14:00-17:30 Hike to Cape Split with naturalist guide from Acadia University (sign up at the registration desk - \$15.00 charge for transportation)
- 20:00-21:00 Line Dancing with Instruction (Old Orchard Barn)
- 21:00- Local Area Dancing (Old Orchard Barn - entrance fee)

Sunday, October 17th, 1993

- 9:00-11:30 CRRF AGM (Room 226 - Old Orchard Inn)

## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

**Allan, Robert**  
Coop Atlantic  
P.O. Box 750  
Moncton, N.B.  
E1C 8N5  
Office: (506) 858-6000  
Fax: (506) 858-6477

**Allen, Ruth**  
Municipality of Cumberland  
P. O. Box 428  
Amherst, N. S.  
B4H 3Z5  
Office: (902) 667-2313  
Fax: (902) 667-1352

**Anka, Gary**  
Canadian Forest Service  
Natural Resources Canada  
351 St. Joseph Blvd.  
Hull, QC  
K1A 1G5  
Office: (819) 997-1107 ext 2058

**Annis, Robert**  
Westarc Group Inc.  
247 - 18th St.  
Brandon, Manitoba  
R7A 5A6  
Office: (203) 729-3440  
Fax: (204) 729-9090

**Apedaile, Peter**  
Department of Rural Economy  
University of Alberta  
Edmonton, AB.  
T6G 2H1  
Office: (403) 492-4225  
Fax: (403) 492-0268  
E-Mail: LAPEDAIL@SMITH.RE  
.UALBERTA.CA

**Aucoin, Kevin**  
Dept. of Forestry & Agriculture  
Box 89, R. R. #1  
Portugal Cove, Nfld.  
A0A 3K0  
Office: (709) 729-3793

**Baker, Harold**  
Rm. 132, Kirk Hall  
Department of Extension  
University of Saskatchewan  
Saskatoon, SK.  
S7N 0W0  
Office: (306) 966-5591  
Fax: (306) 966-5567

**Balcomb, James**  
Fundy Region Devpt. Commission  
57 King St.  
Saint John, N. B.  
E2L 1G5  
Office: (506) 658-2918  
Fax: (506) 658-2861

**Beland, Giles**  
Rural & Small Town Programme  
Mount Allison University  
Sackville, N. B.  
E0A 3C0  
Office: (506) 364-2799

**Biggs, Brian**  
Agriculture Division  
Statistics Canada  
Ottawa, Ont.  
K1A 0T6  
Office: (613) 951-3061  
Fax: (613) 951-1680

**Bollman, Ray**  
Agriculture Division  
Statistics Canada  
Ottawa, Ont.  
K1A 0T6  
Office: (613) 951-3747  
Fax: (613) 951-3868  
E-Mail: BOLLMAN@NRSVM01

**Boon, Mark**  
Cumberland Futures Committee  
P. O. Box 546  
Amherst, N. S.  
B4H 4A1  
Office: (902) 251-2404  
Fax: (902) 667-2270

**Bower, Mark**  
Shelburne Co. Business Develop-  
ment Centre  
P. O. Box 189  
Shelburne, N. S.  
B0T 1W0  
Office: (902) 875-1133  
Fax: (902) 875-4199

**Brooks, Chief Douglas**  
Vice President  
Micmac Maliseet Development  
Corporation Inc.  
910 Main Street, Suite 104  
Moncton, N.B.  
E1C 1G6  
Office: (506) 852-4747  
Fax: (506) 852-4773

**Broskins, Phyllis**  
Weave Shed Craft Co-op  
P.O. Box 894  
Wolfville, NS  
B0P 1X0  
Office: (902) 542-5504

**Brownell, Barbara**  
North Wellington Advisory Group  
240 George St.  
P.O. Box 579  
Arthur, ON  
N0G 1A0  
Office: (519) 848-2667  
Fax: (519) 848-3901

**Bryden, John**  
Program Director  
The Arkleton Trust  
Coulmakyle, Nethy Bridge  
Inverness-shire PH25 3EA  
United Kingdom  
Office: 011-444-7982688  
Fax: 011-444-7982441  
E-Mail: JBRYDEN@ABERDEE  
N.AC.UK

**Buchanan, Clay**  
Shelburne Co. Business Devpt.  
Centre  
P. O. Box 189  
Shelburne, N. S.  
B0T 1W0  
Office: (902) 875-1133  
Fax: (902) 875-4199

**Burton, Lynn Ellen**  
Fisheries & Oceans Canada  
11th Floor - Strategic Planning  
200 Kent St.  
Ottawa, Ont.  
K1A 0E6  
Office: (613) 990-9765  
Fax: (613) 991-3254

**Casey, Dianne**  
Casey's Lighthouse Harbour Tours  
Ltd.  
P.O. Box 1714  
Digby, NS  
B0V 1A0  
Office: (902) 245-5515

**Casey, Joseph**  
P.O. Box 1714  
Digby, NS  
B0V 1A0

**Cassin, A. Marguerite**  
School of Public Administration  
Dalhousie University  
Halifax, N. S.  
B3H 3J5  
Office: (902) 494-1641  
Fax: (902) 494-7023

**Chambers, Richard**  
United Church of Canada  
85 St. Clair Ave. E.  
Toronto, Ont.  
M4T 1M8  
Office: (416) 925-5931  
Fax: (416) 925-3394

**Choo-Tung, Michael**  
Atlantic Canada Opportunities  
Agency  
1801 Hollis St. Suite 600  
P.O. Box 2284, Station "M"  
Halifax, N. S.  
B3J 3C8

**Clemenson, Heather**  
Small Communities and Rural  
Areas Secretariat  
Sir John Carling Building  
930 Carling Ave.  
Ottawa, ON  
K1A 0C5  
Office: (613) 996-4913  
Fax: (613) 995-3459

**Connell, Maxine**  
Digby County CFC  
P.O. Box 1743  
Digby, N.S.  
B0V 1A0  
Office: (902) 245-5816  
Fax: (902) 245-5748

**Connor, Thomas**  
59 Queen Elizabeth Drive  
Charlottetown, P.E.I.  
C1A 3A8  
Office: (902) 892-5314  
Fax: (902) 368-7464

**Connors, Tina**  
P. O. Box 512  
Chester, N. S.  
B0J 1T0  
Office: (902) 275-5840  
Fax: (902) 275-4771

**Conrad, Neal**  
Dept. of Economic Development  
World Trade Centre  
Suite 707, 1800 Argyle St.  
Box 519  
Halifax, N. S.  
B3J 2R7  
Office: (902) 424-6000  
Fax: (902) 424-0508

**Costa, Jerri**  
Community Futures  
P. O. Box 1537  
Digby, N. S.  
B0V 1A0  
Office: (902) 245-5558

**Cunningham, Gordon**  
P.O. Box 190  
Lockport, NS  
B0T 1L0

**Davidson, Gary**  
Director  
Huron County Planning Depart-  
ment  
Court House  
Goderich, ON.  
N7A 1M2  
Office: (519) 524-2188  
Fax: (519) 524-5677

**Dawe, Shirley**  
Small Communities and Rural  
Areas Secretariat  
Sir John Carling Building  
930 Carling Ave.  
Ottawa, ON  
K1A 0C5  
Office: (613) 996-4913  
Fax: (613) 995-3459

**Donnelly, Ken**  
Labour Market Services  
Employment and Immigration  
Canada  
Place du Portage, 5th Floor  
140 Promenade du Portage  
Hull, PQ.  
K1A 0J9  
Office: (819) 994-6701  
Fax: (819) 953-5941

**Dykeman, Floyd**  
Director  
Rural and Small Towns Research  
Institute  
Mount Allison University  
Sackville, NB.  
E0A 3C0  
Office: (506) 364-2394  
Fax: (506) 364-2601

**Eaton, Janet**  
J.M. Eaton Associates  
Education and Development Con-  
sultants  
6269 Edinburgh St.  
Halifax, N.S.  
B3L 1W1  
Office: (902) 455-2384  
Fax: (902) 455-5790

**Ehrensaft, Philip**  
Departement de Sociologie  
Universite du Quebec a Montreal  
C.P. 8888, Succursale A  
Montreal, PQ.  
H3C 3P8  
Office: (514) 987-4309  
Fax: (514) 987-4638  
E-Mail:EHRENSAFT.PHILIPP  
E@UQAM.CA

**English, Dermot**  
Executive Director  
N.S. Federation of Agriculture  
Box 784  
Truro, NS  
B2N 5E8  
Office: (902) 893-2293  
Fax: (902) 893-7063

**Fautley, Ray**  
Forest Development  
506 West Burnside Rd.  
Victoria, B. C.  
V8Z 1M5  
Office: (604) 363-0725  
Fax: (604) 363-0775



**Flint, David**  
Dept. of Sociology  
Memorial University  
St. John's, Nfld.  
A1C 5S7  
Office: (709) 754-5986  
Fax: (709) 737-4569

**Foster, Ralph**  
Cumberland Futures Committee  
P. O. Box 546  
Amherst, N. S.  
B4H 4A1  
Office: (902) 254-3333  
Fax: (902) 254-2993

**Frank, Robert**  
Municipality of Lunenburg  
210 Aberdeen Rd.  
P. O. Box 200  
Bridgewater, N. S.  
B4V 2W8  
Office: (902) 543-8181  
Fax: (902) 543-7123

**Fuller, Tony**  
University School of Rural  
Planning and Development  
University of Guelph  
Guelph ON.  
N1G 2W1  
Office: (519) 824-4120/3637  
Fax: (519) 767-1692  
E-Mail:RPDTONY@UOGUEL  
PH

**Gallant, Kathy**  
The People Place Information  
Centre  
P. O. Box 872  
Amherst, N. S.  
B4H 4E1  
Office: (902) 667-3638  
Fax: (902) 667-3372

**Gallant, Rochelle**  
Executive Council  
Govt. of P.E.I.  
P. O. Box 2000  
Charlottetown, P.E.I.  
C1A 7N8  
Office: (902) 368-4508  
Fax: (902) 368-5544

**Gallant, W. James**  
N.B. Federation of Agriculture  
R. R. #3  
St. Stephen, N. B.  
E3L 2Y1  
Office: (506) 452-8101  
Fax: (506) 452-1085

**Gauvin, Michel**  
ICURR  
150 Eglinton Ave. E.  
Toronto, Ont.  
M4P 1E8  
Office: (416) 973-5645  
Fax: (416) 973-1375

**Gould-Thorpe, Patricia**  
Box 2313  
Windsor, N. S.  
B0N 2T0  
Office: (902) 798-2284  
Fax: (902) 798-0464

**Grace, Mike**  
EIC, Halifax  
99 Wyse Rd  
Dartmouth, N.S.  
B1Y 4B9  
Office: (902) 426-2766  
Fax: (902) 426-8724

**Greenwood, Louise**  
Town of Riverview  
30 Honour House Court  
Riverview, N. B.  
E1B 3Y9  
Office: (506) 387-2043  
Fax: (506) 387-2033

**Greenwood, Robert**  
Consultant, Economic Recovery  
Commission  
Faculty of Business Administration  
Memorial University of New-  
foundland  
St-John's, NFLD.  
A1B 3X5  
Office: (709) 737-2139 (ERC -  
M/F)  
(709) 737-2138 (Univ - T/W/Th)  
Fax: (709) 738-2469 (ERC)  
(709) 737-7680 (Univ)

**Gruchy, Dale**  
Dept. of Sociology  
Acadia University  
Wolfville, N. S.  
B0P 1X0  
Office: (902) 542-2201

**Hope-Simpson, Peggy**  
15 Locust Ave.  
Wolfville, N. S.  
B0P 1X0  
Office: (902) 542-3906

**Hornsell, Andrew**  
Atlantic Entrepreneurial Institute  
Acadia University  
Wolfville, N.S.  
B0P 1X0  
Office: (902) 542-4431  
Fax: (902) 542-4111

**Hunter, Fraser**  
INRICH B.D.C. Ltd.  
P.O. Box 600  
Inverness, N.S.  
B0E 1N0  
Office: (902) 258-3698  
Fax: (902) 258-3689

**Landry, Rocky**  
Regional Development Corp.  
P. O. Box 428  
Fredericton, N. B.  
E3B 5R4  
Office: (506) 453-2277  
Fax: (506) 453-7988

**LeDrew, Ronald**  
Town of Botwood  
26 Memorial Ave.  
Botwood, Nfld.  
A0H 1E0  
Office: (709) 257-2839  
Fax: (709) 257-3330

**Looker, Dianne**  
Sociology Department  
Acadia University  
Wolfville, NS.  
B0P 1X0  
Office: (902) 542-2201 ext 1498 or  
1360  
Fax: (902) 542-3323  
E-Mail: DLOOKER@ACE.ACA  
DIAU.CA

**Lunn, Donna**  
R. R. #1  
Belmont, Ont.  
N0L 1B0  
Office: (519) 644-0316

**Macdonald, Dennis, Director**  
Community Futures Program  
Human Resources and Labour  
Canada  
Place du Portage, Phase IV, 5th  
Floor  
140 Promenade du Portage  
Hull, PQ.  
K1A 0J9  
Office: (819) 994-2337  
Fax: (819) 994-2314

**MacDonald, Keith**  
ACOA  
Suite 801, Atlantic Place  
Box 1060  
St. John's, Nfld.  
A1C 5M5  
Office: (709) 772-2974  
Fax: (709) 772-5083

**MacKenzie, Fiona**  
Dept. of Geography  
Carleton University  
Ottawa, Ont.  
K1S 5B6  
Office: (613) 788-2561

**MacNeil, Theresa**  
Nova Scotia Council on Higher  
Education  
6th floor  
1701 Hollis St.  
P.O. Box 2086, Stations 'M'  
Halifax, N.S.  
B3J 3B7  
Office: (902) 424-3758  
Fax: (902) 424-0651

**Marshall, Robin**  
Kings Regional Economic Devpt.  
Commission  
P. O. Box 787  
Kentville, N. S.  
B4N 3X9  
Office: (902) 679-0700  
Fax: (902) 679-6094

**Mattatall-Dobson, Debbie**  
The People Place  
P. O. Box 872  
Amherst, N. S.  
B4H 4E1  
Office: (902) 667-1346

**McGregor, Barry**  
YMCA of Yarmouth Enterprise  
Centre  
P.O. Box 86  
276 Main St.  
Yarmouth, NS  
B5A 4B1  
Office: (902) 742-1277  
Fax: (902) 749-1988

**McLaughlin, Darrell**  
R. R. #1  
Aroostook, N. B.  
E0J 1B0  
Office: (506) 273-3543  
Fax: (506) 273-3258

**McLevey, Anthony**  
Agriculture & Agri-Food Canada  
P. O. Box 1878  
St. John's, Nfld.  
A1C 5P9  
Office: (709) 772-4063  
Fax: (709) 772-4803

**Miloff, Maury**  
Coll. Centre for Sust. Communities  
116A Promenade du Portage  
Hull, Quebec  
J8X 2K1  
Office: (819) 777-1042  
Fax: (819) 776-9776

**Moody, Barry**  
Dept. of History  
Acadia University  
Wolfville, NS.  
B0P 1X0

**Moreland, Mary**  
Fisheries & Oceans Canada  
11th Floor - Strategic Planning  
200 Kent St.  
Ottawa, Ont.  
K1A 0E6  
Office: (613) 993-2401  
Fax: (613) 991-3254

**Murray, MacKay**  
Municipality of Cumberland  
P. O. Box 428  
B4H 3Z5  
Office: (902) 667-2313  
Fax: (902) 667-1352

**Neal, Linda**  
P. O. Box 1493  
Liverpool, N. S.  
B0T 1K0  
Office: (902) 354-7174  
Fax: (902) 354-7355

**Neis, Barbara**  
Dept. of Sociology  
Memorial University  
St. John's, Nfld.  
A1C 5S7  
Office: (709) 737-7443  
Fax: (709) 737-4569  
E-Mail: BNEIS@KEAN.UCS.M  
UN.CA

**O'Neill, Tim**  
Senior Vice-President and Deputy  
Chief Economist  
Bank of Montreal  
1st Canadian Place, 21st floor  
Toronto, ONT  
M5X 1A1  
Office: (416) 867-5144  
Fax: (416) 867-5401

**Pardy, Bill**  
Atlantic Provinces Economic  
Council  
1 Prince St, Unit 502  
Dartmouth, Nova Scotia  
B2Y 4L3  
Office: (902) 422-6516  
Fax: (902) 429-6803

**Patterson, Carol**  
Human Resources & Labour  
5th Floor, Phase IV  
Place du Portage  
Hull, Quebec  
K1A 0J9  
Office: (819) 953-3401  
Fax: (819) 953-5941

**Pearson, George**  
Small Communities and Rural  
Areas Secretariat  
Sir John Carling Building  
930 Carling Ave.  
Ottawa, ON  
K1A 0C5  
Office: (613) 996-4913  
Fax: (613) 995-3459

**Pelham, Chris**  
Atlantic Entrepreneurial Institute  
Acadia University  
Wolfville, N.S.  
B0P 1X0  
Office: (902) 542-4431  
Fax: (902) 542-4111

**Perry, Jennifer**  
Northeast Avalon Community Fu-  
tures  
P. O. Box 269  
Kelligrews, Nfld.  
AOA 2T0  
Office: (709) 834-1000  
Fax: (709) 834-1149

**Pothier, Nicole**  
Centre Jodrey  
Universite de Sainte Anne  
Pointe de l'Eglise, N.S.  
B0W 1M0  
Office: (902) 769-2114

**Provencier, Rosaire**  
490 Sleeper  
Coaticook, Quebec  
J1A 2G9  
Office: (819) 849-7041  
Fax: (819) 849-6430

**Rankin, Clair**  
P. O. Box 658  
Louisdale, N. S.  
B0E 1V0  
Office: (902) 345-2142  
Fax: (902) 345-2201

**Reimer, Bill**  
Department of Sociology and  
Anthropology  
Concordia University  
Sir George Williams Campus  
De Maisonneuve Blvd. West  
Montreal, PQ.  
H3G 1M8  
Office: (514) 848-2171  
Fax: (514) 689-5435  
E-Mail:REIMER@VAX2.CON  
CORDIA.CA

**Rice, Elizabeth**  
P. O. Box 478  
Bridgetown, N. S.  
B0S 1C0  
Office: (902) 665-2635  
Fax: (902) 665-2878

**Robinson, David**  
N.S. Dept. of Agriculture &  
Marketing  
Box 190  
Halifax, N. S.  
B3J 2M4  
Office: (902) 424-8948  
Fax: (902) 424-3948

**Rollheiser, Joan**  
Rural Development Institute  
Brandon University  
Brandon, Manitoba  
R7A 6A9  
Office: (204) 727-9734  
Fax: (204) 725-0364

**Rounds, Richard**  
Rural Development Institute  
Brandon University  
Brandon, Manitoba  
R7A 6A9  
Office: (204) 727-7361  
Fax: (204) 725-0364  
E-Mail:ROUNDS@BRANDON  
U.CA

**Savard, Daniel**  
Municipalities, Culture & Housing  
P. O. Box 6000  
Fredericton, N. B.  
E3B 5H1  
Office: (506) 453-2171  
Fax: (506) 453-4991

**Shaffner, Richard**  
Dept. of Economic Development  
1800 Argyle St., WTCC  
Box 519  
Halifax, N. S.  
B3J 2B7  
Office: (902) 424-4514  
Fax: (902) 424-0505

**Sheppard, Douglas**  
Gander Area Community Futures  
175 Airport Blvd.  
Gander, Nfld.  
A1V 1K3  
Office: (709) 651-2979  
Fax: (709) 651-3339

**Shortall, Sally**  
Dept. of Sociology and Social  
Policy  
The Queen's University of Belfast  
Belfast, Northern Ireland  
BT7 1NN  
Office:011-44-232-245133  
ext3712  
Fax: 011-44-232-320668  
E-Mail:SSG0018@VAX2.QUE  
ENS-BELFAST.AC.UK

**Sinclair, Peter**  
Dept. of Sociology  
Memorial University  
St. John's, Nfld.  
A1C 5S7  
Office: (709) 737-7443  
Fax: (709) 737-4569  
E-Mail:PETERS@KEAN.UCS.  
MUN.CA

**Sloan, Alan**  
Annapolis Co. Economic Devpt.  
Commission  
P. O. Box 251  
281 Granville St.  
Bridgetown, N. S.  
B0S 1C0  
Office: (902) 665-4083  
Fax: (902) 665-2878

**Sorgaard, Lavern**  
Box 25  
LaGlace, Alberta  
T0H 2J0  
Office: (403) 568-2565  
Fax: (403) 568-4519

**Stanley, Jim**  
Cumberland County Development  
Authority  
P.O. Box 546  
32 Church St.  
Amherst, N.S.  
B4H 4A1  
Office: (902) 667-3192

Fax: (902) 667-2270  
**Thibodeau, Terry**  
ACOA  
P. O. Box 607  
Yarmouth, N. S.  
B5A 4B6  
Office: (902) 742-0809

**Thompson, Barb**  
Women & the Economy  
50 Willow St.  
Amherst, N. S.  
B4H 3W3  
Office: (902) 667-9578

**Vey, Gary**  
Gander Area Community Futures  
Committee  
175 Airport Blvd.  
Gander, Nfld.  
A1V 1K3  
Office: (709) 651-2979  
Fax: (709) 651-3339

**Watson, G. Brian**  
Dept. of Economic Development  
Box 519  
Halifax, N. S.  
B3J 2R7  
Office: (902) 424-2720  
Fax: (902) 424-0508

**Webb, Tom**  
Co-op Atlantic  
P.O. Box 750  
Moncton, NB  
E1C 8N5  
Fax:(506) 858-6477

**West, Patricia**  
Shelburne Co. Community Futures  
P. O. Box 189  
Shelburne, N. S.  
B0T 1W0  
Office: (902) 875-3993  
Fax: (902) 875-4199

**Young, Grace**  
6873 ch. Parkinson  
Rawdon, Quebec  
V0K 1S0  
Office: (514) 834-5558

## LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

### AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL RESTRUCTURING GROUP

---

- Rounds, R.C., editor. 1993. *The Structure, Theory and Practice of Partnerships in Rural Development*. ARRG Working Paper Series, Number 5, The Rural Development Institute, Brandon University, Brandon, MB, 76 pp. (\$12.20).
- Fuller, A.M. (Tony) and R.C. Rounds, editors. 1993. *Stimulating Rural Economies for the 2000's: The Challenge for Rural Manufacturing and Tradeable Services, Proceedings of the 4th Annual ARRG Conference, 21-23 October, 1992, Goderich, Ontario*. ARRG Working Paper Series, Number 4, The Rural Development Institute, Brandon University, Brandon, MB, 134 pp. (\$12.20).
- Rounds, R.C., editor. 1993. *Restructuring Industrial Production and Tradeable Services in Rural Canada in the 1990's, Brandon, Manitoba 2-5 July, 1992*. ARRG Working Paper Series, Number 3, The Rural Development Institute, Brandon University, Brandon, MB, 71 pp. (\$12.20).
- Apedaile, L. Peter and R.C. Rounds, editors. 1992. *Stimulating Rural Economies for the 2000s: Proceedings of the ARRG Rural Economic Conference, Camrose, Alberta 23-25 October, 1991*. ARRG Working Paper Series, Number 2, The Rural Development Institute, Brandon University, Brandon, MB, 85 pp. (\$12.20).
- Rounds, R.C., editor. 1991. *Trade Liberalization and Rural Restructuring in Canada*. ARRG Working Paper Series, Number 1, The Rural Development Institute, Brandon University, Brandon, MB, 52 pp. (\$12.20).