

CANADA'S NATIONAL PARKS POLICY: FROM BUREAUCRATS TO COLLABORATIVE MANAGERS by C. Lloyd Brown-John, Professor Emeritus,
Department of Political Science
University of Windsor

INTRODUCTION

Canada's 42 national parks are located in all provinces and territories. Historically national parks policy, both in terms of designation and park management, has been largely centerist in origin and application. However, in the past 15-20 years some remarkable changes have occurred in policy design and policy delivery and this has especially affected new national parks established in the three northern territories. Furthermore, the very nature of national parks management has drastically altered from that of a Departmental line division to that of a Special Operating Agency.

In this Paper I shall examine but one very general policy process change and that is the approach to "stakeholders" and, in particular, those from aboriginal communities. Some observers might disagree, but arguably the new Parks Canada Agency is developing much more collaborative approaches to both the designation of national parks and, in particular, their internal management.

Parks Canada Agency (PCA) has moved very rapidly from its first experience in collaborative management for Gwaii Hanas National Park (Queen Charlotte Islands) to full - fledged collaborative management for the operation of all national parks in the territories. Furthermore, the model is being applied to national park management in other national parks located within the provinces. For example Torngat Mountains National Park in Labrador (Canada's newest national park) has been created with the collaborative participation of local aboriginal communities.

Extensive resource, cultural and heritage management agreements have been signed by PCA and local first nations communities. For territorial governments the agreements usually offer modest levels of local employment ranging from park services to visitor services managed by local communities. Arguably, the PCA's approach offers distinct economic benefits to surrounding communities which benefits might not otherwise pertain.

Employing network theory as a basis for understanding collaborative management, the Paper will offer a cursory assessment of the differences which the PCA offers both local communities and territorial economies through access to national park management. In the process we will review two things: 1) national parks policy change over time; and, 2) the move to a more collaborative policy process. The latter will be placed within a context of collaborative network policy making.

There are numerous subsidiary issues including that of economic benefits deriving from collaborative management. These issues could become critical to the PCA's future as efforts are made to create or enlarge national parks within provincial boundaries. Opposition to the expansion of national parks within some western provinces, in particular, may be muted once a more collaborative management policy framework is set forth. However, the new Conservative federal Government has made no public commitments in respect to the future of Canada's national parks but to the extent that the parks represent a national policy effort to protect species and habitat, the issue is of concern in light of the handling of, for example, the Kyoto implementation programmes. And, furthermore, the critical issue of federal-provincial relationships and park creation and management still suggest a number of unresolved issues.

POLICY NETWORKS

Roseneau (1992) made a creative and clear distinction between *governance* and *government*.

Government is about the exercise of legal and legitimate authority. It is about power exercised for public purposes. *Governance*, on the other hand, is all about engagement and goals. Governance is ‘activity premised’ where shared goals and, sometimes, shared responsibilities ensue. Governance is a conscious effort to share power—but not, ultimately, either authority or accountability—in the decision making process. Governance, it can be argued, opts for processes whereby citizens are engaged in the public policy process in tangible and results based activities.

Public administration and public policy have moved quite dramatically into new governance modalities. Frederickson (1999, 702) has argued for the relevance of public sector network theory and collaborative governance models. In a fragmented and often disarticulated state, Frederickson, suggests that public administration “is moving towards theories of co-operation, networking, governance and institution building and maintenance”. He stresses that institutionalism, public sector network theory and governance theory are relevant to the future of public administration. “Institutionalism” he defines as “social constructs of rules, roles and norms, and the expectations that constrain individual and group choice and behavior” (1999, 703), Public sector network theory pertains to structures of ‘interdependence’ that may have formal and informal linkages which may include reciprocal relationships, common and shared interests and may include some “bonds of shared beliefs and professional perspectives.”

Governance theory, Frederickson suggests, involves institutional, organisational, managerial, technical and even legal frameworks. This would appear to encompass everything from formal and informal rules, hierarchies, procedures, administrative legal frameworks, influences, “principal-agent theory, transactional costs analysis and leadership theory” (704 - 706). In varying forms, others have discussed *governance* including Kooiman (1993), March and Olson (1995), Peters (1996); Rhodes (1997) and Salamon (2002).

Salamon (2002, vi) addresses the matter of “skills” he considered essential for public managers in the new world of ‘governance’. Skill sets which include, negotiation and persuasion, collaboration and *enablement*. The latter term, he suggests include skills such as: ‘activation’, orchestration’ and, ‘modulation’. Activation: is the process of persuading players and stakeholders to participate in a collaborative endeavour; orchestration is the process of actually facilitating and achieving collaboration; and, modulation is the skill of providing incentives to participate while, simultaneously, not giving away fundamental policy values and objectives. For Salamon, governance is a framework within which “the collaborative nature of modern efforts to meet human needs, the widespread use of tools of action that engage complex networks of public and private actors, and the resulting need for a different style of public sector, emphasizing collaboration and enablement rather than hierarchy and control” (2002, vii).

For this discussion we have chosen to extend the concepts emerging from Frederickson to Salamon into the research of a colleague, Robert Agranoff. Agranoff and McGuire (2003, 4-5) have fairly comprehensively documented how networks facilitate collaborative management at a local level. Their objective was to examine multi-organizational relationships which facilitate problem solving in situations where multi-level policy benefits may be derived from collaborative decision making and where traditional hierarchical and single organisation decisions were not either politically feasible or simply not practical. They argue that there exist

an abundance of collaborative mechanisms available to offer opportunities for problem solving and policy development.

Agranoff (2003, 10) has identified four typologies of collaborative networks¹:

1. *Informational Networks*: where partners come together, exclusively, to exchange agency policies, programmes, technologies and prospective solutions to problems; action, by participant agencies is purely voluntary;
2. *Developmental Networks*: where partner information and technical information exchanges are combined with a form of inter-active education and partner member service which facilitates and enhances capacity to implement solutions within a broad policy framework;
3. *Outreach Networks*: where partners coalesce to exchange information and technologies, sequence programming, exchange resource opportunities, pool client information and contacts, and enhance access opportunities that lead to new policy programme activities; implementation of policy goals and strategic objectives generally are within the capacities of the array of partnered public and private agencies themselves; and,
4. *Action Networks*: where partners collaborate to achieve inter-agency adjustments, formally adopt collaborative courses of implementation action, and/or deliver services along with ongoing exchanges of information and technologies.

Agranoff (2003, 18) argues that collaborative networks require “promotion”. This includes “vision keepers” that is, those with the energy and vision to animate collaborative processes. This vision would include constant efforts to broaden participation so that all prospective stakeholders feel equally comfortable with the networking processes. This form of collaborative networking requires, Agranoff suggests (2003, 19) the use of websites, for example, as a basic communication process enhanced by emails and, because it matters, personal telephone calls. Brokering of decisions and achievement of results can demand almost spontaneous organisations and nonhierarchical decision making.

In this discussion it will be argued that Parks Canada has been engaged in the development of **a set of policy networks**. To a large extent these ‘networks’ accord with Agranoff’s “*outreach*” and “*action*” networks. I suggest, however, that the PCA policy networks vary and are idiosyncratic for virtually each national park. Some are still emerging and, thus, might tend to fall within Agranoff’s other two categories: *informational* and *developmental*. The reasons for the emergence of network collaboration within Parks Canada’s policy and managerial systems are diverse and require elaboration.

NATIONAL PARKS POLICY IMPERATIVES

One can identify at least six major historic policy imperatives driving development and maintenance of Canada’s national parks. Not all policy imperatives have been active simultaneously and, as I shall suggest below, the configuration of the policy imperatives have changed—often dramatically—over time. Currently, we are in the process of witnessing one of those significant policy changes and this will be discussed momentarily. The six historic policy imperatives include:

¹ These typologies have been discussed in detail with Professor Agranoff with whom I have collaborated on a number of projects over the past many years.

1. The policy evolution from tourism and resources to habitat protection and ecological integrity;
2. The acknowledgement and engagement of Canada's aboriginal peoples;
3. The (recent) assertion of national sovereignty especially in the Arctic;
4. The imperative of statutory requirements and, in particular, those which have emerged since 1999 when Parks Canada became an "Agency"²;
5. The persistence of inter-governmental relations as a dimension of national park creation and operation;
6. Echoes from the New Public Management.

1. From Tourism to Ecological Integrity

According to ecologists Canada has 39 *terrestrial natural regions* of which at least 25 are now represented and protected by national parks. Several national parks are also UNESCO World Heritage Sites and two are world Biosphere Reserves. Initial national parks—all in western Canada—were widely viewed as tourist attractions hence environmental and ecological issues were vastly under rated while the condition pertaining native peoples was largely disregarded. Indeed, while "Indian reservations" were widely established in western Canada many were subject to the nibbling away of land for timber, mining and cattle grazing.

In 1911, for example, the federal Government passed *An Act Respecting Forest Reserves and Parks*³ which established 25 federal Forest and Park Reserves in the four western provinces. Between 1911 and 1923 the Act was amended and additional Reserves were added while boundary adjustments were made to others⁴. In most cases, when federal Forest Reserves were established specific reference was made to neighbouring Indian Reservations and that land was excluded from the forest reserve, for example, the Fort a la Corne Forest Reserve (508 sq. miles) in British Columbia excluded land on the Cumberland Indian Reserve; and, the James Smith Indian Reserve. Similarly, the Rocky Mountains Forest Reserve (initially 18,213 sq. miles but reduced in 1923 to 13,454 sq. miles) excluded lands on the Stoney Indian Reserve.

In Canada's arctic territories very little consideration was given by the federal government to the needs or interests of the Inuit peoples. For example, in the debate on the Ministry of the Interior's *Estimates* for 1920-21 there was an extensive discussion over a proposal by arctic explorer V. Stefansson to establish a caribou ranch on the southern half of Baffin Island (south of the 68th Parallel). The responsible Minister (Mr. Meighen) did acknowledge that "proper provisions" would need to be made "for the protection of the rights of the Eskimo." But, by 1923, a new Minister (Mr. Stewart) was expressing deep concern about

² On April 1, 1999, Parks Canada became the "Parks Canada Agency." Bill C-29, *The Parks Canada Agency Act* was proclaimed into force on December 21, 1998 [SC (1998) cap.-31]. The Agency was established as a Departmental Corporation under Schedule II, *The Financial Administration Act*. The new Agency was also listed under Part II, Schedule I, of the former *Public Service Staff Relations Act*.

³ See: 1-2 George V Chap.10 .

⁴ See: 1914, 4-5 George V Chap. 32; 1919, 9-10 George V Chap 49; and, more importantly, in 1923 the Act's Schedules were further amended, 13-14 George V Chap.13.

Eskimos with rifles because now caribou and seals were being shot instead of being ‘captured’ and this, the Minister, suggested could jeopardise the Eskimo’s food supply.⁵

Almost from their inception, national parks were seen as tourist attractions and, to some extent, as natural resource preserves. In 1902, for example, Parliament authorised the expenditure of a total of \$24, 420 for construction of roads, bridges and other works including a museum at the Hot Spring Reservation near Banff Station. Indeed, Minister Sifton could report that by December 1902 Banff had received some 13,000 visitors. In 1906 another Minister (Oliver) offered the opinion that he “did not know upon what policy the parks [Rocky Mountain] were established, “I found them there when I came into office...they were established to attract tourist travel, and I am carrying on the policy as I find it.”⁶

National Parks were also viewed as ‘resource management areas’. Riding Mountain national park, for example emerged from a timber reserve. The Minister of the Interior (Oliver) expressed concern that lands were being reserved where such lands would better serve the needs of agriculture.⁷

Creation of Point Pelee national park in 1918, for example, marked an interesting and subtle change in national park policy. Arguably, Point Pelee national park (and ‘game reserve’)—one of Canada’s smallest and the only park in the Carolinian ecological terrestrial natural region—was the first park established in recognition of the value of natural habitat. Persistence of highly reputable birders led the federal government to convert an old Naval Reserve (1883) into a national park. Sand and gravel had been extracted from the waters at the tip of Point Pelee as far back as the 1870’s. As of 1918 all extraction leases for the area within the new park were—more or less—cancelled.⁸ Yet, in February 1921, national parks Commissioner, J.B. Harkin, authorised extraction of sand from the Park in order to construct roads in the area.

Outside the national park boundaries, the provincial government permitted sand mining as late as 1974 and for many years The Erie Sand and Gravel Company of Erie, Pennsylvania, extracted upwards of a million cubic metres of sand and gravel from an area just south and southwest of Canada’s most southerly land mass.

Among the policy imperatives which have driven national parks policy for the past 100 years the dramatic shift from tourism/resources to biodiversity acknowledgement, habitat restoration and preservation and, ultimately, ecological integrity have been most substantial. Much of this alteration in policy emphasis can be linked to changes in public and government attitudes towards the environment in general. Unfortunately, much of the shift also has involved

⁵ The minister also expressed concern about the long-term food supply prospects for Indians in the Northwest Territories whom, he alleged, were “not very energetic” and who were “a very poor hunter” for whom the possibility of care and conservation of a food supply would be a necessity. House of Commons, *Debates*, June 1, 1923, Col. 3439.

⁶ House of Commons, *Debates*, June 22, 1906, Col.5944. A brief, but very useful discussion of tourism vs. revenue in parks can be found in Eagles (1998).

⁷ House of Commons, *Debates*, May 22, 1914, Col.4151. In 1929, the Riding Mountain Forest Reserve was set aside as a national park and on July 26, 1933, Riding Mountain National Park was officially opened. www.pc.gc.ca

⁸ Much of the early history of Point Pelee national park is contained in a delightful book published under the auspices of the Friends of Point Pelee. Henrietta O’Neill (2000), *In Search of a Heart*. Leamington, ON: FOPP.

various levels of government absolving themselves of responsibilities (Harrison, 1995, 1996) and to that subject I shall return shortly.

To some extent national parks and, it follows, Parks Canada have experienced a proverbial ‘roller-coaster’ ride in terms both of the locus of political power in Ottawa and, it follows, funding. For example, Toner (1996) recounts what he described as the ‘roller-coaster’ ride of the federal Department, Environment Canada Brown-John (1996), Simmons (1999). To a large extent, the fate of Parks Canada as an agency and national parks policy reflected in a micro-manner the fate of the salience of environmental policy in Canada.

Yet, arguably, a change in policy emphasis was beginning to emerge in the late 1970's and most certainly found conceptual expression in the 1988 revised National Parks Act which identified *ecological integrity* as a formal policy objective. Yet, despite that initiative, and despite the federal Government's much heralded “Green Plan”, for the next ten years Parks Canada as an organisation suffered from declining financial and human resource allocations.⁹ Finally in 1999 a new Parks Canada Agency Act launched a new, arms-length, Parks Canada Agency (PCA).¹⁰ The 2000 Report of the Panel on Ecological Integrity (Panel, 2000) argued that the new status offered the PCA an opportunity to build not only a knowledge-based organisation but, perhaps more to the point, “to engage Canadians in a national culture of conservation that works to maintain and restore *Canada's ecological integrity*, with national parks as core protected areas within a broader sustainable landscape” (Panel, 2000, 2-3) (my emphasis).

All the machinations which have befallen environmental policy and national parks policy in Canada over the past four decades would appear to have left Environment Canada denuded of policy direction and initiative. Hence the Panel held forth the temptation to the new PCA that it accept some responsibility for Canada's ecological integrity. Presumably as a somewhat autonomous Agency, the PCA could offer a policy lead via the national parks towards respect for environmental issues in Canada.¹¹ Furthermore, as biodiversity, endangered species and

⁹ This is documented very extensively in a significant policy document: the Report of the Panel on the Ecological Integrity of Canada's National Parks (2000).

¹⁰ For all practical purposes the PCA is a “Special Operating Agency” (SOA) with very distinct statutory relationships with other federal statutes such as *The Financial Administration Act*.

¹¹ The PCA is responsible for three operational programmes: Parks; Historic Sites; and, Marine Conservation encompassing:

1. 42 national parks and reserves under the National Parks Act;
2. 131 national historic sites owned and operated by Parks Canada and “nationally significant persons and events” under the *Historic Sites and Monuments Act*;
3. 661 national historic sites owned and operated by third parties, *Historic Sites and Monuments Act*;
4. seven historic canals under the *Department of Transport Act* and the *Historic Sites and Monuments Act*; and,
5. two/three marine conservation areas, *Marine Conservation Areas Act*,

There are also four additional responsibility areas: Federal Heritage Buildings; Heritage Railway Stations; Heritage Rivers Systems; and, the Federal Archeology Programme, as follows:

1. 165 heritage railway stations under the *Heritage Railway Stations Protection Act*; and,
2. 31 heritage rivers.

In addition the PCA, through the federal Heritage Buildings Review Office, administers the Federal Heritage Buildings policy which includes responsibility for over 1,000 federal heritage buildings (e.g. The Supreme Court of Canada building). The Agency also administers and implements federal archeological policy as part of Canada's

environmental issues come under more scrutiny and economic appraisal, Parks Canada itself has had to develop entirely new organisational capacities to respond and to ensure its currency.¹²

2 .Engaging Aboriginal Peoples

While collaborative policy making is not entirely confined to aboriginal peoples I shall return to the modalities of networking later under a brief discussion of the New Public management (NPM). Suffice it to be noted here that collaborative management has become a watchword for the operation of many national parks but that the typology of each collaborative network varies usually in response to local circumstances.

Engagement of aboriginal peoples is becoming significant in respect to the management of national parks, cultural heritage sites and archeological sites and, including resource management. Furthermore, the role is intimately linked to land claim settlements and to governance of aboriginal communities. Moreover, the model being developed may have far reaching consequences for other aboriginal communities seeking respect for their lands and resources as well as local economic benefits.¹³

In most respects what has been happening is something of a ‘side-bar’ event to Canada’s recent constitutional history. The 1982 *Constitution Act*, Section 35, reads (in part) as follows:

- 35.** (1) The existing aboriginal and treaty rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada are hereby recognized and affirmed.
(2) In this Act, "aboriginal peoples of Canada" includes the Indian, Inuit and Métis peoples of Canada.
(3) For greater certainty, in subsection (1) "treaty rights" includes rights that now exist by way of land claims agreements or may be so acquired. ...

The June 1987 *The Meech Lake Accord* contained no reference to the status of aboriginal peoples and, as the Accord required unanimous approval of all provinces in order to take effect, that omission—among other things—led to its rejection in June 1990 by two provincial legislatures.

. In August 1992, the *Charlottetown Accord* emerged from intergovernmental negotiations but its subsequent failure in referendums had consequences for aboriginal peoples. The Accord contained a series of provisions pertaining to aboriginal peoples. Section 2, for

“Archeological Heritage Policy Framework”. The PCA also shares administrative responsibility for eight UNESCO world heritage sites.

And, within Canada, the PCA is involved in policy implementation of:

1. UNESCO’s programme on biosphere reserves;
 2. the International Biodiversity Convention;
 3. the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy;
 4. the Hague Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict; and,
 5. the International Convention on the Illicit Export, Import and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property.
- Canada’s national parks, historic sites and heritage sites host over 24 million visitors annually. Over 225,000 km² of Canada’s natural and cultural heritage are administered by the PCA with 6,711 employees (August 20, 2001) of whom about one-third work on a seasonal basis and 90% of whom are located outside the National Capital Region.

¹² There is a vast literature on biodiversity, endangered species and the economics of environmental issues, See, for example, Brown and Shogren (1998), Metrick and Weitzman (1998), Boardman (1992).

¹³ For example, Cree communities on West James Bay in Ontario are now involved with the DeBeers diamond business as 16 diamond bearing “pipes” have been discovered on traditional Cree lands and strenuous efforts are now being made to develop cultural respect and economic benefit agreements.

example, affirmed consistency of the 1982 Constitutional Charter and the rights of aboriginal peoples.

2. Aboriginal Peoples and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms

The Charter provision dealing with Aboriginal peoples (section 25, the non-derogation clause) should be strengthened to ensure that nothing in the Charter abrogates or derogates from Aboriginal, treaty or other rights of Aboriginal peoples, and in particular any rights or freedoms relating to the exercise or protection of their languages, cultures or traditions.

This general provision was operationalised in an extensive series of provisions, Sections 41 to 56 under the Title of “The Inherent Right of Self-Government.” Specifically, Section 49 linked the Accord with Section 35 of the 1982 Constitution.

49. Equity of Access to Section 35 Rights

The Constitution should provide that all of the Aboriginal peoples of Canada have access to those Aboriginal and treaty rights recognized and affirmed in Section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982 that pertain to them.

When the *Charlottetown Accord* went down to defeat in late October, 1992, it appeared as if many of the treaty rights and self-governance issues would follow. To some extent that occurred but events were quietly taking another turn and Parks Canada was very involved..

B.C.’s Queen Charlotte Islands have been home to the Haida peoples from time immemorial and known to the Haida as *Gwaii Haanas*. From the 18th Century onward, European explorers and travellers marvelled at examples of Haida totem poles, long houses, canoes and other distinctive cultural attributes. However, many cultural sites were pillaged for private collections and museums and this included many sacred objects often including the remains of ancestors. Furthermore, a brief stint of gold fever, a longer period of logging and the assault upon a culture through schooling and religion led to a point in the 1960's where the viability of the Haida culture and heritage itself were under threat.

Land claim issues in British Columbia are complicated and I do not propose to enter that discussion at this time. However, Haida land claims came into direct conflict with a provincial government prepared to extend logging leases on islands claimed as part of Gwaii Haanas. In an effort to lend strength to their claim the Haida Nation finally announced that the entire archipelago were Haida lands “subject to the collective and individual rights of the Haida citizens, the sovereignty of the Haida Chiefs, and the jurisdiction of the Council of the Haida nation.” Somehow Parks Canada became engaged with the Haida nation and in 1992 negotiations began for what became an Agreement in 1993. The preceding phrase is drawn from that *Statement of Purpose* in the 1993 Agreement between the Haida Nation and Parks Canada. This Agreement led to creation of Gwaii Haanas National Park and Reserve.

What is impressive about the 1993 Gwaii Haanas Agreement is that the parties (the Haida Nation and the Government of Canada) agree to disagree “with respect to sovereignty, title or ownership” and then in Article 1.3 they conclude that:

“Notwithstanding and without prejudice to the aforesaid divergence of viewpoints, and in recognition of the convergence of viewpoints with respect to objectives for the care, protection and enjoyment of the Archipelago, *the parties agree to constructively and co-operatively share in the planning, operation and management of the Archipelago...*”¹⁴

¹⁴ A Marine Preserve is also under development. Combined it will make the National Park and Preserve literally from mountain top to ocean bottom.

The Agreement then establishes a co-Chaired Archipelago Management Board (AMB) consisting of two representatives each from the Government of Canada and the Council of the Haida Nation.

The AMB, among other things, is responsible for preparation of Guidelines for permits and licenses for commercial tour operators and access and use by fishermen. Furthermore, the AMB is charged to develop strategies “to assist Haida individuals and organizations to take advantage of the full range of economic and employment activities associated with the planning, operation and management of the Archipelago.” In an Appendix it is directed that “Haida individuals be encouraged and given opportunities for employment with the Canadian Parks Service in the Archipelago” (Appendix 4, section 2.1). A qualification incorporates that “where appropriate” statements of qualifications will reflect the need to work effectively in support of the objectives of the Agreement including knowledge and understanding of Haida heritage and culture.”

The essentials of the 1993 Agreement were carried forth into the 1999 *Gwaii Haanas National Park and Haida Heritage Site: Management Plan for the Terrestrial Area*. The Plan, approved by the then Heritage Minister Sheila Copps, committed the two parties to “co-operative management” for the preservation of Gwaii Haanas. Fundamental to co-operative or shared management is agreement on parallel statements of purpose, objectives and process. The Management Plan itself is derived from several sources including scientific data and traditional Haida knowledge. The Plan specifically states that Decisions of the Board “are made by consensus” (Paragraph 1.6).

As an aside, Management Plans have become a significant avenue for Parks Canada to engage stakeholders and local communities in national park development and management throughout Canada.¹⁵ Minister and Tabled in Parliament. Plans must be revised every five years. Typically Management Plans set forth objectives relating to everything from ecological integrity, to cultural and archeological preservation to the visitor experience. They are usually extremely comprehensive and offer wonderful insights into the richness of each individual national park. Many are available on individual park websites via the Parks Canada general website.

In several respects the 1993 Gwaii Haanas Agreement was a first attempt at a comprehensive ecological and cultural heritage protection agreement valuing, as a world heritage site, lands and culture of an aboriginal community. Furthermore, that the Agreement was extended to residents in economic terms was a significant injection of federal expenditure into the Gwaii Haanas region. These same themes have been carried through, often in much greater detail, into Agreements relating to all national parks in the three Territories (for example, Kluane, Ivvavik-Yukon; Aulavik, Tuktoyaktuk Nogaait - Northwest Territories; and, Ukkusikalik, Sirmilik - Nunavut) as well, increasingly, into other national parks within the provinces such as Pacific Rim and Gulf Islands in British Columbia and Torngat Mountains in Labrador or Wapusk (white bear) in Manitoba.

Engaging those who have had stewardship of the land forever seems to take collaborative management and networking into a quite unique dimension as I shall suggest later. There are, however, significant legacy issues to be resolved including the history of exploitation (McPherson, 2003).

3. Confirming National Sovereignty

¹⁵ Under the *National Parks Act* every national park must have a **Management Plan** approved by the

Periodically Canadians discover that some foreign submarine has penetrated Canadian Arctic waters¹⁶. Almost invariably this sets-off a discussion about Canadian territory in the Arctic and periodically Governor General's "have shown the flag" in various northern communities.. Canada's military, during the Cold War, established a forward listening and weather station at Alert on the north end of Ellesmere Island. Canada's armed forces routinely conduct exercises in the Arctic often in collaboration with local indigenous communities.

National Parks probably have not been visualised as tangible assertions of national sovereignty. Yet, in practise, the August, 1999, *Nunavut Land Claims Agreement* requires the federal government (Parks Canada) and Inuit to conclude an *Inuit Impact and Benefit Agreement* (IIBA) prior to the establishment of national parks in Nunavut. An IIBA, signed on August 12, 1999, covers Auyuittuq ("the land that never melts"), Quttinirpaaq ("top of the world") and Sirmilik ("place of glaciers") national parks. Quttinirpaaq ("top of the world") is perhaps the best example of the point being stressed for this national park, which receives fewer than 150 visitors annually, "is representative of the Eastern High Arctic Natural Region and is Canada's second largest national park, covering 37,775 km². Established as Ellesmere Island National Park Reserve in 1988, Quttinirpaaq attained full national park status in 2000" (newparksnorth.org). The area, about the size of Switzerland, also includes a headquarters at Tanquary Fiord (a military research station had existed here after 1958), Eureka (a weather station). Griese Fiord, Canada's most northerly community, is on Ellesmere Island but not within the national park

The exercise of sovereign jurisdiction can be as specific as a military exercise or it can be as transparent as provision of services, education, training and economic opportunity.¹⁷ Irrespective of the subtleties involved, establishment of national parks and provision of services for visitors and researchers in those parks including wildlife and ecological management involving permanent residents of adjoining communities constitutes very tangible displays of a capacity to exercise and to enforce jurisdiction. These are the very fundamental premises upon which the exercise of state sovereignty is founded.

4. Parks Canada Agency (PCA) Statutory Requirements¹⁸

Historically Parks Canada's mandate had always been something of a duality. To 'enhance the visitor experience' and 'to keep the parks unimpaired for future generations'. The 1999 Parks Canada Agency Act changed the emphasis placing greater stress upon protection of ecological integrity. Visitors are still a major concern for the PCA but now the emphasis is much more upon the visitations as a value-added educational experience from which an appreciation of the primary goal of ecological integrity, is derived..

The enabling statute places immense managerial responsibility upon the Chief Executive Officer who is mandated, among other things, to develop a Charter for the PCA setting forth values and principles governing the Agency [Section 16(1)]; to prepare a Corporate Plan and, to

¹⁶ The USS *Seadragon* made the first submerged transit of the Northwest Passage in 1960. The USS *Nautilus* reached 90 degrees north on August 5, 1958 followed by USS *Skate* and USS *Sargo*. In 1969 the 155,000 ton tanker, SS *Manhattan*, with the aid of Canadian icebreaker *John S. MacDonald* made it into McClure Strait

¹⁷ A modest attempt was made to examine provision of public services in the north by the Institute of Public Administration of Canada (IPAC) in 2002. See: Abele and Graham (2002).

¹⁸ There are no fewer than 15 additional statutes for which the PCA has primary responsibility.

convene every 2nd year a Minister’s Round Table ([Section 8.1(1)]. Since 1988 the Parks have been required to prepare comprehensive Management Plans for each Park.

The Charter has been completed and it sets forth both the mandate of the PCA and its commitment to achieve that mandate. The Charter is available in a multitude of languages including many of those employed by people in areas where national parks have been established (eg, Blackfoot, Woodland Cree, Swampy Cree, Innu, Inuvialutut).

The Corporate Plan (and Annual Reports) are linked through performance measures. The Corporate Plan also includes Program Activities which encompass system planning, the establishment of national parks and national marine conservation areas, establishment of national historic sites and other heritage sites, and negotiations with stakeholders for inclusion in the national systems. It is this latter activity which engages the PCA in collaborative networking.

An Example of Corporate Planning: Establish Heritage Places¹⁹

Planned Results	Performance Expectations
1. Create national parks and national marine conservation areas in unrepresented regions	1. 34 of 39 terrestrial regions and eight of the 29 marine regions are represented by March 2008.
2. Complete or expand selected existing national parks	2. Expand three national parks by March 2008 and increase the percentage of land holdings in three unfinished national parks.

The Minister’s Round Table on Parks Canada is a unique form of collaborative networking for not only are matters of primary concern to the PCA discussed and debated by a wide-ranging group but, within 180 days of a Round Table, the responsible Minister is required to respond to the recommendations.²⁰

In part the 1999 PCA Act reflects not only rapidly changing attitudes towards the public but also significant echoes of the “New Public Management”. For the PCA is also mandated to become more effective in generating revenues and less dependant upon Parliamentary Appropriations. This has imposed both motivation and stress upon the Agency because, in real terms, the capacity to generate self-sustaining revenue is extremely limited. The PCA has, for example experimented with

national parks entry passes but these are of limited value outside the Rocky Mountain parks simply in consequence of the widespread distribution of parks.

There is also a statutory capacity to receive gifts and bequests but the experience has been limited and even when the parks could work in collaboration with an assortment of “Friends” associations, the Agency itself seems unable to grasp the complexity of fund-raising and, to that must be added, an apparent reluctance of taxpayers to “donate” to government agencies.

¹⁹ Table is excerpted from: **Parks Canada Agency, Corporate Plan, 2005/06 - 2009/10. Section 3.**

²⁰ There were representatives from 65 different groups and organisations at the February 2005 Minister’s Round Table. Representations ranged from First Nations to the travel industry, Métis Society, academics, industry associations, teachers and private enterprises with a national par connection. The Round Table was a fascinating exercise in inter-active recommendation making. The minister did respond within the 180 days to recommendations emerging from the Round Table. The 2005 Round Table examined three key policy areas: “Accountability”; “A Culture of Conservation”; and, “Facilitating Memorable Visitor Experiences”. Stefanick (1998) reviews the use of round tables in the development of environmental policy and identifies several short-comings of such a device.

5. Intergovernmental Relations as a Policy Parameter

Earlier in a discussion of Point Pelee national park I noted that the removal of sand from the area immediately adjoining the 'tip' of Point Pelee has continued, under provincial resource legislation, for over 50 years after the Park was created. Provincial resource lands adjoining national parks have almost invariably posed problems for national parks. From wildlife wandering outside a park into ranch land in the west to trappers, hunters and fishers seeking to exploit the resources of a park. Again, at Point Pelee national park, for example, neither hunting nor fishing are permitted in the Park yet there are still alive many local residents who fondly remember when both activities could be indulged in the Park.

When former Prime Minister Jean Chrétien announced in October 2002 that Canada would add new, and expand older, national parks including Waterton Lakes national park his comments were met with a vigorous response from B.C.. Waterton Lakes national park adjoins a much larger United States national park, Glacier. It also adjoins Akamina-Kishenena provincial park and recreational area in southeastern B.C. Local communities (Flathead and Fernie, B.C.) derive income from logging in the same area. La Mauricie national park, created only in 1970 as the first national park in Québec—and that was a major intergovernmental issue!—is surrounded by logging roads and private resource exploitation threats to the existence of the integrity of the Park.

Canada's largest national park and one of the oldest, Wood Buffalo (1922) is a Unesco World Heritage Site and has wetlands protected under the 1971 Ramsar International Convention for the Protection of Wetlands. Wood Buffalo straddles the Alberta-Northwest Territories boundary. It also lies about 200 kms. North of Fort McMurray the heart of Alberta's tar sands development. There is no threat to the integrity of the Park at this time but as demand for oil from the tar sands increases there is potential for an intergovernmental issue.

Another related issue stems from unresolved land claims by aboriginal communities which land claims, especially in western Canada, can involve territory administered by the provinces. As environmental groups used the courts in the 1970's and 1980's ²¹ aboriginal communities sought definition of treaty and heritage rights in the courts.²²

Intergovernmental relations is an omnipresent reality for national parks. But there is another reality involving the third level of government, municipal, which also has consequences. Canada's largest cities are most often distant from national parks. Thus, as cities grow in population there is a reality that more and more urban Canadians have had little or no experience with national parks and, thus it follows, that the salience of national parks and the mandate of Parks Canada is low in opinion and, with the exception of some very articulate interest groups (eg. Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society; Sierra Club; the Nature Conservancy), those with a capacity to engage governments in a positive dialogue on national parks policy is limited. In

²¹ In general see Skogstad and Kopas (1988) which includes a discussion of the *Crown Zellerbach* case. Also see: Kennett (1993).

²² Cases such as: *Sioui v. The Queen* (1990); *Blueberry River Band v. Canada* (1997); *Maldivik v The Queen* (1998); *Delgum'uukw v. Auditor General of B.C.* (1997); *Marshall v. The Queen* (1999), all in some manner contributed to defining treaty relations and oral tradition understandings of treaties. In virtually all instances, provincial interests were involved along with federal obligations.

some respects, for Parks Canada, promoting interest and support for national parks in growing urban communities is an immediate challenge.

6. The New Public Management (NPM)

The re-definition of government in terms both of what governments do and how they do it has had a profound impact upon how public policy goals are defined.. Borrowing from the private sector, ‘taxpayers’ became clients and conundrums evolved: management replaced policy; performance replaced process, and efficiency replaced equity.

Susan Phillips (1995) argued that deficit reduction became an excuse for a retreat from policy obligation while the rhetoric of performance based managers enchanted those charged with devising and implementing programme review. Almost by definition, programme review became a re-definition of the role of government and what Paquette and Shepherd termed “a deconstruction.” (1996). For Parks Canada, the NPM effectively shifted and distorted the traditional and emerging norms and principles which had guided national parks policy and administration. As the federal government jockeyed with the provinces to define (or off-load) responsibility for broad environmental policy, Parks Canada became somewhat obscured in the process. For Parks Canada “sustainable development” became “ecological integrity” in 1988 and again in 1999.

Yet throughout the same NPM period, budgets suffered and it followed that national parks were left somewhat in limbo with little funding for expansion and, more seriously, less funding for infra-structure maintenance. In the months prior to the terrorist attacks in the USA (“9/11”) there was some expectation that some federal funds would begin flowing to help repair decaying national park infrastructures. Unfortunately, in the immediate aftermath and its almost frantic pursuit of national security, discretionary funding was diverted almost in mass to the new hot-button issue.

The NPM, however, has been profoundly influential in respect to collaborative networking as a public policy process and it is to subject that I shall now turn.

FROM BUREAUCRATS TO COLLABORATIVE MANAGEMENT

For many years the history and development of Canada’s national parks was associated with one person, J.B. Harkin (1957) the first Commissioner of national parks.²³ National parks policy, as it evolved under Harkin, was very pragmatic and often very carefully crafted in political terms. For example as eastern Canadian Members of Parliament began to query the absence of national parks in eastern Canada—parks being seen largely as local tourist revenue sources—Harkin moved to develop new parks in the east away from the grandeur of the Rockies which had so impelled the initial national parks. Policy seems to have been very idiosyncratic and utilitarian. For example, between 1915 and 1946—with Harkin’s approval—some ten thousand homeless, jobless, unskilled foreigners, conscientious objectors, prisoners of war, internees and perceived enemies of the state, were put to work constructing roads and buildings in Canada’s western national parks (Waiser, 1995). National Parks policy, as it evolved, was largely a product of the compelling capacities of J.B. Harkin. Like many great federal public servants of the 1920's to 1940's, Harkin was both sympathetic to wildlife and the national park concept and often autocratic in process.

²³ J.B. Harkin’s Papers, compiled and edited, were published in 1957. Lothian (1976 - 1981) produced a four volume history of national parks. Taylor (1990), while focussing upon national historic parks and sites, does offer some splendid insights to the “politics” swirling about Parks Canada and its mandate.

As suggested in the preceding discussion of the six policy imperatives, so much has changed both in the context and in the manner in which national parks policy is now developed. I have already noted the co-management agreement covering Gwaii Haanas national park. This was the model for processes and agreements which both have followed and are being negotiated. I will suggest that what began, and still remains in many contexts, as an *outreach network* became, through formal agreements, *action networks*.

Outreach networks are still emerging in many national parks as the PCA endeavour to grapple with an appropriate role for volunteers, residents of adjoining communities, businesses which derive benefits from a national park presence, naturalists, researchers and other stakeholders. In Wood Buffalo national park, aboriginal communities are fully engaged not only in wildlife management but in protection of heritage sites. National parks where local interests often require reconciliation with national park policy objectives and where development of the five year Management Plan engages those interests appear to have benefited from PCA outreach efforts. Riding Mountain national park (Manitoba), Gulf Islands national reserve (British Columbia), Kluane (Yukon), Kouchibouguac (New Brunswick), Grasslands (Saskatchewan), Kejimikujik (Nova Scotia), Mingan Archipelago (Québec) and others have all involved local stakeholders in development of their Management Plans.

The specifics of the process vary from park to park but can involve a range of activities from public forums and workshops to advisory committees and locally engaged technical staff where cultural preservation is of concern. At Elk Island national park (Alberta), for example, the Federal Heritage Buildings Review Office (FHBRO) assessed the historic significance of a pioneer Ukrainian home and horse barn. These structures plus the Superintendent's residence and a Pavilion are maintained and managed in accordance with FHBRO direction and with collaboration of the local Ukrainian community.

Not quite so clear in the decision making process is the role of the various "Friends" associations affiliated with many national parks and historic sites. At one time Parks Canada funded the Canadian Parks Partnership and an annual conference of representatives of Friends groups. These conferences, in particular, were a very effective means both for generating support for national parks and historic sites and as a forum for explaining thinking on national parks policy. Parks Canada still does not appear to understand that if 'you don't have friends then you have either indifference or enemies' (Brown-John, 2003).

I will now briefly examine what Agranoff (2003) probably would describe as an *action network*. A key element in all of Agranoff's network typologies is that the network exchange information and technologies. I will argue here for a view of information and technology which is based upon oral tradition and cultural heritage. Specifically, as will become evident in the next few paragraphs, through formal agreements many of our national parks, particularly in the north and in British Columbia, involve aboriginal peoples. Aboriginal people bring to the management of the national parks traditional knowledge ranging from location and significance of cultural sites to the migratory behaviour of animal herds. From the perspective of wise policy makers this knowledge often has a validity equal to—or, better than—hard scientific data. So I shall examine briefly some of those relationships.

By way of an introductory illustration, I shall draw upon the Volunteer Program Policy for National Parks of the Western Arctic Field Unit. This illustrates Parks Canada's pro-active approach to engaging local communities. The Purpose of the volunteer policy is to guide Parks Canada in implementation of the Parks Canada Western Arctic Field Unit (WAFU) Volunteer Program and to provide procedures for the recruitment and selection of volunteers. The policy

applies to persons and groups seeking to participate in a Parks Canada project without pay (volunteer), within the Western Arctic Field Unit. The Objectives include:

1. To increase public knowledge and understanding of Parks Canada, its operations, mandate, values, particularly among Inuvialuit and other residents of the Western Arctic;
2. To improve relations, knowledge and understanding of Parks Canada operations in the field unit among co-operative management groups of the Western Arctic;
3. To give youth and student volunteers the opportunity to improve their job skills, develop new skills, gain work experience and develop self-confidence;
4. To interest youth in a career with Parks Canada;
5. To give Elders the opportunity to spend time on the land and share their knowledge with youth and Parks Canada staff;
6. To give individual volunteers the opportunity to contribute to Parks Canada's work through the sharing of their knowledge, abilities and skills, and by bringing a new perspective to the job and organization;
7. To give other Parks Canada employees the opportunity to get familiar with the WAFU operation while contributing their abilities, skills and knowledge;
8. To build environmental stewardship to promote/preserve our natural and cultural heritage; and
9. To facilitate meaningful public involvement in the delivery of Parks Canada programs in the WAFU.

In many respects the nine objectives encapsulate much of the current philosophy behind collaborative national parks management particularly in the North. But there are more formal arrangements such as those found in Agreements between Parks Canada (for the Government of Canada) and , for example, the Vuntut Gwitchin people of Old Crow (Yukon).

Vuntut National Park was established on February 14, 1995. It is bordered to the west by the Alaska boundary and the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, to the north by another national park Ivvavik National Park, to the east by the vast plain reaching both to the MacKenzie River delta and the Arctic ocean. To the south of Vuntut National Park lies the Vuntut Gwitchin village of Old Crow, Yukon and its related wetlands known as the Old Crow Flats. The area within the Park is a unique part of the ancestral homelands of the Vuntut Gwitchin people ("people among the lakes"). Old Crow is a village of about 300 persons on the north side of the Porcupine River and it can be reached only by air.

Vuntut National Park (4,345 sq. km) is part of a chain of connected protected areas extending from the Beaufort to the Bearing Sea. The Park includes the Old Crow flats a significant Yukon wetlands designated under the Ramsar Wetlands International Convention. The Park also includes portions of the Porcupine Caribou Herd's spring and fall migration range as well as significant archeological sites related to the caribou harvest and significant post-Beriniian landscapes.

Management of the Park and its natural resources is a joint management project of the North Yukon Renewable Resources Council (NYRRC)²⁴, the Vuntut Gwitchin Government (based in Old Crow) and Parks Canada. Agreement for the creation of the Park was reached as

²⁴ The Resource Councils are an integral part of land claims settlements. As various land claims with the various Yukon First Nations are concluded, a Renewable Resource Council (RCC) is established "as a primary instrument for local renewable resources management in the respective traditional territory." (*Management Plan*, 2004, p.5). Each RRC consists of six members, three each from the respective First Nation and three nominated by the Government of the Yukon Territory. The North Yukon RRC was created as part of the implementation of the *Vuntut Gwitchin First Nation Final Agreement (VGFNFA)* which settled all outstanding land claim and management issues.

part of the Vuntut Gwitchin First Nation Final agreement which Agreement includes provision for governance and land claim settlement. Roles are well defined for each party, *viz.*:

The NYRRC is a public board which makes recommendations to the Minister responsible for Parks Canada (federal Minister of the Environment) on all matters pertaining to the development and management of Vuntut National Park including:

1. management of heritage resources within the Park;
2. routes, methods and modes of access for harvesting within the Park;
3. harvest limits and seasons for harvesting within the Park;
4. locations and methods of harvesting within the Park;
5. proposed Park boundary adjustments;
6. matters relating to Park management and development referred to the NYRRC by the responsible federal Minister;
7. development and revisions of the statutorily required Park Management Plan;
8. existing and proposed legislation relating to the Park; and,
9. co-ordination with a Fish and Wildlife Management Board, other Renewable Resource Councils and responsible agencies, regarding management of fish and wildlife populations which cross into or transcend Park boundaries.

The role of the Vuntut Gwitchin Government generally relates to protection of the Vuntut Gwitchin lifestyle, culture and local economy. The village of Old Crow is home to the Vuntut Gwitchin people. The community is governed by a Council consisting of a Chief and nine elders. Under the terms of the VGFNF Agreement the Vuntut Gwitchin Government is responsible for:

1. allocating harvesting opportunities for fish and wildlife under a quota assigned to the Vuntut Gwitchin;
2. collecting, maintaining and reporting harvest information for the Park;
3. allocating trapping opportunities within the Park and maintaining a Register of all allocations;
4. providing suitable land or facilities to Parks Canada for the establishment of a visitor reception and information centre, park operation centre and staff housing;
5. providing input into the naming or re-naming of places and features within the Park;
6. ensuring cultural resource management planning with respect to establishing the value, significance and protection required for heritage sites including controlling access;
7. playing a lead role in recording oral history related to Park Management Plans;
8. reviewing contract notices for which the Vuntut Gwitchin people have the first right of refusal; and,
9. reviewing applications which Parks Canada may receive for business licenses for which the Vuntut Gwitchin people have a pre-emptive option to apply.

Finally, of course, there is the role of Parks Canada as representative of the Government of Canada. Parks Canada has overall responsibility for management and operation of the Park including a series of specific responsibilities established in a Co-operation Agreement between the NYRRC and the Vuntut Gwitchin Government, these include:

1. protecting the harvesting rights of the Vuntut Gwitchin people;
2. enforcing harvest restrictions and the terms and conditions which have been established for conservation purposes;
3. identification of Park research needs, issues and priorities in consultation with the NYRRC and the VG Government;

4. responsibility for up-dating information on Park-related research projects;
5. consulting with the NYRRC and VG Government on Park planning and the Park Management Plan;
6. cultural resource management in the Park, recognising the special interests of the NYRRC and VG Government, with respect to designation and protection of heritage sites and controlling access;
7. collecting and utilising oral history in connection with the preparation of the Park Management Plan;
8. heritage research within the Park in partnership with the Vuntut Gwitchin and through consultation with the NYRRC;
9. giving special attention to the control, timing and location of visitor access to the Park to avoid conflicts with harvesting activities or interference with cultural resources; and,
10. consulting with the Vuntut Gwitchin on matters related to their economic and employment benefits in the development, management and operation of the Park.

The same types of joint or partnership- management, respect for traditional cultures and encouragement of economic benefits occur not only in joint Agreements covering other national parks within the Territories but are now becoming routine in various forms in the Management Plans for national parks located in the ten provinces. For example, the management Plan for Wapusk National Park (the polar bear park on Hudson Bay, near Churchill, Manitoba) contains a significant role definition for local aboriginal peoples..

One of Canada's newest national parks is Ukkusiksalik National Park surrounding Wager Bay on the west side of Hudson Bay, Nunavut Territory. In an Agreement, *Inuit Impact and Benefit Agreement*, August 23, 2003, Parks Canada, the Kivalliq Inuit Association and the Government of Nunavut concurred in the creation of the Park, to respect Inuit rights and continued use of the Park and its renewable resources, to minimize detrimental impacts of the Park on Inuit while conferring benefits arising from the management and continued operation of the Park and, to provide a framework for co-operative Park management. The Impact and Benefit Agreement was based upon, and is deemed consistent with, the *Nunavut Land Claims Agreement (NLCA)*. However, the Park Agreement "does not form part of the NLCA and is not intended to be a land claims agreement within the meaning of Section 35 of the *Constitution Act, 1982*" (Section 1.2.4.). One unusual resource protected under the Park Agreement is carving stone and a person covered under the Land Claims agreement is entitled to remove up to 25 cubic yards of carving stone annually from the Park.

Park management is through the Ukkusiksalik Park Management Committee (UPMC), again consisting of six members three of whom represent the Kivalliq Inuit Association (KIA) and three representing the Minister responsible for Parks Canada. This joint-management pattern emerged in the Gwaii Haanas Agreement (1993) and is now rather typical of other Agreements. One interesting variation is contained in the 1996 *Tuktut Nogait Agreement*.

Tuktut Nogait National Park was created in part through insistence of local communities in order to protect the bluenose west Caribou herd. The Park contains 16,340 square kilometres of land running along the shoreline of the Amundsen Gulf and the Outwash River.

The Management Board consists of five members consisting of representatives of the Inuvialuit Regional Corporation and the Paulatuk Community Corporation; one member from the Inuvialuit Game Council and the Paulatuk Hunters and Trappers Committee; two representing the minister responsible for Parks Canada; and a Chair to be appointed on and with

the advice of the various Councils involved in nominating single members.²⁵ Responsibilities of the Board closely parallel those of, for example the Vuntut Gwichin Agreement as do the dispute resolution processes. Parks Canada has agreed to maintain in the Nunavut Settlement Area the offices and staff responsible for the ongoing operation and management of national parks in Nunavut. Provision for the protection and development of cultural resources as well as training and development including “as-yet undeveloped business opportunities and markets for Paulatuk residents” as well as harvesting rights are set forth in the Agreement.

Three other national parks are covered under somewhat similar agreements. Thus, the *Inuit Impact and Benefit Agreement for Auyuittuq, Quttinirpaaq and Sirmilik National Parks, August 12, 1999* acknowledges the unique place and role of inuit people as “an integral part of the ecosystems of the Park(s)” (Section 5.3.3.). Each national park has a specified local community(ies) wherein economic benefits are anticipated and park management is to be located. Thus: Auyuittuq National Park has adjacent residential communities on Broughton Island and at the village of Pangnirtung; Quttinirpaaq National Park, the communities of Griese Fjord and Resolute Bay; while Sirmilik National Park is linked to the communities of Arctic Bay and Pond Inlet.

Each park has a Joint Inuit/Government Park Planning and Management Committee consisting of six members of which three are appointed by the responsible federal Minister (of the Environment) while the other three members are appointed by the Qikiqtani Inuit Association (QIA).

As part of the training and development component of the Agreement, the Government of Canada provided \$200,000 to establish a Trust to be administered by the local Kakivak Association (one of the peoples of the region) to provide scholarships for training in traditional knowledge associated with ecology. Renewable resource management and a host of other disciplines ranging from geography to accounting and remote sensing. The agreement also provides for military exercises in the national parks under strict conditions. This reflects a long-standing tradition in Canadian national parks for military training and exercises including a cadet camp in Banff National Park.

The remoteness of most of the territorial national parks tends to minimise visitor numbers. Nevertheless, there are concerns as greater numbers of adventure tour companies offer experiential tours in the north. Moreover, as respect has grown for traditional culture and ways of living as integral parts of respective ecological systems, there is momentum for ensuring that benefits flow to all parties including visitors and local residents and aboriginal peoples.

CONCLUSION

Contemporary public policy and administration—to say nothing of populist democracy—have witnessed massive alterations in the relationship between the citizen and the state. Public policy makers risk policies if they fail to fully appreciate the extent to which modern citizenship posits expectations about relative roles of citizens and public officials in the process of governance.

²⁵ *The Tuktut Nogait Agreement: An Agreement to Establish a National Park in the Inuvialuit Settlement Region near Paulatuk, Northwest Territories, June 1996.* Sections 5 - 7 set forth the Management Board’s responsibilities. Generally, Parks Canada agrees to carry most costs including *per diems* as required associated with Board meetings and administration. Costs of translation are also borne by Parks Canada.

Network theory offers some insights into the manner in which policy process have responded to the requirements of new public management and to the ensuing styles of governance which characterise related public policy process.

The Parks Canada Agency, in many respects has developed its own model of networking which, for many circumstances, is clearly intended to be action oriented. Arguably, in its own often pragmatic way the PCA has emerged in the forefront of collaborative public policy development and management. Certainly, given both the magnitude and the sensitivity of land claim and cultural heritage issues the move from bureaucratic driven policy processes to network policy processes has opened the way both for sustainability of ecological integrity within Canada's national parks but, perhaps, more importantly, for the sustainability of valued cultures and life-styles of people for whom the encroachment of 'market civilisation' has been at best historically tenuous.

Networks are opportunities to extend involvement of those for whom public policy ultimately is framed. I submit that the Parks Canada experience is worthy of note if no emulation as Ottawa and Canada venture into democracy 'writ large' for Canadians.

REFERENCES

- Abele, F. and K. Graham (2002), *Serving the Public North of 60*, Toronto: IPAC, New Directions #10.
- Agranoff, R. (2003), *Leveraging Networks: A Guide for Public Managers Working Across Organizations*, Arlington, VA: IBM Endowment for the Business of Government.
- _____ and M. McGuire (2003), *Collaborative Public Management: New Strategies for Local Governments*, Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Boardman, R. (ed.) (1992), *Canadian Environmental Policy: Ecosystems, Politics and Processes*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Brown, G.N. and J.F. Shogren (1998), "Economics of the Endangered Species Act", *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 12(3).
- Brown-John, C. L. (1996), *Federal-Provincial Relationships and Environmental Management: The Canadian Harmonization Initiative: Innovation or Failure?*, Report to the Institut Kajian Strategik Dan Antarabangsa/ISIS Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
- _____ (2003), "The Politics of National Parks and Historic Sites in Canada: The Role of Voluntarism", Paper, Western Social Science Association, Annual Conference, Las Vegas, NV.
- _____ (2005), "Managing Canada's National Parks: The Emerging Role of First Nations Communities", Paper, Western Social Science Annual Conference, Albuquerque, NM.
- Canada, Panel on the Ecological Integrity of Canada's National Parks, (2000), *Unimpaired for Future Generations: Conserving Ecological Integrity with Canada's National Parks*. (2 Volumes), Ottawa: Public Works and Government Services.
- Eagles, P.E.J. (1998), "Ecotourism and Parks: Do or Die", in: J.S. Marsh and B.W. Hodgins (eds.), *Managing Parks: The History, Future and Cultural Context of Parks and Heritage Landscapes*, Toronto: Natural Heritage/Natural History Inc., 261 - 278.
- Frederickson, H.G. (1999), "The Repositioning of American Public Administration", *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 32(4): 701 - 711.
- Harkin, J.B. (1957). *The History and Meaning of the National Parks of Canada: Extracts from the Papers of the Late Jas. B. Harkin, First Commissioner of the National Parks of Canada*. (Compiled by Mabel B. Williams). Saskatoon: H.R. Larson Publishing Company
- Harrison, K. (1995), "Federalism, Environmental Protection and Blame Avoidance", in: F. Rocher and M. Smith (eds.) *New Trends in Canadian Federalism*, Peterborough: Broadview Press, 414 - 38.
- _____ (1996), *Passing the Buck: Federalism and Canadian Environmental Policy*, Vancouver: UBC Press.

- Kennett, S.A. (1993), "Hard Law, Soft Law and Diplomacy: The Emerging Paradigm for Intergovernmental Cooperation in Environmental Assessment," *Alberta Law Review*, 31: 653-58.
- Kooiman, J. (ed.), (1993), *Modern Governance: New Government-Society Interactions*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lothian, W.F. (1976-1981). *A History of Canada's National Parks*. (4 volumes). Ottawa: Parks Canada.
- March, J.G. and J. P. Olsen (1995), *Democratic Governance*, New York, NY: Free Press.
- Mcpherson, R. (2003), *New Owners in their Own Land: Minerals and Inuit Land Claims*, Calgary: University of Calgary Press.
- Metrick, A. and M. L. Weitzman (1998), "Conflicts and Choices in Biodiversity Preservation", *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 12 (3).
- O'Neill, H. (2000), *In Search of a Heart*, Leamington, ON: Friends of Point Pelee.
- Peters, B.G. (1996), *The Future of Governing: Four Emerging Models*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Parks Canada (2002), "Volunteer Program Policy For National Parks of the Western Arctic Field Unit", Inuvik, NWT: Parks Canada WAFU.
- Paquet, G. and R. Shepherd (1996), "The Program Review Process: A Deconstruction", in: G. Swimmer (ed.), *How Ottawa Spends, 1996 - 97: Life Under the Knife*, Ottawa: Carleton University Press.
- Phillips, S. (1995), "The Canada Health and Social Transfer: Fiscal Federalism in Search of a Vision," in: D. Brown and J. Rose (eds.), *Canada: The State of the Federation*, Kingston: Queens University Press, Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, 65 - 96.
- Rhodes, R.A. (1997), *Understanding Governance: Policy Networks, Governance, Reflexivity, and Accountability*, Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Roseneau, J. N. (1992), "Governance, Order and Change in World Politics", In: *Governance Without Government: Order and Change in World Politics*, J. N. Roseneau and E. Czempiel (eds.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1 - 29.
- Salamon, L. (ed.) (2002), *The Tools of Government: A Guide to the New Governance*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Simmons, J.M (1999), "The Canada-Wide Accord on Environmental Harmonization and Value Change Within the Department of the Environment", Paper, Annual Meeting, Canadian Political Science Association, Sherbrooke.
- Stefanick, L. (1998), "Organisation, Administration and the Environment: Will a facelift suffice, or does the patient need radical surgery?", *Canadian Public Administration* 41: 99 - 119.
- Taylor, C. J. (1990). *Negotiating the Past: The Making of Canada's National Historic Parks and Sites*. Montréal: McGill-Queens University Press.
- Toner, Glen (1996), "Environment Canada's Continuing Roller Coaster Ride", in: G. Swimmer (ed.), *How Ottawa Spends, 1996-97: Life Under the Knife*, Ottawa: Carleton University Press.
- Waiser, B. (1995), *Park Prisoners: The Untold Story of Western Canada's National Parks, 1915 - 1946*, Calgary: Fifth House Publishing.