

Provincial Roles in Federal-Municipal-Provincial Relations in Saskatchewan
by

Joseph Garcea and Ken Pontikes

1. Introduction

The Canadian federal system produces a plethora of interesting and important intergovernmental relations that have varying degrees of effects not only on the nature and scope of public policy and programs, but ultimately also for the operation of the political system. This includes various combinations and permutations of relations between the five major orders of government, namely federal, provincial, territorial, municipal and Aboriginal (i.e., First Nations and Metis). Such relations are pervasive in all policy sectors. Indeed, there is no policy sector in which some type of such intergovernmental relations does not exist either in most, if not all facets, of that sector regardless the precise alignment of jurisdictional authority among the various orders of government. The literature on Canadian federalism, public policy and public management devotes extensive analysis to most, though by no means all, such relations. One facet of such relations which has not been examined in an extensive manner to date, however, is federal-municipal relations, and particularly the roles of provincial governments in such relations. This is not to say that some attention has not been devoted to such roles. After all, there is no shortage of examples in the literature regarding the vigilance which various provinces have exercised in monitoring and guarding against what they would deem to be federal intrusion into the municipal sector using either its constitutional powers or its power of the purse. But what have not received sufficient attention are both the precise nature and scope of federal-municipal relations per se, and the precise nature of the provincial roles in such relations.

In considering why sufficient attention has not been devoted to those two matters it is important to recognize that traditionally the relations between the federal and municipal governments have been treated as products of federal-provincial relations. The conventional wisdom among governmental actors and academics alike was that federal-municipal relations were not to be treated as the principal object of analysis; instead, they were to be treated as at best secondary objects of analysis because they were deemed to be essentially outputs of federal-provincial relations. In other words federal-municipal relations, whatever their form, were deemed to be products of the negotiations between the federal and provincial governments. Such a view treated municipal governments not as relatively active and relatively powerful political actors who performed instrumental roles in shaping their relations with the federal government, but merely as relatively passive and relatively impotent actors whose relations with the federal government were largely constructed for them by the senior orders of government. In recent years there has been a growing awareness among governmental actors and academics alike that this is not the case and, at least according to some of them, that this should not be the case. The orthodoxy of yesteryear regarding the desirability of limiting the scope of direct federal-municipal relations which was grounded largely in the philosophy or gospel of autonomist and sovereigntist provincial governments is quickly becoming passé and politically incorrect. It should be noted that the old orthodoxy was not always practiced. The new orthodoxy values the desirability of increasing the scope of direct federal-municipal relations which may or

may not entail any form of provincial involvement. It should be noted that the old orthodoxy was not always practiced religiously. There were many instances in various major cities, including some in Saskatoon where the mayors and councils were engaged in direct negotiations for programs and projects with the federal government largely through partisan political connections. The legacy of former Senator Sid Buckwold in his capacity as mayor of Saskatoon during the 1960s is a case in point. He was very successful in negotiating funding for various major municipal projects during his tenure as mayor.

Despite the new orthodoxy, however, it is virtually impossible for provincial governments not to be involved either directly or indirectly and either extensively or nominally in anything that might be described as federal-municipal relations. In other words it is very difficult, if not impossible, to identify any so-called federal-municipal relations which on closer inspection are not in effect trilateral federal-municipal-provincial relations. This raises the question as to whether it possible or desirable to focus analyses on bilateral or even multilateral federal-municipal relations without devoting any attention to the preferences, roles and responsibilities of provincial governments, or whether the focus should be on trilateral or multilateral federal-municipal-provincial relations with special attention to the preferences, roles and responsibilities of those three orders of government. The fact that within the Canadian federal system another order of government, namely the Aboriginal one, has become increasingly important in many relations between and among the other three orders of government, including provincial governments, complicates the calculus of intergovernmental relations by creating even more combinations and permutations that merit closer and more systematic analysis.

Objectives and Organization of Paper

The central objective of this paper is to provide a preliminary analysis of the Saskatchewan provincial government's roles in managing federal-municipal-provincial relations. More specifically, the objective is to provide an overview of the following: the nature and scope of the roles performed by the provincial government in managing such relations; the processes, approaches, and strategies that it uses for performing such roles; the determinants of both the roles performed by the provincial government as well as the processes and strategies it uses in doing so; an overview of existing and emerging issues related to such roles and approaches; and the need for further research on such roles and approaches.

In keeping with the foregoing objectives it is useful to provide a brief overview of two key background or contextual matters that are useful for understanding the nature, scope and determinants of the provincial government's roles in managing federal-municipal-provincial relations. The first is an overview of the key structural and organizational features of the municipal system in Saskatchewan. The second, is an overview of some notable programs and projects established within the municipal sector in recent years that are illustrative of two key matters: (a) the types of initiatives that are generally the object of federal-municipal-provincial relations; and (b) the types of roles and responsibilities of each of those three orders of government in initiating, developing, funding and implementing them.

2. Structural and Organizational Features of Saskatchewan's Municipal System

Each province's municipal system has relatively distinct structural and organizational features that have implications for, among other things, the nature of intergovernmental relations and the roles that provincial governments perform within the context of such relations.

2.1 Structural Features of Saskatchewan's Municipal System

The key structural features of Saskatchewan's municipal system in terms of numbers and types of municipalities and can be described as follows. The province has approximately 836 municipalities. This is the second highest number of municipalities in the country; only Quebec has more. Not surprisingly, given the large number of municipalities and the relatively small size of its population, Saskatchewan has the lowest population per municipality ratio in the country (i.e., 1,225). Without the two major cities which have approximately 45% of the total population the average population per municipality is closer to 750. The municipalities are classified into three general categories namely, urban, rural and northern. There are over 515 urban municipalities grouped into three major sub-types namely 13 cities (population over 5,000), towns (population ≥ 100 and $<5,000$), and villages (population <100). The average size for cities is approximately 44,000 ranging from approximately 5,000 to 220,000. There are 297 rural municipalities that, apart from some anomalies which are larger than the others, are essentially of equal size. The average population in such rural municipalities is approximately 664 with a range from a low of 154 to a high of 7,152 (i.e., Corman Park which surrounds, and is inextricably linked to, Saskatoon) There are 24 northern municipalities and quasi-municipalities within the Northern District which are grouped into northern towns (2) northern villages (13) and northern hamlets (9). Apart from Laloche which has a population of 3,000 and LaRonge which has a population of approximately 2,000 the other municipalities have very small populations ranging from 40 to 2,000. Collectively these northern municipalities along with the First Nations reserves have a population of approximately 27,000 people.

2.2 Features of Saskatchewan's Municipal System

In describing key organizational features of Saskatchewan's municipal system it is useful to distinguish between the municipal component, the provincial component, and the provincial-municipal component of the system.

(a) The Municipal Component of the Municipal System

The municipal component of the municipal system consists of three major associations of municipalities which represent each of the aforementioned general types of municipalities. These are the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association (SARM), the Saskatchewan Rural Municipalities Association (SARM), and the Saskatchewan Association of Northern Communities (SANC) which is formally affiliated with SUMA for certain operational purposes. These associations perform a key role both

in lobbying the provincial and federal governments on behalf of their members and in negotiating the development and implementation of various policies, programs and projects.

In such lobbying efforts in some cases their interests diverge and in some cases they converge. Part of the reason for this is that some of their member municipalities have more in common than their name would suggest. For example, despite being referred to as “urban”, the smallest towns and villages have more issues and concerns in common with rural, than with urban, municipalities. In response to the needs of its membership, SUMA’s position on many issues can be influenced more by the rural agenda, pursued by SARM, and occasionally at the expense of the agenda that would be of concern to the cities and larger towns. Northern municipalities are responsive to broad social and economic issues facing their communities and their residents; their perspectives of their roles are the broadest of any municipalities, even the cities, in Saskatchewan. Fiscal pressures have forced rural and most urban municipalities to view their role as being confined to providing “services to property”. For the largest cities, while they suggest limiting their role in this way, the practical needs of their residents force them to take a broadly-based approach to providing and supporting services and programs.

It is noteworthy that SUMA has established what committees or caucuses for each major type of urban municipality (i.e., cities, towns and villages) who meet and deliberate on issues of interest and importance for them. In some instances some of SUMA’s committees or caucuses communicate directly with the provincial and federal governments in advancing their interests. This is particularly true of the City Mayors committee which has achieved specific interest group status with other orders of government and the news media. Also, the Mayors of Saskatoon and Regina are members of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities’ Big City Mayors Caucus.

Similarly, SARM has established regional groupings which meet annually to discuss issues of importance for municipalities within their particular regions. All organizations convene meetings of the entire membership either on an annual basis in the case of SUMA and SANC and on bi-annual basis in the case of SARM which generally are attended by several cabinet ministers who not only deliver speeches but have traditionally engaged in what is known as ‘bear pit sessions’ to answer questions from elected and appointed representatives of the member municipalities. Part of the tradition is also for the provincial government to respond to resolutions passed by the municipal associations in writing after the convention. In the case of SUMA such responses are generally published in their monthly newsletter.

(b) The Provincial Component

The provincial component of the municipal system changed in configuration in 2002. Whereas prior to 2002 responsibility for municipal affairs rested with the line department Municipal Affairs, Culture and Housing) which had various names over time (Municipal Government [1993 – 1998], Municipal Affairs, Culture and Housing [1998 – 2001], Municipal Affairs and Housing [2001 – 2002]) depending on the precise configurations of its policy or program responsibilities, since 2002 the responsibility for municipal affairs has been transferred to the central agency Government Relations and Aboriginal Affairs

(GRAA) that responsible for governmental relations, including intergovernmental relations. This is the same agency that is responsible various types of intergovernmental relations including federal-provincial provincial-Aboriginal relations, and international relations. GRAA's mandate includes "to promote Saskatchewan's interests through management of the Province's relations with other governments, in Canada and abroad , and to work with Aboriginal peoples and their organizations to advance our common interests". It also "coordinates and manages matters related to Government House, French-language services, official protocol, provincial honours, and provides administrative services to the Office of the Lieutenant Governor". Its mandate related to municipalities is "to work in partnership with communities to support local governance, provide financial and technical support and develop legislation, regulations and other policies to meet the changing needs of municipal governments." (See GRAA official mandate statement).

This recent organizational change has had three effects simultaneously; (a) it has formally integrated the line department and the central agency for purpose of intergovernmental relations; (b) it has fragmenting some of the core policy and program functions that were being performed by the department of Municipal Affairs Culture and Housing because the culture, public safety, libraries, sport and recreation, heritage resources, museums, urban land development, and social housing functions were hived off to other line departments: and (c) it has integrated the culture, housing and other functions with other departments who have also been involved in providing community services.

It is unclear whether the rationale for integrating municipal affairs into Governmental Relations and Aboriginal Affairs was primarily a function of political imperatives related to cabinet construction or of policy and program considerations. Nevertheless, this configuration has produced a unique organizational framework among the various provinces and territories. To date no other province or territory has integrated its municipal affairs bureaucracy with its intergovernmental relations bureaucracy. Given the increasing overlap of policy and program issues involving various orders of government, including federal, provincial, municipal and Aboriginal, this administrative integration could well prove be not only interesting but important for governance purposes. To some extent this change also attests to an evolution that has been occurring over the past twenty years, but particularly in the past ten, in the provincial perspective towards municipal governments in Saskatchewan. Whereas in the more distant past the provincial government viewed municipalities as its local administrative units whose principal role was the facilitation of provincial priorities in the provision of local programs and services, in recent years it has been viewing and treating them more as governments and moving toward a "government to government" relationship with them. Whether the latter is actually realized in action and provincial policy and motivation, remains to be seen.

The main advantage of the new structure is twofold. First, the municipal file is now integrated within the overall attention of the deputy and minister responsible for intergovernmental affairs. The intergovernmental file also has a great deal of direct attention by the Premier. So, it is possible that the Premier will be more aware of municipal relations issues on a more timely and direct basis. The Premier's

involvement also provides more clout when it comes to achieving interdepartmental coordination in dealing with municipalities. Previously, the municipal affairs minister alone could not command enough authority to influence other department's actions which might be detrimental to a broader municipal strategy. Second, there is intergovernmental relations and strategic negotiation expertise that the new department can offer to the municipal file. There are skills that full-time intergovernmental affairs specialists can offer to the program specialists, who previously handled municipal relations in the municipal affairs department.

This innovation is still at the experimental stage subject to close monitoring and potential change by the provincial government based either on political or policy rationality. It remains to be seen both whether it is retained in Saskatchewan and whether it is emulated by other provinces and territories. If it is emulated by other province and territories it could prove to be modern day contribution by Saskatchewan to innovative public administration. Whether it is retained in Saskatchewan and emulated by other provinces will depend largely on judgments that are made regarding the effect it has both on the efficiency and effectiveness in managing various types of intergovernmental relations involving municipal governments, and whether it facilitates or hampers the development and implementation of policies and programs.

(c) The Provincial-Municipal Component

In Saskatchewan two intergovernmental bodies have been established to facilitate communication and negotiations between the provincial government and the municipal associations to deal with matters that fall within the scope federal-municipal relations as well as those that fall within the scope of federal-municipal-provincial relations. The first is the Provincial-Municipal Roundtable which consists of representatives of the provincial government and both SUMA and SARM. The second is the Northern Provincial-Municipal Roundtable which consists of representatives of the provincial government and SANC. Whereas SUMA and SARM sent their executive members to the roundtable meetings, the Northern Roundtable involved representatives from all of the northern municipalities. It was a wide open meeting and communities might send several representatives. The extent to which these roundtables are used for dealing with various policy and program issues involving the various orders of government is highly variable and depends of the willingness of the various governmental and municipal representatives to attend the meetings to address various issues of interest or importance to them. Political machinations and personal relations have substantial effects on the efficacy of these roundtables to serve the purposes for which they have been established. In addition to reliance on these formal provincial-municipal bodies, relations between the provincial and municipal are conducted through various informal mechanisms involving either the most senior elected officials, or the most senior appointed officials from both orders of government meeting informally from time to time to deal with issues of mutual interest.

3. Products & Objects of Federal-Municipal-Provincial Relations

The objective in this section is to provide a brief overview of existing policies, programs and projects within the municipal sector that are objects of federal-municipal-provincial relations. This overview consists of a sample of all such policies, programs and projects that individually and collectively serve to shed light on some interesting and important aspects of what has been produced within the scope of federal-municipal-provincial relations. This includes: the basic nature of the programs and projects; which order of government took a lead role in initiating, developing and implementing them; which of them contributed to the funding of such programs and projects, which of them was primarily responsible for implementing or delivering them, and which provincial department performed a lead role. (*See Appendix 1: Federal-Municipal-Provincial Collaboration in Saskatchewan in Saskatchewan-- Selected Examples 2003*) Based on the information contained in Appendix 1 it is possible to make several observations or generalizations. Before doing so, however, it is important to note that this appendix is illustrative of the range and complexity of federal-municipal collaboration related to various programs and projects in Saskatchewan, most of which have been established in recent years; it is not an exhaustive list of all such collaboration. It is also important to note that there is at least one federally initiated program where municipalities have not participated. That is the Western Economic Diversification's Urban Development Agreements Program which has not been accessed by Saskatoon and Regina as it has by comparable cities in neighbouring provinces. The reason for this is not clear, but undoubtedly, it has more to do with the choice of those cities than either with ineligibility or provincial government direction not to access the program. It is included in the table to serve as a reminder that municipalities have the freedom to choose to participate or not to participate in some programs and projects developed by the federal and provincial governments.

There are five major observations related to that table. First, such programs and projects are undertaken in a wide range of policy sectors. This includes: minority language community planning, airports, facilities for movie production, infrastructure, agriculture, university research facilities, culture, heritage, disaster assistance, housing, regional intersectoral planning, environment, emergency preparedness, construction codes, northern development, rural roads for grain transportation, policing, inner city neighbourhood planning and development, forestry, and summer student employment, urban development, Aboriginal heritage museum. In looking at this list through a jurisdictional lens, it is quite apparent that such initiatives impinge on areas of federal and provincial jurisdiction as well as in areas of shared jurisdiction. Moreover, the various programs and projects tend to have what might be termed 'pluri-jurisdictional' characteristics which render them difficult to place in a particular jurisdictional category. Jurisdictional issues do not loom large in such programs and projects in Saskatchewan because they are undertaken on a partnership basis with the consent and support of the various orders of government.

Second,, the vast majority of those policies, programs and projects were initiated and developed by the federal government, a few were initiated and developed by the provincial and municipal governments. Clearly, the federal government has been and remains an active, indeed a proactive, actor in

initiating and developing policies, programs and projects within the scope of the municipal sector (e.g. “Green Funds” and the federal government’s climate change initiative and the Kyoto commitment). Although it is somewhat beyond the scope of this paper to explore the motivations of the federal government to be proactive in such initiatives, the federal government has been quite willing to work in partnership with the municipal and provincial governments primarily to advance various policy and program goals. This includes its own policy and program goals and to some extent also to advance those of the provincial and municipal governments. Undoubtedly, of course, the federal government has also been motivated by its political imperatives, especially in cases where such policies, programs and projects provide services or benefits that are valuable to, and valued by, various municipal governments and members of their respective municipalities. The Liberal federal government has found that although its financial contributions to programs and projects in Saskatchewan tend generate support for the federal order of government, they do not generate much the requisite electoral support for it to win many seats in the province. In recent elections the Liberal government has generally had the fewest seats among the major parties and there is little to suggest that its fortunes will change dramatically.

Third, most of the programs and projects are jointly funded by the various orders of government and in some instances also by other governmental and non-governmental entities. However, it is noteworthy that in many, if not most, instances the federal government tends to assume either all or at least the largest part of the financial responsibility for such policies, programs and project. Indeed, there is only one initiative among those we have identified that does not entail a federal financial contribution. That is the regional intersectoral coordinating committees which are funded entirely by the provincial government.

Fourth, the federal government has also been very actively involved in the prioritization of specific initiatives and the adjudication of proposals pursuant to various programs and projects. Its involvement in performing such functions is probably a function of wanting to exert some oversight and control in ensuring that both its policy goals and political interests are advanced.

Fifth, the federal government has not been very involved in the implementation or delivery of various programs and projects. Invariably that has been the responsibility of the provincial and municipal governments as well as other local governmental and non-governmental entities. These features of the implementation or delivery of programs and projects reflects the practical reality that the federal government does not have the requisite administrative infrastructure at the local level to do so. It also reflects the growing tendency both by the federal and provincial governments to rely on municipalities and various other local governmental and non-governmental agencies to implement programs and projects and to deliver services. This approach is justified on the grounds that it enhances the degree of flexibility and sensitivity to meet local conditions, needs and preferences.

Sixth, there is a wide array of provincial departments involved in the implementation of various programs and projects and in the delivery of various services. This is not deemed to be the exclusive preserve of the department or agency responsible for municipal affairs. This array of departments has grown because of actions by the provincial government over the years to decentralize and integrate its cost-

shared or policy-specific programs for municipalities within the larger context of provincial policies and programs. Municipalities are viewed less as entities onto themselves and more as a interest groups or program and service delivery vehicles through which the provincial government can achieve its policy and program priorities.

In summary the foregoing overview reveals that there is an interesting and relatively important array of policies, programs and projects that have been produced through federal-municipal-provincial collaboration in Saskatchewan. Such policies, programs and projects require each of those three orders of government to perform various roles and responsibilities. They are willing to collaborate and to perform various roles and responsibilities because they have a shared belief that doing so will advance their respective policy and to some extent also their political goals.

3. Provincial Roles in Managing Federal-Municipal-Provincial Relations

The objective in this section is to provide a brief explanation of five different provincial roles in managing federal-municipal-provincial relations, and to provide some examples of each of them. Before doing so, however, it is important to note that all three orders of governments perform some roles in managing relations among them. The roles performed by the other two orders of government are somewhat beyond the scope of this paper. Provincial governments may perform at least five major types of roles in the context of federal-municipal-provincial relations.

| TYPES OF PROVINCIAL ROLES |
|----------------------------------|
| Partnership Role |
| Monitoring Role |
| Regulatory Role |
| Advocacy Role |
| Mediation Role |

Before explaining each of those roles and providing some examples of each, a caveat is in order. These are not mutually exclusive roles. It is possible that provincial governments perform some of these roles either concurrently or even simultaneously. It should also be noted that in some instances there is a fine line between various roles. For example, there is a fine line between the performance of an advocacy role and a mediation role. Provincial governments could be performing an advocacy and mediation role simultaneously. Moreover, provincial governments are not impartial, disinterested and objective third parties, therefore in performing various roles its own interests are front and centre.

Partnership Role

The first type is a partnership role. In performing this role the provincial government operates as more or less an equal member of a tripartite intergovernmental partnership with the federal and municipal governments. As a partner the provincial government may perform any of the roles that are commonly attributed to members of various types of partnerships. This includes the following general types of partnerships: consultative partnerships in which all members engage in consultations related to matters of

mutual interest or concern; contributory partnerships in which entail a sharing of financial support for certain activities or services; operational partnerships which entail a sharing of the core management and administrative tasks that must be performed; collaborative partnerships which entail a sharing of core governance, strategic planning and various decision-making tasks as well as financial responsibility between two or more governmental and/or non-governmental organizations. Within the context of any of those partnerships the provincial government has considerable opportunities to manage federal-municipal-provincial relations. The decisions of the provincial government to participate or not to participate in various federal-municipal-provincial partnership initiatives, and its decisions regarding how it will participate, are crucial in managing both federal-municipal-provincial relations and even any purely federal-municipal relations that may emerge. The consent of the provincial government to participate in or support or at least to agree not to object or impede such federal- municipal intergovernmental partnerships is absolutely essential; without it the other two orders of government would run the risk of having their initiative contested either within the political or judicial arenas, especially in the case of initiatives that impinge on areas of provincial jurisdiction. Moreover, as a partner, in such intergovernmental partnerships, the provincial government adds “stature” to the municipal governments, who otherwise might be viewed inferior in constitutional authority and status to the federal government.

There is no shortage of examples in which the provincial government performs a partnership role. Indeed, as can be gleaned from the table contained in Appendix 1 most program and project initiative entail some form of a provincial partnership role. The precise roles and responsibilities of the provincial government in such partnerships tend to vary, but usually entail one of the following: initiating, developing, funding, and implementation of the program or project. Notable examples of programs and projects in which the provincial government has been performing varying combinations of key roles in each of those facets of the process are found in the table contained in Appendix 1 and need not be reiterated here. Nevertheless, for illustrative purposes it is useful to note some features of the intergovernmental dynamics creation and operation of one such partnership. The Canada-Saskatchewan Infrastructure Program is an example of where the provincial government and municipalities were of the same view that federal funding for infrastructure was justified and essential to ease the financial pressures on provincial and municipal governments. In Saskatchewan, the provincial government announced the introduction of a provincial-municipal infrastructure program during the year prior to when the federal government agreed to renew its involvement in such a program. In announcing its contribution, the provincial government expressed support for the municipal call for assistance from other orders of government and urged the federal government to come on board. The following year, the federal government announced that it would enter into agreements with the provinces to finance a new national infrastructure program. This announcement marked a change to the “partnership” insofar as the federal government negotiated the agreements with the provincial and territorial governments. The municipalities were not directly involved in the formal negotiations and were not signatories to the agreement, notwithstanding the fact that they were expected to contribute to the cost-sharing formula for the portion of the program that would apply to them. The reasons

why the federal and provincial governments did not include the municipalities in the negotiations were, first, that the federal government saw this program as primarily an employment-creation program and not a municipal program and second, the provinces wished to have the flexibility to determine how much of the funding would be directed to municipal priorities and how much would go to other provincial priorities. In Saskatchewan, at least 80% of the federal-provincial funding was to be directed to municipal priorities, with municipalities supplementing this funding to reflect a one-third contribution

Monitoring Role

The second type is the monitoring role. In performing this role the provincial government monitors the relations and any resulting initiatives between the federal and municipal governments in an effort to ascertain what, if any, implications they might have both for its own policy goals, its political interests, and the broader public provincial interest.

It is not unreasonable to suggest that very little, if any, of the federal-municipal relations are not monitored by the provincial governments. This is equally true at the initiation, development and implementation of any program or project that would involve those two orders of government. However, the focus here is on two particular instances of provincial monitoring: the first is when the provincial government is not involved in initiating, developing, funding, and implementing a program or project; the second is when the provincial government may be involved in initiating and developing a program or project but is not involved in funding or implementing it. In both of those types of instances it is effectively monitoring from a distance what the other two orders of government when its directly involved either never existed or has ceased at a particular stage of a the process.

Regulatory Role

The third type is a regulatory role. Again pursuant to its constitutional prerogative and political imperative, the provincial government may establish a regulatory regime for its municipalities that may have an effect both on the policy or program matters on which they might engage in relations or enter into agreements with the federal government and the means by which they might do so. Such regulation can occur either through legislation or through policies and protocols that might be developed on how the provincial government expects the municipal governments to conduct themselves in intergovernmental relations either with the federal government or any other government. Similar protocols, either written or unwritten might also be adopted between the provincial governments and any other governments with which their municipal governments might have some relations so as to clarify what type of relations are acceptable and what types are not.

The provincial government has the constitutional authority to regulate various activities of its municipalities, including their intergovernmental relations activities. Such authority is exercised through legislation or through policies and protocols that might be developed on how the province expects the municipalities to operate. Historically there have been both statutory and non-statutory limitations to the authority of municipal governments neither to undertake formal relations nor to enter into negotiations for the purpose of concluding agreements with other orders of government in Canada and abroad without full

and formal provincial approval. During the past decade, however, the provincial government has been much more willing to broaden the scope of the authority of municipal governments to undertake such relations and also to negotiate and enter into agreements with other orders of government without being subjected to an unduly restrictive provincial regulatory regime on such matters. This is evident in Bill 33 which had been drafted to provide municipal governments with greater authority to make decisions regarding their restructuring and their relations not only with each other, but also with other orders of government. Surprisingly, such provisions were not included in the new Cities Act which, ostensibly, provides greater authority and autonomy for city governments that choose to be governed under it. Regardless of the provisions in the current statutes, however, the emerging protocol and practice is one that is much more permissive. Finally it is worth noting that the provincial government does not have a protocol on such relations, negotiations and agreements with the municipalities. Whatever regulatory or quasi-regulatory function that it performs on such matters is largely a function of convention, tacit understandings, and periodic ad-hoc discussions between the provincial government and either the municipal association or individual municipal governments from time to time.

Advocacy Role

The fourth type is the advocacy role. Provincial governments, either on their own initiative or at the request of municipal governments, may perform an advocacy role on behalf of their municipal governments vis -à-vis the federal government. There are at least two notable examples of such a role. The first is the initial lobbying for the Canada-Saskatchewan Infrastructure program that the provincial government did not only in its own interest and on its own behalf, but in the interest and on behalf of the municipal associations and their members, all of whom were very anxious to access federal funds for their transportation infrastructure. Another notable example is the provincial government's support for rural municipalities when SARM was calling for higher compensation for specific land claims. The province had no direct financial obligation with respect to this matter, but agreed to support carefully – in order not to be drawn into the federal government's funding responsibilities – the municipalities' arguments. Another example is the Prairie Grain Roads Program. While the provincial government ended up getting a share of the federal funding under this program for provincial secondary highways, this program was the culmination of many years of support to municipalities who claimed that grain handling and transportation changes which occurred following the withdrawal of the Crow Freight Rate benefit was adding significant direct costs to farmers and was increasing financial pressures on municipalities to rebuilt and maintain their roads.

Mediation Role:

The fifth type is a mediation role. Provincial governments, either on their own initiative or at the request of either or both the federal and municipal governments, may perform a mediating role between those two orders of government. There are numerous instances in which the provincial government has served as a mediator between the federal and municipal governments. In some instances it is invited or implored to do so by their or both the federal and municipal governments and in other cases it chooses to do so of its own accord because it feels that it is imperative to preclude or eliminate some disagreement or impasse between those two other orders of government. In some instances, of course, it is invited and even implored but does its best not to become embroiled in what it perceives as an issue that has problematical policy or political implications.

There are several notable examples in the recent past of provincial mediation between the federal and municipal governments. In some instances it only involved those two particular orders of government. In other instances, however, it also involved Aboriginal governments. A notable example of where it involved only the federal and provincial governments is the mediation related to the Disaster Financial Assistance Arrangements. This program was initiated and developed by the federal government with little formal negotiation processes for input and changes to the program either with the provincial or municipal governments. After it created the program, the federal government made some unilateral adjustments to the program intended to contain its financial exposure. The Saskatchewan, provincial government, along with other provincial governments, ended up mediating discussions between the federal government and municipal representatives in an effort to establish a more stable, predictable and durable framework for the program to compensate municipalities for losses suffered due to natural disasters. It should be noted that in this particular case, and others like it, the provincial government is not mediating entirely as an objective and disinterested third party. After all, the level of compensation provided by the federal government has a direct bearing on how much of its own money the provincial government may have to devote for purposes of reconstruction in the aftermath of a disaster.

Examples of instances in which the provincial government has performed a mediation role, albeit admittedly a relatively limited one, which involved negotiations between the federal, municipal and Aboriginal governments include both compensation to municipalities for Treaty Land Entitlement and the creation of urban reserves. In both of these cases the provincial government has been very reluctant to perform a mediation role. Insofar as it has done so it has been very limited, informal and low profile. In the case of compensation for Treaty Land Entitlement the negotiations were primarily between the federal government, SARM which was negotiating on behalf of rural municipalities, and the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations which was negotiating on behalf of its member bands who were signatories to the Treaty Land Entitlement Agreement (TLEA) concluded during the early 1990s. The negotiations between them were conducted in a formal process known as the Treaty Land Entitlement Roundtable. At issue was how much compensation would be provided to rural municipalities for property taxes lost as a result of having land converted to reserve status on which property taxes *per se* could not be collected. The

provincial government tried to avoid becoming involved and performing any role in those negotiations largely out of fear that it would be called upon by the various parties around the table to make some financial contribution toward a mutually acceptable financial arrangement. Despite its efforts to avoid becoming involved, however, ultimately the provincial government was constrained to become involved by SARM when negotiations were reaching an impasse and that municipal association was threatening to take the issue to the courts. In an effort to prevent a court challenge the provincial government agreed to serve a mediator or a facilitator between the municipal and federal government representatives. The provincial performed that role in a very limited and informal manner. Finally, it should be noted that although the provincial government was performing primarily a limited mediation role, apparently it also performed a very limited advocacy role on behalf of the municipal association by encouraging the federal government to attempt to try to find a mutually acceptable solution. The provincial government was very reticent in performing such an advocacy role in a public, concerted substantial manner. The reasons for this is that it was a very sensitive matter, because in effect at issue was not simply how much money they could both exact from the federal government, but how much of the money that the federal government had already committed to the First Nation bands pursuant to the TLEA would have to be used for compensating municipalities for tax loss compensation. The provincial government did not want to be seen as siding with the municipal governments and against the First Nations governments.

Similar dynamics and considerations were at work in the provincial government's involvement in the creation of some urban reserves during the past decade in which the federal, municipal and Aboriginal governments were directly involved. This is particularly true of those urban reserve creation initiatives that generated strong resistance and opposition from the municipal government involved, namely the one in Fort Qu'Appelle and most recently the one in Prince Albert. In both of those cases the provincial government was very reticent to become involved either in a very formal or direct way or even in an informal and indirect way. Both publicly and privately the provincial government's preferred approach was to encourage and implore all parties to be sensible, pragmatic and fair in their efforts to find a mutually acceptable solution. Even such an approach tended to follow the modus operandi of low profile and informal discussions designed as much to inform the federal, municipal and Aboriginal governments that it preferred that they resolve the matter among themselves as best they could without provincial government involvement.

In summary, the provincial government performs at least five different types of roles managing in federal-municipal-provincial relations. These are not mutually exclusive roles and may be performed either concurrently or simultaneously even in conjunction with a single program or project initiative. Moreover, the decisions of the provincial government regarding which roles it will perform are based on strategic policy and political considerations on its part. The next section of this paper devotes some attention to the processes, approaches and strategies that the provincial government uses in performing its roles.

4. Approaches in Performing Provincial Roles:

The objective in this section is to provide a brief overview and explanation of the approaches that the provincial government uses in performing its key roles. Toward that end, this section consists of two sub-sections: the first provides a framework for describing provincial approaches and the second consists of some generalizations regarding the distinguishing characteristics of the provincial government's approaches to performing various roles.

In examining the key characteristics of the approaches used by various provincial governments in performing various roles within the context of intergovernmental relations the five sets of characteristics identified in the table below are quite useful.

| Classification of Approaches |
|--|
| Reactive Approach vs. Proactive Approach |
| Bilateral Approach vs. Trilateral Approach |
| Non-Intrusive vs. Intrusive Approach |
| Informal Approach vs. Formal Approach |
| Low Profile Approach vs. High Profile Approach |

Each of those sets of characteristics helps to focus attention on interesting and important tendencies on the part of provincial governments. Individually and collectively they are useful in describing what might be characterized as a style of intergovernmental relations, and particularly in the context of federal-municipal-provincial relations. The first set directs attention to the extent to which the provincial government's modus operandi is either reactive or proactive. The second set directs attention to the extent to which it prefers to operate on a bilateral or trilateral basis. The third set directs attention to the extent to which it is willing to assert itself in relations between the federal and municipal governments regardless of their preferences, or whether it tends to defer to them and wait for an invitation for involvement. The fourth set directs attention to the extent to which in performing various roles it relies on relatively formal and institutionalized processes as opposed to relatively informal and ad-hoc processes. The fifth set directs attention to the extent to which it performs its roles either in a high profile or a low profile manner.

During the past decade the Saskatchewan provincial government has approached its roles in federal-municipal-relations in a relatively distinct way. Although more research in other jurisdictions would be required to determine the extent to which its approach is similar or different from the way that its counterparts have approached their roles. Before proffering some generalizations regarding the Saskatchewan provincial government's approaches to its roles a caveat is in order. The following generalizations are based on general tendencies, rather than on perfectly consistent behaviour on the part of the provincial government. There are exceptions to the generalizations, and some are noted below. Moreover, these generalizations are based largely on our own observations regarding its tendencies in approach. It will be interesting to see the extent to which others either concur or disagree with our generalizations.

There are at least five generalizations that can be made regarding the provincial government's approach(es) in performing its roles within the context of federal-municipal-provincial relations. First, the provincial government tends to rely on a reactive, rather than proactive approach in performing its roles in federal-municipal-provincial relations. The provincial government tends to respond to federal initiatives related to the municipal sector, rather than undertaking its own initiatives and constraining the provincial government to respond to those. One wonders to what extent this is either a function of general governance style or of it being realistic regarding the extent to which, given its relatively limited financial and political clout, it can constrain the federal government to respond to its initiatives.

Second, the provincial government tends to rely much more on a bilateral approach than a trilateral approach in performing various roles, and particularly its advocacy and mediation roles. The provincial government seems to prefer to deal with the federal and municipal governments separately through bilateral negotiations with each of them either simultaneously or concurrently, rather than through trilateral negotiations. Indications are that this is also seems to be the preference of the federal government. The municipal governments are less supportive of this 'dual bilateralism preferred and practiced by the provincial and municipal governments. While they value a certain degree of such bilateralism when it suits their purposes either on some matters or at certain stages of a consultation or negotiation process, there are many instances in which they would prefer that they were included in any consultations or negotiations undertaken by the federal and provincial governments in negotiating various programs and projects.

Third, the provincial government's tendency is not to adopt an intrusive approach in injecting itself into federal-municipal consultations and negotiations. It seems to be quite content to monitor such interactions from a distance and wait for the invitation of either or both the federal or municipal governments to become involved. The Saskatchewan provincial government generally does not exhibit the characteristics sometimes ascribed to provincial governments as jealously guarding jurisdiction and as being highly concerned about and sensitive to federal-municipal consultations, negotiations, and agreements. Its generally philosophy seems to be that the best way to avoid problems for itself that might emerge from federal-municipal relations is to maintain a safe distance from the negotiating table. Its major reason for doing so is a concern that if it occupies a place at that table it is likely to incur some financial obligations and political liabilities.

Fourth, the provincial government tends to prefer informal approaches in performing various roles. This is particularly true of its monitoring, regulatory, advocacy and mediation roles. In performing each of these roles the provincial government tends to eschew formal and institutionalized mechanisms and processes, in favour of informal and ad-hoc processes.

Fifth, the provincial government tends to prefer to use a low profile approach in performing its roles vis-à-vis the federal government. One gets the distinct impression that the provincial government does not like to be seen to taking strong public stands on any relations between the federal and municipal government. This is equally true during provincial elections and between such elections. Again the Saskatchewan provincial government does not conform to the characteristic ascribed to governments in

some other provinces that fed-bashing is an integral part of strategic political behaviour to curry support with the local electorate. There are exceptions, however, as evidenced by the position taken by the provincial government on the gun registry an issue in which it sided with the municipal leadership in this province against the provincial government. Even on that issue, however, the provincial government articulated its position in a more tempered and lower profile manner than its counterparts Alberta.

5. Determinants of Provincial Roles and Approaches

The objective in this section is to address the following question: What are the factors that affect the decisions of the provincial government regarding both (a) the roles that it will perform and (b) the approaches that it used in performing such roles within the context of federal-municipal-provincial relations? Many specific factors could be cited in answering that question. Invariably, however, they all subsumed within three broad categories of factors, namely the provincial government's interests, the political and financial resources that it has in advancing those interests, and some public management philosophies which to a varying extent have been influencing the public management practices of all governments. The provincial government is a rational actor (though one might quibble regarding the quality of its rationality). As a rational actor it makes decisions based on calculation regarding the ways that it can advance its interests given the resources that it has at its disposal.

Policy, Financial, and Political Goals

The Saskatchewan provincial government like its counterparts in other provinces, has policy interests or goals, financial interests or goals, and political interests or goals, all of which figure prominently in its decisions regarding what roles to perform and the approaches to use in doing so. The provincial government seems to be willing to perform roles that contribute to advancing its policy goals, its financial goals, and its political goals. Conversely it is very reluctant to perform roles which are likely to have an adverse effect on any of those sets of goals. Its policy goals are related primarily to its own policy agenda, and secondarily to the policy goals on the policy agendas of the federal and municipal governments' policy agenda that are consonant with its own. The provincial government performs various roles identified in a previous section of this paper as needed to advance all of those goals. In doing so it is mindful of the provincial public interest and to some extent also of the local and national public interests. Its financial goals are essentially to maximize the level of provincial contributions to various programs and projects by the other two orders of government and minimize the level of its own contributions whenever possible. Its political goals are to maximize both its electoral support and its legitimacy as an order of government vis-à-vis the other orders of government. Both types of support are essential for holding and exercising power. Therefore, the provincial government attempts to avoid as much as possible both the performance of any roles or a particular approach to performing that role which may have an adverse effect on its support among the electorate and its legitimacy in the eyes of the attentive public.

All of the foregoing considerations regarding its various policy and political goals have led the provincial government to perform an array of partnership roles in conjunction with the federal and

municipal governments. Its precise involvement and the nature and scope of its roles and responsibilities in various partnerships are based on calculations regarding the effects that they are likely to have on its goals. Similarly such considerations have also been influential in performing its other four major types of roles (i.e., monitoring, regulatory, advocacy, and mediation). Finally, it is noteworthy that the provincial government is not entirely free to do as it wishes vis -à-vis the federal and municipal governments. They are powerful and capable governmental actors in their own right. Consequently, the provincial government always has to take into consideration their policy preferences and policy goals in choosing what roles it chooses to perform and the approaches it uses in doing so. This is particularly true regarding the municipal governments. The vast majority of municipalities in Saskatchewan consist of very small communities where people know their municipal politicians personally and feel a closer relationship with them than with more distant provincial and federal Cabinet ministers. Municipal politicians therefore have the capacity to frame policy issues and disagreements in ways that respond to the level of understanding and perception that exists within their community.

The foregoing reality leads the provincial government to treat small municipal governments more as interest groups that have to be appeased than a vehicle for advancing provincial policy priorities. Consequently, the provincial government tends to view many of its funding programs to such municipalities in relation to achieving a politically optimal level of incremental funding when making budgetary decisions that will appease such municipal governments. Its main funding program for municipalities, Revenue Sharing, has no specific purpose other than to transfer unconditional funding to municipalities at a level that the government feels can be justified relative what is given to other interest groups. For this reason, the provincial government's interests in participating in funding programs are often judged in relation to the overall level of funding and to broad spending priorities (e.g. "green infrastructure" in the Canada-Saskatchewan Infrastructure Program). It is less interested in how the funding is specifically allocated to individual municipalities and projects. In the Canada-Saskatchewan Infrastructure Program, a committee of municipal representatives provides peer review of the funding applications and makes recommendations, which are generally accepted by the federal and provincial governments, on how the limited funds will be allocated to the large number of competing municipal applications. The underlying strategy of this process is to contain the criticism and disappointment from unsuccessful applicants by pointing to the peer review process. This approach mutes the municipal lobbying organizations, SUMA, SARM, and SANC – who have to support the decisions from the review process and who are forced to take a public role in justifying why some municipalities' applications are successful and others are not. By way of contrast, the provincial government is much more interested in the decisions made by the health districts with respect to the specific allocation of available funding. In these circumstances, even though separate decision-making bodies have been created, the board members are appointed by the government and there are review and approval procedures that allow the government to over-ride the spending decisions of the health districts. The foregoing suggests that in many instances political rationality trumps fiscal rationality in provincial-municipal financial relations.

Financial and Political Resources

Although its interests have been influential in its decisions regarding what roles to perform and the approaches to use in performing them, invariably such decisions have also been heavily influenced by the financial and political resources that it has had at its disposal. It is important to note although its financial and political resources permit the Saskatchewan government to perform certain roles and to do so in certain ways, they also have a constraining effect on what it can do because its resources are relatively limited compared to some other provinces in the federation. In terms of both its financial resources and its political resources Saskatchewan is not one of the 'big four' (i.e., Ontario, Quebec, Alberta, and British Columbia). In terms of its financial resources Saskatchewan has a much smaller budget and less flexibility in what it can do with that budget than any of the 'big four'. The financial resources limit what Saskatchewan can do on its own as well as what it can do in partnership with either or both the federal and municipal governments in terms of funding various programs and projects. This problem is compounded by the fact that its economy is subject of highly volatile swings based on the vagaries of the farm economy which, among other things, affects whether it receives equalization payments from the federal government. This affects the number and types of programs and projects with which it can involve itself, especially if they require it to make long-term financial commitments. Its limited resources constrain it to be more sensitive to the preferences of the federal government both in terms of the choice of programs and projects, the precise roles and responsibilities of the various orders of government, and the approaches it chooses to use in performing its roles. The same is true of its political resources. Politically, Saskatchewan is also not one of the 'big four'. Its political clout within the federation is relatively limited. After all, it has a relatively small population and a relatively small number of federal electoral seats. These particular limitations are compounded by the fact that the provincial electorate in Saskatchewan, unlike that in some other small provinces, has generally chosen not to engage in strategic voting to curry favour with the party forming the government. The only exception in recent elections was the strong, albeit short-lived support, for the Mulroney government which expressed its gratitude with a \$1 billion farm aid package just prior to the 1986 provincial election that benefited a large number of farmers living in various rural and even urban municipalities.

Public Management Philosophy

Another major factor which has had a significant effect on the roles that the provincial government performs in the context of federal-municipal-provincial relations is the 'new public management' philosophy and especially that part of it which embodies some of the tenets of neo-liberal and neo-conservative ideology in that value more 'limited government' and governments that focus primarily on 'steering rather than rowing', and 'subsidiarity' and 'user pay' in developing, delivering and funding programs and projects. The Saskatchewan provincial government has not been immune to such tenets and, therefore, has followed the examples of other governments in limiting the nature and scope of its involvement in various programs and projects and relying increasingly more on the local governments and

the voluntary sector to fill the void either on their own or in partnership with itself and other orders of government. Of course, from the perspective of municipalities and voluntary sector organizations this is tantamount to downloading, rather than partnering, triggered by the concerns of the provincial government to deal with its deficit and debt. Regardless of what triggered it, the era of the “partnering state” is upon us everywhere, including in Saskatchewan where it resonates relatively well with the political culture that has always valued the idea of federal and provincial governments helping local governments and local communities help themselves as they see fit. This is precisely the purpose of the Regional Intersectoral Committees. The Saskatchewan government has been a leader in establishing this mechanism which involves coordination of policy and program among public, private and non-profit sectors involved in human services. Some departments use these committees as peer review committees to evaluate program applications for project funding.)

6. Conclusions

The objective in this concluding section is to summarize the findings related to the central objectives of this paper, identify some existing and emerging issues and options related to provincial roles and approaches to performing those roles within the context of federal-municipal-provincial relations, and to make some suggestions for further research on this topic both in Saskatchewan and in other provinces.

6.1 Summary of Major Findings

To reiterate, the central objective in this paper has been to examine the nature, scope and determinants of the roles performed by the Saskatchewan provincial government, and the approaches it has used in doing so. This paper has identified five major types of roles that the provincial government performs within the context of federal-municipal provincial relations (i.e., partnership roles, monitoring roles, regulatory roles, advocacy roles, and mediation roles). The paper also identified five major characteristics of the provincial government’s approaches that the provincial government uses in performing those roles (i.e., reactive, bilateral, non-intrusive, informal and low profile). Finally, the paper identified three major sets of factors that have influenced the provincial government’s decisions regarding the roles that it performs and the approaches that it uses in doing so. This includes its policy, financial and political interests; its financial and political resources; and the new public management philosophy.

6.2 Existing and Emerging Issues and Options

In Saskatchewan, as elsewhere in Canada there is a growing recognition of the increasing importance of federal-municipal-provincial relations. There is also a growing recognition of the importance relations between those three orders of government and Aboriginal governments (i.e., First Nation and Metis). That particular awareness has spawned an interest in several existing and emerging issues and options related to the roles and responsibilities of the federal, municipal and provincial government. The focus here is on three sets of such issues and options.

Efficacy of the Structural and Organizational Features of the Municipal System

The first set is on the efficacy of the structural and organizational features, both at the local and at the provincial government level, of the municipal system for purposes of intergovernmental coordination and collaboration. At the local government level a key issue is whether the current structural and organizational features of the municipal system in Saskatchewan are an asset or a hindrance for, among other things, efficacious intergovernmental coordination. The outstanding question is whether the large numbers of municipal units, most of which are very small, contribute to or hinder the development, funding, and implementation of various programs and projects, and particularly those produced within the federal-municipal-provincial context. Similar issues exist regarding the provincial government level. The outstanding question there is whether the organizational framework is adequately integrated and coordinated to deal effectively with the multitude of programs and projects that impinge on the municipal sector. There is a tacit understanding among many provincial and municipal officials as well as among the many members of the attentive public that improvements to both of those components of the municipal system in Saskatchewan are essential for, among other things, improving federal-municipal-provincial relations and the development, funding, and implementation of the various programs and projects that are generated through such relations.

Efficacy of the Roles Performed by the Provincial Government

The second set of existing and emerging issues and options are the nature of the roles performed by the provincial government. There is a growing awareness among those involved in the various policy sectors and those who observe them that there may be a need for the provincial government to improve both its willingness and its organizational capacity to perform various roles within the context of federal-municipal-provincial relations. There are at least two major things which it must consider regarding the roles that it has been performing. The first relates to the adequacy or appropriateness of the precise nature and scope of its roles. There have been times when either the federal, municipal or Aboriginal governments have wanted the provincial government to perform various roles, particularly in terms of advocacy and mediating roles, but the provincial government has decided either not to do so or perform them in a very limited manner.

Efficacy of the Approaches Used by the Provincial Government

The third set of existing and emerging issues, and closely related to the second, relate to the approaches that the provincial government has used in performing its roles. The more significant and the more attention is devoted to federal-municipal-provincial relations and the relative benefits that various provinces and municipalities derive from the resulting programs and projects of such relations, the greater will be the number of questions that will be raised regarding the value of the Saskatchewan government's tendency to employ reactive, bilateral, non-intrusive, informal and low profile approaches in performing its roles within the context of federal-municipal-provincial relations. Governments tend to assess and reassess

the way they do things from time to time. The time may well be approaching where the Saskatchewan may have to do this in conjunction with the approaches it used in the context of federal-municipal-provincial relations.

6.3 Suggestions for Further Research

More research is required on this interesting and important phenomenon, especially in light of what seems to be a proactive posture adopted by the federal government. More research is clearly required in conceptualizing both federal-municipal-provincial relations (e.g., structures, processes, and dynamics) well as provincial roles (types of roles, approaches and strategies in performing roles, etc.). More research is also required at the empirical level. In particular more empirical research is required on the following matters both in Saskatchewan as well as in other jurisdictions:

- ◆ the nature and scope of federal-municipal-provincial relations in initiating, developing, funding, and implementing various programs and projects;
- ◆ the roles of all three orders of government in such relations;
- ◆ the roles of provincial and national municipal associations in such relations;
- ◆ the approaches used by various governments in performing their respective roles;
- ◆ the mechanism used by various governments in performing their respective roles;
- ◆ the effects that the roles which various governments perform and the approaches they use in performing such roles have both on the following matters:
 - the level of efficiency, effectiveness and accountability in relation to various programs and projects;
 - the climate of intergovernmental relations between the various orders of government; and
 - the social and economic development and the social harmony within the polity.

None of these are likely to be easy topics to research. Our efforts in producing this exploratory paper on some of these research topic in Saskatchewan have made us realize how difficult it is not only to produce the appropriate conceptual frameworks and models but also to collect the requisite information for researching and analyzing this interesting and important. The challenge of the tasks is daunting, but the value and potential benefits for improved governance are substantial.

Appendix 1

Federal-Municipal-Provincial Collaboration in Saskatchewan—Selected Cases 2003

| Program | Description | Policy and Program Initiation and Development | Funding Participants | Prioritization and Adjudication of Applications | Admin. And Delivery | Lead Provincial Department |
|--|---|---|----------------------|---|---------------------|--|
| Agriculture Rural Minority Language Community Planning Initiative ⁱ (2003-04) | The purpose of this program is to assist agricultural rural minority language communities to produce community development plans. The emphasis on economic diversification and job creation. Municipal governments, among others are eligible to apply for funding. Federal and provincial governments are not eligible for assistance, but partnerships are encouraged. | Federal Government (Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada and Canadian Heritage) | F | F | O | ? |
| Airport Capital Assistance Program (1995 to present) | Municipally -owned airports can apply for capital funding to undertake safety improvements, asset protection, and operating cost reduction. This program was created as part of the federal government's National Airports Policy. While Transport Canada fully funds the program in Saskatchewan, it is administered through the provincial Department of Highways and Transportation. | Federal Government (Transport Canada) | F | F | P,M | Highways and Transportation |
| Canada-Saskatchewan Soundstage | Federal, provincial, municipal governments, and the film industry have jointly funded the construction of an \$11.9 million, 82,000 square foot, film and video production and training facility in Regina. Opened in 2002, the facility preserved portions of an historic building owned by the Government of Saskatchewan. | Provincial Government (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation) | F,P,M,O | O | O | Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|-----------|---------|-----|---|
| Canada-Saskatchewan Infrastructure Program (2000-01 to 2006-07) | At least 80% of the projects approved under this program are sponsored by municipalities. The first priority is for “green infrastructure” (approximately 50% of funding). While the federal government agreed to another version of this program in 2000, the Saskatchewan government initiated a \$10 million, one year, provincial-municipal infrastructure program in 1999-2000. Besides assisting municipalities with urgent infrastructure needs, this program also demonstrated to the federal government that the provincial and municipal governments placed priority on addressing these needs and want federal involvement in a new program. | Federal Government (Western Economic Diversification Canada) | F, P, M,O | F,P,M | M,O | Government Relations and Aboriginal Affairs |
| Canadian Agricultural Rural Communities Initiative ⁱⁱ (2000-01 to present) | The objective of this program is to enhance the viability of rural communities, with an emphasis on those that are affected by fundamental changes to the agricultural sector. Eligible recipients of federal funding include rural organizations, municipalities, aboriginal groups, community-based groups, and educational institutions. | Federal government (Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada) | F,M,O | F | M,O | Monitored by Agriculture and Rural Revitalization |
| Canadian Light Source | The Canadian Light Source will be Canada’s first synchrotron facility. It will be operational in 2003 at the University of Saskatchewan. The federal and Saskatchewan governments, universities, industry, the City of Saskatoon are funding the capital costs of the project. | University of Saskatchewan | F,P,M,O | F,P,M,O | O | Industry and Resources |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---------|---|-------|---|
| Cultural Spaces Canada ⁱⁱⁱ (2001-02 to 2003-04) | This program funds the construction, adaptive use or renovation of arts and heritage facilities and the acquisition, the purchase of specialized equipment and the production of feasibility studies. Its purpose is to improve the physical conditions for artistic creativity and innovation and for increasing and improving accessibility to performing, media, and visual arts and to museums and heritage facilities. | Federal Government (Canadian Heritage) | F | F | P,M,O | Monitored by Culture, Youth and Recreation |
| Disaster Financial Assistance Arrangements (1970 to present) | Under these arrangements, the federal government provides financial assistance to provincial governments, municipalities, and other private interest who have suffered uninsurable damage to property due to natural disasters (e.g. floods, ice and wind storms). | Federal Government (Office of Infrastructure Protection and Emergency Preparedness) | F,P,M,O | F | M,O | Corrections and Public Safety |
| National Homelessness Initiative and Supporting Communities Partnership Initiative ^{iv} | Announced in 1999, the National Homelessness Initiative involves \$753 million of federal funding over three years to existing and new programs to address homelessness issues in Canada. A key element of this funding is the \$305 million Supporting Communities Partnership Initiative which supports local community-based efforts to find local solutions to these issues. It brings together all levels of government, non-profit, labour, and community-based organizations. | Federal Government (Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, Human Resources Development Canada) | F,P,M,O | F | P,M,O | Community Resources and Employment |

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|-------------|---|
| Regional Intersectoral Committees | <p>Established in 1994, the Human Services Integration Forum is a multi-departmental provincial government structure to promote and implement interagency collaboration and integrated planning and delivery of human services. The Forum has facilitated the development and provides financial and coordinative support to nine regional intersectoral committees located throughout the province. Each committee consists of representatives from provincial and federal government departments, health districts, school divisions, post-secondary institutions, housing authorities, municipalities, police services, tribal councils, Metis organizations, and some community-based organizations. These committees support community-based planning, sharing of strategies, interagency collaboration and sharing of resources, and coordinated and integrated action for human services. They facilitate community involvement in consultation processes supporting the National Children's Agenda and the provincial government's early childhood development and the School PLUS initiatives).</p> | <p>Provincial Government (Human Services Integration Forum supported by eight departments -- Learning; Justice; Health; Community Resources and Employment; Corrections and Public Safety; Culture, Youth and Recreation; Government Relations and Aboriginal Affairs; and Executive Council)</p> | P | P | F,P,M, O | Human Services Integration Forum |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|-------------|---|

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---------|-------|-------------------------------|
| Green Funds (2000 – 2007) | <p>The federal government created an endowment in 2000 to encourage municipalities to pursue environmental innovation and to participate in reducing greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>(Subsequently, this program become part of the federal government’s plan to implement the Kyoto Accord.) The program is managed by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and consists of two components– Green Enabling Fund (providing grants for technical, environmental, and/or economic feasibility studies) and Green Municipal Investment Fund (providing interest-bearing loans and loan guarantees for environmental project).</p> | Federal Government (Natural Resources Canada and Environment Canada) | F | F,P,M,O | M | Environment |
| Joint Emergency Preparedness Program (on-going, subject to budgetary approval) | <p>This program provides federal funding to enhance Canada’s national emergency response capability. “Earmarked funds” are assigned to each province and territory. The provinces and territories support the evaluation and prioritization of applications, but do not make the final decisions on approval (since these depend on national, not regional, priorities and needs). Funding is channeled through the provinces and territories.</p> | Federal Government (Office of Critical Infrastructure Protection and Emergency Preparedness) | F | F | P,M,O | Corrections and Public Safety |
| Model Construction Codes (1937 to present) | <p>The federal government coordinates and facilitates national consensus on the development and updating of national construction codes (e.g., National Building Code, National Fire Code, National Plumbing Code). The purpose of these model codes is to provide the basis for countrywide consistency in standards enforced under provincial and territorial legislation and implemented by municipalities.</p> | Federal Government (National Research Council) | F | F,P,O | P,M | Corrections and Public Safety |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|-----|--|--|------------------|
| Northern Development Agreement/Accord (2002 to present) | <p>In 2002, the federal and provincial governments signed the Saskatchewan Northern Development Accord and a \$20 million Canada-Saskatchewan Northern Development Agreement. These apply to the area known as the Northern Administration District of Saskatchewan.</p> | <p>Provincial Government (Northern Affairs) and Federal Government (Western Economic Diversification)</p> | F,P | <p>F,P,O (municipal involvement through Northern Development Board</p> | <p>F,P,O (municipal involvement through Northern Development Board</p> | Northern Affairs |
| | <p>The Accord is a memorandum of understanding concerning the development of a strategic framework to guide federal and provincial governments and northern communities to improve the living conditions and enhance economic opportunities facing northerners. The Accord calls for the federal and provincial governments to seek advice and recommendations and to work with a Northern Development Board (consisting of representatives from the Prince Albert Grand Council, Meadow Lake Tribal Council, Metis Nation of Saskatchewan, the Saskatchewan Association of Northern (Municipal) Communities, and the Athabasca First Nation Chiefs.</p> | | | | | |
| | <p>The five-year Canada-Saskatchewan Northern Development Agreement promotes and supports sustainable economic development for northern Saskatchewan in such areas as economic infrastructure, innovation, realizing employment opportunities, capacity building, and investment attraction. The Agreement will be administered by a management committee consisting of representatives from the federal and provincial governments and from the Northern Development Board.</p> | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|-------|-------|-------|------------------------------------|
| Prairie Grain Roads Program (2001-02 to 2005-06) | Federal cost-shared funding is provided to upgrade municipal grain roads and provincial secondary highways that are deteriorating or have become unsafe due to changing transportation policies and the restructuring of grain handling systems. Eligible applicants include municipalities, the provincial government, and municipal organizations (SUMA and SARM). | Federal Government (Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration) | F,P,M | F,P,M | P, M | Highways and Transportation |
| Provincial and Municipal Policing (1928 to present) | Under contract with the provincial government, The Royal Canadian Mounted Police serves as Saskatchewan's provincial police. The provincial government requires municipalities with populations greater than 20,000 to have their own municipal police service. Other municipalities enter into agreements, either indirectly (through the provincial government) or directly, with the RCMP to provide municipal policing. | Provincial Government (Saskatchewan Justice) | F,P,M | F,P | F | Justice |
| Regina Inner City Community Partnership | A federal-city government initiative to support a consultation process on local priorities within an inner city community in Regina. The goal is to develop and implement an continuum of activities which will build the social and economic future of the neighbourhood. The partnership will bring together the three orders of government, relevant non-governmental organizations, and inner city residents. | Municipal Government (City of Regina) | F,M | F,M,O | P,M,O | Community Resources and Employment |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|-------|-------|-------|--|
| Rural Community Forest Project (1994 to present) | Villages and towns in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta with populations of less than 5,000 are eligible under this program to receive certain fruit-bearing tree species to enhance the quality of life in these communities and to provide habitat for wildlife. The trees and shrubs must be planted on municipal land. The Saskatchewan government participates in the program by funding the provision of plastic mulch for weed control. | Federal Government (Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration) | F,P,M | F | F,P,M | Saskatchewan Environment |
| Summer Work Experience (on-going as budgetary resources are available) | Municipal governments are eligible to apply for wage subsidies to hire secondary and post-secondary students in career-related summer jobs. The provincial government has a separate student employment program (Centennial Student Employment Program) which does not apply to municipalities. | Federal Government (Human Resources Development Canada) | F | F | M,O | Monitored by Public Service Commission and Culture, Youth and Recreation |
| Urban Development Agreements | These agreements involve the federal, provincial and municipal governments. They provide instruments for coordinating the action among orders of government and for providing the seamless delivery of programs and services. These agreements encourage the development of strategic alliances to enhance the economic activity in the seven major cities in western Canada. ^v | Federal Government (Western Economic Diversification Canada) | F,P,M | F,P,M | F,P,M | ? |

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|---------|---------|---|-------------------------------|
| Wanuskewin Heritage Park | <p>This national historic site, located north of Saskatoon, has been the hunting and occasional wintering ground frequented by several Indian tribes of the northern plains for more than 6,000 years. Today, the park interprets the culture and provides a place of spiritual importance for the descendents of the Northern Plains Indians. Approximately twenty archeological sites have been discovered within the Park. The park was developed through a partnership involving federal, provincial, municipal, First Nations, university, and other sectors. The Wanuskewin Heritage Park Corporation consists of representatives from Wanuskewin Indian Heritage Inc., the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations, the City of Saskatoon, the Governments of Canada and Saskatchewan, the University of Saskatchewan, the Meewasin Valley Authority, and the Friends of Wanuskewin.</p> | Federal Government (Western Economic Diversification Canada) | F,P,M,O | F,P,M,O | O | Culture, Youth and Recreation |
|--------------------------|---|--|---------|---------|---|-------------------------------|

Notes Regarding Table in Appendix 1

ⁱ The first projects were to be approved in 2003.

ⁱⁱ Even though they are eligible to apply, no evidence has been found where Saskatchewan municipalities have received funding under this program.

ⁱⁱⁱ While Saskatchewan municipalities are eligible for funding, this program has provided such support indirectly, through funding to projects with municipal involvement in a larger organizational structure (e.g. Wanuskewin Heritage Park, Moose Jaw Cultural Centre).

^{iv} Most of the funding for projects has been dispersed to community-based organizations. Municipalities have been involved in the development of “community homelessness plans”. These plans have been prepared by steering committees with representatives from federal, provincial, and municipal governments, as well as representatives from local social and private agencies and Aboriginal organizations.

^v To date, urban development agreements are in place in Edmonton, Winnipeg and Vancouver. Tri-party discussions have commenced to explore the establishment of such agreements in Saskatchewan’s major cities (in particular, Regina), but negotiations have not yet been completed.