Institute of

Courchene has termed *glocalization* –

Both the neo-realist and the post-Westphalian paradigms seem over-stated. On the one hand, there is more cooperation in the world than can be explained in neo-realist terms, and on the other hand, states are not disappearing as rapidly as the

sought to be consulted by the federal government on immigration and international treaties, local governments arguably have an equal or greater claim to be consulted.

Aboriginal communities are probably more vulnerable to the forces of glocalization, but they are perhaps overlooked even more than local governments. Considerable attention has been devoted to the federal-Aboriginal relationship, and secondarily to the provincial-Aboriginal relationship, while the local-Aboriginal relationship is frequently neglected. All Aboriginal communities, however, live in reasonably close proximity to non-Aboriginal local communities. Conflicts over fishing rights in Atlantic Canada and along the Fraser River in British Columbia – let alone Oka and Gustafson Lake – demonstrate that the local-Aboriginal relationship is a critical link in the governance of the federation and needs to be incorporated in the country's governing institutions.

Glocalization has blurred the jurisdictional boundaries between different spheres of governance in the federation. Modern politics has shifted in large measure from happening within neat jurisdictional boundaries to the expanding space of multiple jurisdictional frontiers. The various orders of government within the federation – local, provincial, federal and Aboriginal – are thus under pressure to cooperate and coordinate their responses to global challenges, often in conjunction with foreign governments and international organizations.

The vertical model of dual federalism, in which the federal government assumes responsibility for international affairs and the provinces look after local affairs, thus no longer seems tenable. We need to conceptualize a new, non-hierarchical model of governance that recognizes the multiple jurisdictional interdependencies at play in the federation, incorporates the inter-connectivity of issues, and builds modalities for intergovernmental collaboration among all the partners in the federation. In other words, we need to shift from our old conceptions of federalism to a broader

model of *multicentric* governance.[13] So far, the model only incorporates governments, but there are many other sorts of organizations that provide governance in our society. While business/labour, interest groups, non-governmental organizations, and the non-profit sector have always existed, in this era of new public management these organizations have assumed a greater governance role in our society. In short, all orders of government in Canada have transferred, others might say abdicated, responsibility for some activities to non-government sectors. The model must also allow for the meaningful participation of citizens.

If a council of the federation had been established by the federal and provincial governments thirty years ago, it would likely be easier to incorporate local and Aboriginal governments at this time. But a council of the federation was not created when it was most needed, and now the governments of Canada are faced with the challenge of creating an infinitely more complex governing institution. While it would be easier for the federal government and the provinces to ignore the claims of local and Aboriginal governments, the realities of glocalization may not afford them that luxury.

The Challenges of Multicentric Governance

The governments of Canada are now tightly enmeshed in a complex multicentric network of intergovernmental relations. It would thus seem that the council of the federation needs to be based on the idea of multicentric governance rather than on the old federalism paradigm. The prospect of a multicentric governing council raises many challenging questions. How will the various orders of government be represented on

---

[13.] I have adopted the term *multicentric governance* in preference to the more common term *multilevel governance*. While the governments in a political union will surely have different capacities, and thus produce a variety of asymmetrical relations, the term multicentric governance supports a normative preference for *non-hierarchical governance*, whereas the term multilevel governance implies that the governments are and should be organized hierarchically.

Hamish Telford, *Expanding the Partnership*

when we are dealing with just two orders of government – federal and provincial. If more spheres of government are added to the decision-making process, it is likely to become more difficult to reach political decisions. Fritz Scharpf, in his analysis of the politics in Germany and the European Union, refers to this dilemma as the "*joint-decision trap.*" What are the remedies for the joint-decision trap?

One solution is to centralize power and implement decisions through a chain of command. This was how empires were governed. Alternatively, the idea of subsidiarity has been proposed as a means of escaping the joint-decision trap. While subsidiarity is an attractive idea in theory, it is more problematic to operationalize in practice. All too often subsidiarity becomes a fancy justification for a larger government to offload responsibilities to a smaller government, for the benefit of the former and to the detriment of the latter. Canadians are not likely to accept either of these solutions.

Scharpf looks for answers in decision-making theory. He identifies three types of decision-making: confrontational, bargaining, and problem-solving. Scharpf dismisses the confrontational approach (e.g. the threat of separation) as pathological. He thus focuses on the bargaining and problem-solving models. He suggests that the bargaining model is "premised upon the assumption that participants will pursue their individual self-interest," while "problem solving in its pure form...is premised on the existence of a common utility function and the irrelevance of individual self-interest for the decision at hand." In terms of collective decision-making, the problem-solving model is preferable, but as Scharpf himself acknowledges "the preconditions of problem-solving – the orientation towards common goals, values, and norms – are difficult to create."[14] For the council to operate as a governing partnership based on the

viewed as a call for "citizen engagement" in intergovernmental relations.

The governments of Canada have made a few tepid attempts to engage citizens in matters of public policy, most notably in the process leading up to the Charlottetown Accord and Lloyd Axworthy's foreign policy summits. While these sorts of initiative are welcome, they are also problematic in some respects. One problem with these initiatives for citizen engagement is that they *increase* the demands placed on the citizen. With the steadily declining voter participation rates in Canada, it is not clear that the average citizen is willing to expend greater energy to engage the political process. Still it is possible that if more rewarding avenues of participation were offered, citizens may well re-engage with the political process. This is the old 'field of dreams' thesis: build it and they shall come. This may be true, but it is perhaps more likely that the new opportunities would be exploited by a few special interest groups. Whether by design or default, the attempts to expand citizen engagement have been, to date, highly elitist in nature.

Does this mean that nothing can be done to democratize intergovernmental relations in Canada? Absolutely not. Legislatures, for example, could become more involved in intergovernmental relations, simply by creating standing committees for intergovernmental relations. The council of the federation could also accept submissions directly from the public and other groups. If, in fact, the council cannot