

*This paper is the original manuscript and has not been revised or edited.
For the final version, see the French translation.*

**MULTILEVEL
GOVERNANCE AND
PUBLIC POLICY IN
CANADIAN
MUNICIPALITIES:
ACCOUNTABILITY AND
EFFECTIVENESS**

By **Robert Young**¹, Professor and Canada Research Chair in Multilevel Governance, Department of Political Science, The University of Western Ontario, young@uwo.ca

For the final version, see the French translation.

“La gouvernance multiniveau et les politiques publiques au sein des municipalités du Canada : reddition de comptes et efficacité,”

Vol. 19, No. 1, p. 25-42.

www.telescope.enap.ca/Telescope/docs/Index/Vol_19_no_1/Telv19no1_young.pdf

Abstract: This article reports some of the principal findings from a research project undertaken by a large group of scholars over the past seven years. Our focus was on how intergovernmental negotiations produce policy in Canadian municipalities, and on the role of ‘social forces’ in the policy making process. We have been particularly interested in municipal governments, both as participants in intergovernmental relations and as hubs of networks of local social forces. Our results, overall, paint a thorough picture of multilevel governance in Canada. Here, I have selected findings that bear on questions of accountability and effectiveness. After a brief introduction, and an account of the research, these themes are taken up in turn. I conclude with general findings about multilevel governance in Canada and about the position of municipal governments in the Canadian system.

■ MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT IN CANADA

Local government in Canada is relatively weak. Compared with the systems in other advanced industrial countries, municipalities’ constitutional and jurisdictional power is limited (Young, 2009a). Constitutionally, local authorities are a competence of the provincial governments; hence the well-worn phrase that they are “creatures of the provinces.” Provincial governments create them, regulate them, prescribe many policies they implement, and, not infrequently, eliminate them through amalgamation. Of course, those same provincial governments must be responsive to local public opinion and local pressures, and they must be solicitous of municipal economies. This is especially true when a major city makes up a large share of the provincial population: Winnipeg, to take the extreme Canadian example, constitutes 57% of the population of Manitoba.

Not surprisingly, municipalities’ financial position is also relatively weak. Spending by local governments makes up 4.1% of Canadian GDP, while the 2009 average for the 29 OECD countries for which data are available was 12.2% (calculated from OECD, 2012, Table 2). In Canada, most “senior” governments have not allocated to municipalities access to tax bases that grow with the economy, notably sales taxes and the income tax. As a consequence local governments are unusually dependent on the property tax and related

¹ The support of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada is gratefully acknowledged.

taxes, which account for about 50% of total revenue and 62% of own-source revenue (Sancton and Young, 2009, p. 502). Other revenues come mostly from the sale of goods and services and from transfers, which are overwhelmingly from the provinces and largely conditional.

In the intergovernmental world in Canada, municipalities have a difficult time competing (Breton, 1987, pp. 319-22). But they do have some resources. Municipal governments have a lot of information about the locality. Now, provincial and federal agencies also have much information. In Ontario, for example, where immigrant settlement is concerned, both the federal department, Citizenship and Immigration Canada, and the provincial ministry of Citizenship and Immigration possess localized information about immigrant flows, settlement agencies, language needs, and so on. But this information is not integrated with other knowledge about the community that is relevant to immigrant settlement - about housing, libraries, recreation, local businesses, and so on. Integrated local information is the specialty of the municipal government. Second, municipalities have a monopoly of expertise in some areas, particularly land-use planning and zoning. Third, municipal governments have extensive linkages with organized interests at the local level. To the extent that modern governance relies on consulting and harnessing the expertise and resources of the private and voluntary sectors, municipalities have a comparative advantage at the local level over other governments. Finally, almost all provincial governments have legislated to increase the autonomy of municipalities, especially larger cities, often by replacing narrowly defined powers with broader spheres of jurisdiction (Garcea and LeSage, 2005).

Over the past 15 years, there has been considerable agitation about the structure and functioning of municipal government in Canada. Ultimately this was spurred by deep background factors - demographic change, technological innovation, shifts in political culture, and the economic re-structuring occasioned by deeper globalization. The proximate cause of real change in the federal stance toward municipalities was intense lobbying, especially by the big-city mayors and some business organizations. It was the Liberal government headed by prime minister Paul Martin (2003-06) that introduced a “New Deal” for cities and communities, one that included a full rebate of the federal sales tax on municipal expenditures and the transfer to municipalities of a portion of the federal tax on gasoline; as well, a ministry of state for Infrastructure and Communities was established, so there was a federal interlocutor for municipalities, the first since the late 1970s (Berdahl, 2006). This policy thrust was largely reversed under the Conservative prime ministership of Stephen Harper (2006-). Spending on infrastructure in and with municipalities and provinces was maintained (and very much increased during the 2008-09 recession) but the Conservatives’ policy of “Open Federalism” involves more respect for the constitutional division of jurisdiction, and municipalities in Canada fall under provincial authority (Young, 2006; 2011). So federal-municipal relations have been attenuated overall.

■ THE RESEARCH

It was because municipal issues were rising once more on the national policy agenda (Andrew, Graham and Phillips, 2002) that a research team was assembled to study multilevel governance and public policy in municipalities. This group eventually included more than 90 researchers and a great number of student research assistants. Our focus was on public policies in municipalities, not all of which, of course, are generated by municipal governments themselves. We aimed to explore the creation of such policies, analyzing this as a function of the intergovernmental negotiations that produced the policy and of the involvement of social forces (or not) in the policy-making process. Even with a large research group, not all policy fields could be explored, so we chose six - emergency planning, federal property, municipal image-building, immigrant settlement, infrastructure, and urban Aboriginal policy. These are areas where we could expect to find municipal-federal relationships, mediated by the provincial governments. The fields vary in visibility, the

primary policy instruments used, and jurisdictional location; as well, some involve services to people and others involve physical matters.²

The team produced some noteworthy comparative studies of the position of municipalities in federations and their relations with federal governments (Lazar and Leuprecht, 2007). There were also studies of the background to federal involvement in cities in Canada (Carroll and Graham, 2009). But most of the research dealt with policy making in the Canadian municipal space, and was designed to identify differences across provinces as well as across policy fields and municipalities of different sizes. In every province, we studied the largest city, concentrating in each on four of the six policy fields (Horak and Young, 2012). We also studied two policy fields in every province, investigating policy making in four municipalities of different sizes. (An unusual feature of the whole project is this interest in how multilevel governance works in smaller cities, towns, and even rural municipalities.) The policy-field studies are now being published (Tolley and Young, 2011; Peters, 2011; Harvey and Young, 2012; Ircha and Young, forthcoming; Henstra, forthcoming).

There is a long and distinguished history of scholarship on federalism in Canada (Simeon, 2002; Gagnon, 2009). But there has been little linkage between research on federal-provincial relations and research on municipal government, and this is the gap that our project aimed to fill. Because the study of multilevel governance was in its infancy in Canada (Young and Leuprecht, 2006), we did not start out with a set of clear hypotheses but rather with a set of guiding research questions. On the intergovernmental side, we were interested first in documenting municipal-federal government relationships. Beyond that we wanted to explore:

- how the municipal-federal relationship is mediated by provincial governments,
- what role is played by politicians in intergovernmental relations, as opposed to officials,
- whether ideological differences between governments impede policy making,
- what is the impact of governments having different levels of resources,
- whether the principles of New Public Management have affected multilevel governance, and
- how growing vertical collaboration between governments might stimulate horizontal cooperation between local governments.

On the ‘governance’ side, there were a few questions that pre-occupied our study of the involvement of social forces in the policy process. We wanted to document what interests are involved in policy making, and at what stage - agenda-setting, problem definition, setting out policy options, decision-making, or implementation. Our major issue was the influence of business in determining policy, a question that has dominated the study of local government in North America for decades. How much power does business have over the policies that prevail in municipal spaces? Finally, we were interested in whether business or other interests could ‘shift scale,’ and operate effectively at higher levels of government.

Beyond all this, another research concern was to evaluate the quality of public policy. One of our goals was to assess policies and to suggest changes in the policy process or in policies themselves that would make them better. Researchers were concerned with many aspects of policy - its timeliness, scale, coherence, originality, efficiency, equitability, and appropriateness of problem definition. In the end, however, our two dominant criteria of good policy in Canadian municipalities were effectiveness (whether the policy achieved its objectives) and responsiveness (whether the policy was congruent with local preferences). In this article, I focus on accountability and effectiveness in multilevel policy making.

² For more information about the research project, visit www.ppm-ppm.ca

■ ACCOUNTABILITY IN MULTILEVEL GOVERNANCE

A well recognized drawback of multilevel governance is that it can make it difficult for citizens to hold governments accountable for the policies that are implemented. Accountability requires that governments be transparent about what they have done, that they be prepared to explain or justify policies, and that they face consequences if the public is not satisfied (Papadopoulos, 2010). There are good reasons to think that multilevel governance impedes accountability. Accountability is hard to achieve when meetings are private, and when citizens cannot know about the initial position of various governments, the actors consulted, the alternative outcomes that were possible, and the distribution of responsibility for the final decision. These weaknesses have been noted qualitatively (Pierre and Peters, 2005, ch. 6), and there is strong comparative empirical evidence to show that economic voting - punishing or rewarding incumbents for national economic performance - is less prevalent in federations, where the attribution of responsibility is more difficult than in unitary states (Anderson, 2006).

Our research showed that accountability was certainly weak in some policy areas. Infrastructure programs are the best example. The municipalities propose projects, and a federal-provincial committee makes decisions. (In Quebec, the federal and provincial groups are formally separate.) Citizens do not know the whole set of projects proposed, nor the reasons for denying or approving funding (since the criteria are very general). There is very little information about the relative weight in decision making of provincial and federal actors. And significantly, there is no transparency about inputs from other sources to the committees - from municipal lobbying, Members of Parliament, cabinet ministers, or other interests. Local Members of Parliament and ministers announce successful projects with great fanfare, but citizens cannot know the provenance of the decision to support one project or another.

In other policy fields, where there is less complex multilevel governance, transparency is more possible. In immigrant settlement, for example, there are three provinces - Quebec, Manitoba and British Columbia - where settlement programs and funding have been devolved from the federal to the provincial governments, which can be held accountable for policy. In the other provinces, the federal government provides funding to the immigrant settlement agencies that administer the programs, and it is ultimately responsible for policy choices. In the urban Aboriginal policy field, the federal government ultimately controls those programs delivered through the Urban Aboriginal Strategy, and is accountable. Other programs are primarily funded through accountable provincial governments, even though representative Aboriginal organizations may have substantial decision-making power. In their image-building activities, the municipalities have a lot of autonomy, and they can be held accountable. Emergency planning is less clear, because of the way that regulations and incentives are nested: this forms a loosely coupled system, where accountability for policy is not easily achievable. Finally, our studies of federal property issues show that the federal government is clearly responsible for initial decisions about divestment. But final policy outcomes are determined through processes as murky as those in the realm of infrastructure, involving community organizations, firms, municipalities, multiple agencies of the federal government, and, importantly, provincial departments. Overall in Canada, then, the record is mixed. In some fields we find the lack of accountability that characterizes complex European Union structures and processes; in others, fewer agencies and levels of government are effectively involved as decision makers, and there is more transparency.

■ EFFECTIVENESS

It should be understood that true multilevel governance is not terribly common in Canada: there are relatively few fora where representatives of the three levels of government deliberate together about policy, and fewer still where members of social forces are also included. The Urban Development Agreements signed with Winnipeg, Vancouver, Saskatoon and Regina (and the provinces of Manitoba, British Columbia, and Saskatchewan) were the purest form of multilevel governance in Canada. These UDAs embodied a “whole of government approach,” where the relevant actors from all levels brought their capabilities and

resources to the table and decided who would do what to attack very difficult problems like extreme poverty and drug use on Vancouver's Lower East Side. They were plagued by high transaction costs, especially through the involvement of social forces, but they seem to have been relatively effective (Leo 2006; Bradford 2007). Under the Conservative government, the UDAs have been left to expire.

There are other policy areas and programs where tripartism does exist in Canada. More common, however, are multiple bilateral negotiations, where the provincial government often plays a pivotal role. As the investigators of policy making in Calgary put it, multilevel governance "could better be seen as a complex mosaic of bilateral relations that occasionally expand into trilateral programs or conflicts" (Miller and Smart 2012, 26). It is also true that some substantial policy initiatives bypass municipal governments almost entirely. In the area of immigrant settlement, for example, the federal government and those provincial governments with control of the field deal directly with the not-for-profit agencies that actually provide language training, employment counseling, specialized health services and so on. These contractual relationships are extensive, but municipal officials are involved marginally, if at all. A similar pattern prevails in most of the programming provided for urban Aboriginal people by provincial governments.

On the other hand, there are policy initiatives that require the three levels of government to coordinate their activities in order to achieve their objectives. The infrastructure programs are one example. These began in 1993, and have proliferated since into an array of specialized initiatives, including the federal government's Economic Action Plan that was introduced to provide stimulus during the 2008-9 recession. The standard formula is that projects are cost-shared equally between the three levels of government. Municipalities propose projects, and federal-provincial negotiations - with such input as municipal governments can manage - decide which will be funded.³ Municipalities then implement, under the other governments' supervision. Here is a case where the severe shortfall in municipal capital investment dovetails with the federal government's desire to increase economic demand.⁴ Another field where there is even more intense interaction is federal property. Coordination is necessary when the federal government is undertaking new developments. However, over the past two decades much more interaction has been generated by Ottawa's policies of closing military installations and divesting control over airports and ports. These decisions have caused multilevel negotiations that have often been intense, to say the least. There is some interaction in the field of emergency planning. For example, there did exist a body called the Major Industrial Accidents Council of Canada, with representatives from the federal and provincial governments, many municipalities, and 17 industry associations, but this is now defunct (Henstra, forthcoming). Generally this field is characterized by federal framework policies, provincial policies that elaborate them, and municipal plans and activities that conform, more or less, to provincial guidelines. Policy in this area truly is 'nested' (Hooghe and Marks 2003).⁵ In the urban Aboriginal field, the federal government has continued to support the Urban Aboriginal Strategy, which funds local initiatives. Municipal representatives in those cities where the strategy is established participate with provincial and federal officials, along with Aboriginal representatives, in defining problems and allocating funding.

³ In some provinces, the Management Committees that administer infrastructure programs have been advised by consultative committees that include representatives of municipal associations. In very large projects like the Lachine Canal redevelopment and the Manitoba Floodway expansion, there were extensive public consultations, though these were about implementation only.

⁴ The infrastructure programs were introduced by the federal Liberal government of Jean Chrétien, but they have been maintained under Stephen Harper's Conservative administrations. Infrastructure, along with higher education and health, has always been an exception to Open Federalism's principle that the federal government will respect provincial jurisdiction. In 2010, as the emergency stimulus spending was winding down, Mr. Harper expressed his appreciation that local governments were ready, willing and able to propose viable projects on short notice so that the money could flow. As he told municipal representatives, "It's not easy for us to spend money" (Harper 2010).

⁵ There is informal cooperation too, built through federal training programs and contingent decisions. In the Halifax Regional Municipal, for instance, the emergency coordinator's office is in the same building as the provincial Emergency Management Office and the regional representative of Public Safety Canada (Grieve and Turnbull, forthcoming).

An overview of the effectiveness of multilevel governance is perhaps best undertaken by surveying the obstacles to it. Effectiveness requires that the three levels of government coordinate their agendas and cooperate in supplying resources (Horak 2012a). This requires interaction and trust. One obstacle to effectiveness is the sheer turnover of political leadership. Politicians must lead the formation of new intergovernmental arrangements, and they must be prepared to approve projects and programs negotiated by officials. But elections at three levels of government, at different rhythms and with substantial turnover, mean that there are many periods when new administrations are being formed: they are inward-looking and will take time to trust their counterparts at the other levels. Appendix 1 illustrates this. It depicts the electoral histories of the city of Montreal, the province of Quebec, and the federal government. The gray areas represent one-year periods after a change of government at either the federal or provincial level. Obviously the windows of opportunity for multilevel agreement are constrained, as one level or another was re-organizing over 40% of the time. If we assume further that cooperation is also less likely for a year after municipal governments are newly elected, then the windows narrow further, as shown in Appendix 2.

In Canada, there are generally no political parties at the municipal level (though big cities in Quebec and British Columbia are exceptions). Further, it is widely assumed that there is little connection between the federal party system and provincial parties, despite considerable overlap in party labels, and growing evidence to the contrary (Esselment 2010, 2011). In terms of multilevel governance, this has mixed effects. There are instances where shared partisanship facilitated agreement, and others where partisan differences impeded intergovernmental coordination. But the largest effect that party structure has is through its systematic absence at the municipal level. We found that political channels are very important in some policy areas - notably infrastructure and federal property. This is true in part because there is no recognized and official channel in the federal government that municipal governments can use to press their demands. Yet political contacts were haphazard and sporadic. A mayor might have a particularly close relationship with a federal Member of Parliament or with the regional minister for the province, but such linkages are idiosyncratic and personalistic. When incumbents change, these advantageous connections are broken. Widely known and understood partisan positions can structure multilevel relationships; regardless of any effect on particular outcomes, partisanship provides order and predictability of intergovernmental relations.⁶ These can be achieved in the Canadian system, but it takes time.

Multilevel cooperation tends to be more effective when there is steadfast political leadership at the municipal level. In securing approval of infrastructure projects and in federal property, this is most notable. The city of Toronto, for example, initially lacked a coherent infrastructure strategy, and the projects funded were sub-optimal, at least from the city's viewpoint. Over time, though, its demand coalesced around a single objective - support from the other levels of government for public transit. This was pressed determinedly and consistently for years, and was buttressed by the business community and broader coalitions, and the city was very successful (Horak 2012a, 234-38). Similarly, municipalities need to have policies that are internally coherent. Larger cities benefit from specialized units devoted to intergovernmental relations, while the effectiveness of smaller municipalities depends heavily on mayoral leadership. Mayors in Canada are not 'strong mayors,' in the American sense, but they do have a lot of authority in representing the municipality externally, to other levels of government.

Another obstacle to effective multilevel governance is the federal government's propensity to unilateralism. As noted, Ottawa has no central institution for liaison with the municipal sector as a whole, despite the longstanding efforts of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, and its near success in building consultative institutions with the Martin government (Chenier 2009). Individual departments are in a position to discuss policy and programs, but they do not hesitate to take policy initiatives without consultation with

⁶ The studies reported in Lazar and Leuprecht (2007) all covered the politics of municipal-federal relations. In their summary (Leuprecht and Lazar 2007, 8), the editors wrote that "in all the European cases and also in South Africa and Mexico, political parties have an integrative function that ensures that municipal interests are understood at the national level." This function is carried out by the accumulation of mandates, the selection of national candidates from among municipal politicians, and shared partisanship. The European countries included in the research were Spain, Switzerland, Germany and France.

affected municipalities. This is most striking in the field of federal property, where divestitures and closures have been common. The announcement that some installation will be closed shocks the local community, politicians and business interests mobilize broad coalitions to protest, pressure is applied to Members of Parliament, the provincial government is enlisted; in short, political turmoil results. Either the decision is reversed or, more commonly, local interests fabricate a plan and the federal government ends up providing transition assistance and remediation. In any case, there are highly dysfunctional politics and difficult economic transitions. A consultative, multilevel governance approach would be more effective (Ircha and Young, forthcoming).

Occasionally, multilevel governance produces joint-decision traps. The sheer number of players and their non-congruent policy agendas mean that no progress can be made. Impasse normally results in federal or provincial unilateralism, but when all actors have important resources and conflicting objectives, then stasis can be the result. Again, examples are most common in the field of property, where redevelopment plans are often mired in disagreement. For example, an urban park to be built on the site of an old air base in Downsview has been over fifteen years in the making (Horak 2012a, 238-41). More striking has been the tangled, conflict-ridden redevelopment of the Toronto waterfront, where plans have lurched and veered and stalled for decades because of incompatible and shifting goals and sharp political interventions (Sanderson and Filion, forthcoming). On the other hand, some complex redevelopment efforts that involve all three levels of governments have proceeded relatively smoothly: the Lachine Canal project in Montreal provides a good example (Bherer and Hamel 2012, 125-29).

In the Lachine Canal case, relationships between the three levels of government were institutionalized in an agency, Pôles des Rapides, and also in a set of committees (which involved both governmental and non-governmental actors). Institutionalization is a device that can formalize intergovernmental relations, while insulating them somewhat from transient political pressures. The development of the Toronto waterfront was hampered for decades by competition and conflict among agencies created by all three levels of government. Finally, however, with the establishment of Waterfront Toronto (which has a Board of Directors to which each government appoints four members), there is a vehicle for coordinated planning and development. A similar example was VANOC, the organizing committee for the Vancouver-Whistler 2010 Winter Olympics. This powerful group included municipal, provincial and federal representatives along with appointees from the Canadian Olympic and Paralympic Committees and also a First Nations representative. It was highly effective in planning and implementing very complex events (Hutton 2012).

Inter-municipal competition - or 'horizontal' competition - is a hindrance to effective multilevel policy making. In the view of some analysts, increasing vertical collaboration leads to more horizontal cooperation (Agranoff and McGuire 2003). We did not find much evidence of this in the policy fields that were examined in our research. There was little cooperation among municipalities in immigrant settlement and urban Aboriginal policy. There was some in infrastructure, where joint applications for recreation facilities and other public goods strengthened the case of smaller communities. Cooperation in emergency planning occurred where regionalization was encouraged by provincial governments, as in Nova Scotia and Newfoundland and Labrador. In image-building there was outright competition for the most part. Most inter-municipal cooperation was found in the field of federal property, because facilities with truly regional implications, such as airports and big military bases, were being divested by the federal government.

Overall, multilevel governance in Canada is effective when it does occur. We have found cases of high transaction costs, disagreements and extensive delays, but there are more instances where three levels of government were able to coordinate their expertise and other resources in pursuit of an objective that was a priority for each of them. Much of the day-to-day creation and implementation of the policies that operate in municipalities is done by governments operating alone; other policies are pursued bilaterally, usually through municipal-provincial coordination (which is dominated by the provinces for the most part). But tripartite relationships are possible, and in some fields they are essential. Cooperation can produce effective policies.

This is facilitated when there is adequate consultation by officials, strong political leadership at the municipal level, and good working relationships among politicians at the various levels.

■ CONCLUSION

In the recent past, there have been pressures toward decentralization in Canada, and strong advocacy for a greater role for municipalities, especially the big cities, in the Canadian governance mix. Persuasive analysts argued that global forces and the imperatives of economic competitiveness made this evolution inevitable (Courchene, 2007). There has been movement in this direction. Most provincial governments have increased the range of autonomy of ‘their’ municipalities. More strikingly, the New Deal for Cities and Communities (2004-06) aimed to bolster the resources of local governments and to cement the municipal-federal partnership in making policy in cities. This New Deal was summarily terminated by the current Conservative government.

Nevertheless, municipal-provincial-federal relations are very important in Canadian policy making, especially in the form of bilateralism.⁷ In all these relationships, bilateral or multilateral, municipal governments tend to be policy takers. They are subject to initiatives undertaken by provincial governments, often with little consultation, in a wide variety of areas that have not been discussed above - land-use planning, roads, public health, libraries, policing, building codes, and much more. Municipal governments also must react to unilateral federal policy initiatives, in areas like property and infrastructure. In many intergovernmental relationships, municipalities lack the resources and the jurisdiction to make much of a policy impact.

We have found, however, that municipalities can play a larger role, and that they can successfully pursue their objectives in intergovernmental arenas. Much depends on their orientation. Here, we can distinguish ‘minimalist’ from ‘comprehensive’ municipal administrations (Young, 2012, pp. 16-17). Municipal governments of the former type are focused on providing the standard services, and doing so efficiently in order to keep property taxes and fees as low as possible. But other municipalities are prepared to expand their traditional role as service providers and to take on activities beyond those allocated to them by provincial governments. They are prepared to act with a new “assertive maturity” (Siegel and Tindal, 2006). They do not function almost as administrative units of provincial governments; instead they are the means by which communities formulate collective objectives and act in their common interest.⁸ Municipal governments with a comprehensive orientation are prepared to take the lead in addressing problems within their territories, and in so doing to engage other levels of government. For success in these arenas, a solid foundation of public support, democratically expressed, is most helpful (Young, 2009b, pp. 497-8).

We found local governments that were prepared to propagate their images through big sporting events that drew funding from other levels of government. Others used the Provincial Nominee Program to bring in new immigrants, and undertook creative measures to retain them. The cities of Edmonton and Calgary have no responsibility for urban Aboriginal people, but they engage in some programming, and have long published directories of services offered to native peoples by other governments and local service agencies. Some municipalities do cooperate well with their neighbours in emergency planning. Coherent plans backed by a local consensus have brought success in redeveloping federal properties, and the same holds true for the infrastructure programs. There are many factors that make some municipal governments more successful

⁷ The relationship might be called ‘serial bilateralism.’ (See Miller and Smart, 2012.) While there are trilateral relations - when, for instance, municipal and provincial authorities collectively lobby in Ottawa about some federal property - there are other cases when federal-provincial agreements are followed by provincial-municipal negotiations about policy implementation. In still other instances, it should be stressed, the bilateralism involves federal and provincial governments dealing with local social forces, such as immigrant settlement agencies, with only tangential participation by municipal officials.

⁸ This distinction between service provision and collective political action runs through a standard text on Canadian local government: see Tindal and Tindal 2009.

than others in intergovernmental relations - size, electoral significance, resources, and so on - but it is clear that those with a comprehensive orientation are more likely to try for success in the arenas of multilevel governance.

■ REFERENCES

- Agranoff, Robert and Michael McGuire. 2003. *Collaborative Public Management: New Strategies for Local Governments*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Anderson, C. (2006). 'Economic Voting and Multilevel Governance: A Comparative Individual-Level Analysis.' *American Journal of Political Science*, 50:2, p. 449-63.
- Andrew, C., K. A. Graham, and S. Phillips (dirs.) (2002). Eds., *Urban Affairs: Back on the Policy Agenda*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Berdahl, L. (2006). 'The Federal Urban Role and Federal-Municipal Relations', dans R. Young et C. Leuprecht (dir.), *Canada: The State of the Federation 2004 - Municipal-Federal-Provincial Relations in Canada*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press for the Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, School of Policy Studies, Queen's University, p. 25-43.
- Bherer, L. et P. Hamel (2012). 'Overcoming Adversity, or Public Action in the Face of New Urban Problems: the Example of Montreal', dans M. Horak et R. Young (dir.), *Sites of Governance: Multilevel Governance and Policy Making in Canada's Big Cities*, Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, p. 104-35.
- Breton, A. (1987). 'Towards a Theory of Competitive Federalism.' *European Journal of Political Economy, Special Issue*, 3:1&2, p. 263-329.
- Bradford, Neil. 2007. *Whither the Federal Urban Agenda? A New Deal in Transition*. Canadian Policy Research Networks, Family Network, Research Report F/65.
- Carroll, B. and K.A.H. Graham (dir.) (2009). *Canadian Public Administration*, Special Issue on Federalism, Public Policy and Municipalities. 52:3 (September).
- Chenier, John A. 2009. 'The Evolving Role of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities.' *Canadian Public Administration*, 52:3, 395-416.
- Courchene, T. J. (2007). Global Futures for Canada's Global Cities. *Policy Matters*. Institute for Research on Public Policy, June. Montreal.
- Esselment, Anna. 2010. Fighting Elections: Cross-Level Political Party Integration in Canada.' *Canadian Journal of Political Science*. 43:4, 871-92.
- Esselment, Anna. 2011. 'Birds of a Feather? The Role of Partisanship in the 2003 Ontario Liberal Transition.' *Canadian Public Administration*. 54:4, 465-86.
- Gagnon, A.-G. (dir.) (2009). *Contemporary Canadian Federalism: Foundations, Traditions, Institutions*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Garcea, J. et E.C. LeSage Jr. (dir.) (2005). *Municipal Reform in Canada: Reconfiguration, Re-Empowerment, and Rebalancing*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Malcolm Grieve and Lori Turnbull, Forthcoming. "Emergency Planning in Nova Scotia," dans D. Henstra (dir.), *Multilevel Governance and Emergency Planning in Canadian Municipalities* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

- Haddow, R. (2011). 'Multilevel Governance and Immigration Policy in Nova Scotia', dans E. Tolley et R. Young (dir.), *Immigrant Settlement Policy in Canadian Municipalities*, Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, p. 192-240.
- Harper, S. (2010), Speech to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, Toronto, 28 mai, Author's notes.
- Harvey, J. and R. Young (dir.) (2012). *Multilevel Governance and Image-Building in Canadian Municipalities*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Henstra, D. (dir.) Forthcoming, *Multilevel Governance and Emergency Planning in Canadian Municipalities*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Hooghe, Liesbet and Gary Marks. 2003. 'Unraveling the Central State, but How? Types of Multi-level Governance.' *American Political Science Review*. 97:2, 233-43.
- Horak, M. (2012a), 'Multilevel Governance in Toronto: Success and Failure in Canada's Largest City,' dans M. Horak and R. Young (dir.) (2012) *Sites of Governance: Multilevel Governance and Policy Making in Canada's Big Cities*, Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, p 228-62.
- Horak, M. (2012b). 'Conclusion: Understanding Multilevel Governance in Canada's Cities', dans M. Horak et R. Young (dir.), *Sites of Governance: Multilevel Governance and Policy Making in Canada's Big Cities*, Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, p 339-70.
- Horak, M. et R. Young (dir.) (2012). *Sites of Governance: Multilevel Governance and Policy Making in Canada's Big Cities*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Hutton, Thomas. 2012. 'Multilevel Governance and Urban Development: A Vancouver Case Study.' In Martin Horak and Robert Young, eds., *Sites of Governance: Multilevel Governance and Policy Making in Canada's Big Cities*, 263-98. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Ircha, M.C. et R. Young (dir.) Forthcoming, *Multilevel Governance and Federal Property in Canadian Municipalities*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Lazar, H. et C. Leuprecht (dir.) (2007). *Spheres of Governance: Comparative Studies of Cities in Multilevel Governance Systems*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press for the Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, School of Policy Studies, Queen's University.
- Leo, C. (2006). 'Deep Federalism: Respecting Community Difference in National Policy.' *Canadian Journal of Political Science*. 39:3, p. 481-506.
- Leuprecht, C. et H. Lazar (2007). 'From Multilevel to "Multi-order" Governance?' dans H. Lazar et C. Leuprecht dirs. *Spheres of Governance: Comparative Studies of Cities in Multilevel Governance Systems*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press for the Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, School of Policy Studies, Queen's University, p. 1-21.
- Miller, B. et A. Smart (2012). 'Ascending the Main Stage?: Calgary in the Multilevel Governance Drama', dans M. Horak et R. Young (dir.), *Sites of Governance: Multilevel Governance and Policy Making in Canada's Big Cities*, Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, p. 26-52.
- OECD (2012). . Fiscal Decentralization Database, at http://www.oecd.org/document/32/0,3746,en_2649_35929024_47467040_1_1_1_1,00.html#SEC_B_2 (page consultee le 17 juin 2012).
- Papadopoulos, Y. (2010). 'Accountability and Multi-level Governance: More Accountability, Less Democracy?' *West European Politics*. 33:5, p. 1030-49.
- Peters, E. J. (dir.) (2011). *Urban Aboriginal Policy Making in Canadian Municipalities*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

- Pierre, J. et B. G. Peters (2005). *Governing Complex Societies: Trajectories and Scenarios*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sancton, A. et Robert Young (dir.) (2009). *Foundations of Governance: Municipal Government in Canada's Provinces*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press and the Institute of Public Administration of Canada.
- Siegel, D. et C. R. Tindal (2006). 'Changing the Municipal Culture: From Comfortable Subordination to Assertive Maturity.' Parts 1 and 2, *Municipal World*. March, p. 37-40; April p. 13-17.
- Simeon, R. (2002). *Political Science and Federalism: Seven Decades of Scholarly Engagement*. 2000 Kenneth R. MacGregor Lecture. Kingston: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University.
- Tindal, C. R. et S. N. Tindal (2009). *Local Government in Canada*, 7th ed. Toronto: Nelson Education.
- Tolley, E. et R. Young (dir.) (2011). *Immigrant Settlement Policy in Canadian Municipalities*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Young, R. (2006). 'Open Federalism and Canadian Municipalities.' In K. Banting et autres, *Open Federalism: Interpretations, Significance*, Kingston: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, p. 7-24.
- Young, R. (2009a). 'Canada', dans N. Steytler (dir.), *Local Government and Metropolitan Regions in Federal Systems, A Global Dialogue on Federalism Volume VI*, Senior Editor John Kincaid, Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press for the Forum of Federations and the International Association of Centers for Federal Studies, p. 106-35.
- Young, R. (2009b). 'Conclusion', dans Andrew Sancton et Robert Young (dir.), *Foundations of Governance: Municipal Government in Canada's Provinces*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press and the Institute of Public Administration of Canada, p. 487-99.
- Young, R. (2012). 'Introduction: Multilevel Governance and Its Central Research Questions in Canadian Cities'. dans M. Horak et R. Young (dir.), *Sites of Governance: Multilevel Governance and Policy Making in Canada's Big Cities*, Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, p. 3-25.
- Young, R. et C. Leuprecht (dir.) (2006). *Canada: The State of the Federation 2004 - Municipal-Federal-Provincial Relations in Canada*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press for the Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, School of Policy Studies, Queen's University.

APPENDIX 1. POST-ELECTORAL PERIODS WHEN AGREEMENT IS UNLIKELY: QUEBEC 1975-2008

Federal																																	
Trudeau				1	Trudeau				Mulroney				Chretien								Martin		Harper										
Quebec																																	
Bourassa		Levesque						Bourassa				Parizeau				Bouchard				Charest													
Montreal																																	
Drapeau								Dore				Bourque				Tremblay																	
75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08

This paper is the original manuscript and has not been revised or edited. For the final version, see the French translation.

APPENDIX 2. POST-ELECTORAL PERIODS, ALL THREE LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT: QUEBEC 1975-2008

Federal																																	
Trudeau				1	Trudeau				Mulroney				Chretien								Martin		Harper										
Quebec																																	
Bourassa		Levesque						Bourassa						Parizeau			Bouchard			Charest													
Montreal																																	
Drapeau								Dore						Bourque						Tremblay													
75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08