

Transformation in Governance: The Evolution of Manitoba's
Forest Policy Regime

By
Jodi Griffith

A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies of The University of Manitoba
in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Environment

Department of Environment and Geography
Faculty of Earth, Environment and Resources
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba

August 2011

©Copyright
2011, Jodi Griffith

Abstract

The introduction of sustainable forest management has fostered international change in forest management and policy because economic, environmental and social forest values are now recognized as interconnected components that ought to be balanced. However, the degree to which these values and related ideas have become embedded in Manitoba's forest policy regime and the extent to which they have led to change in forest management and policy development is unclear. Through semi-directed interviews and a qualitative document review, change in the values and ideas that guide Manitoba's forest policy regime were identified. The most important changes have been recognition of ecological values and social components of forestry through forest guidelines and policies. Logging in most of Manitoba's provincial parks has been legally prohibited through the Forest Act. However significant this change to legislation it can be marked as the only significant change to forest legislation in Manitoba in terms of recognizing values beyond traditional forestry activities. Entrenched forestry institutions, such as long-term tenure arrangements, have limited the amount and pace of change in the regime. The number of actors with interests in Manitoba's forest policy regime has expanded, but participation in decision making remains restricted. Institutional inertia provides a stable system in which policy change follows a normal or incremental pattern of change. However, there is potential for paradigmatic policy change to occur. Paradigmatic change can occur when new actors are invited into the policy network during periods of conflict or when new actors promote their interests and these become pursued within the policy network or when incremental change occurs cumulatively in one direction. In Manitoba's forest policy regime, escalated concerns could turn into conflict creating an opportunity for new actors. In fact, existing government actors are slowly recognizing the interests of Aboriginal actors, which could represent incremental steps towards Aboriginal forestry

Acknowledgements

I pursued an education at the graduate level because I believe in life-long learning and I wanted to be challenged to expand and stretch my thoughts and knowledge – I wanted an education that would be life altering. As I should have known none of the challenges, growth or learning occurred in ways I expected and because of this I was not always aware of how much I had learned and how life altering this process was. What I do know is I am grateful to all of the people along the way who have supported me and encouraged me through it.

I would like to thank my advisors and my committee, Dr. Jacques Tardif, Dr. Alan Diduck, Dr. Rick Baydack and Dr. Stephane McLachlan. Thank you, Dr. Jacques Tardif and Dr. Alan Diduck, for giving me the opportunity to work on this project and for the endless hours you have committed to advising and revising. Thank you for your commitment and enthusiasm and for never giving up on me. Thank you, Dr. Rick Baydack and Dr. Stephane McLachlan for your incite and encouragement. I am honoured to work with all of you.

I am also grateful for the funding Dr. Jacques Tardif and Dr. Alan Diduck provided to me which was granted by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) and Canada Research Chairs.

I would like to thank all of the people that participated in the interviews for this research. I loved speaking with each one of you. I was intrigued by your words, perceptions and knowledge. I learned so much from our conversations.

Mom and Ralph, Dad and Naomi, Margaret and Larry, thank you for reminding me of the importance of what I was working towards when I had at time lost sight of this and for always encouraging me to continue. Sherri, Reg, Rhyan and Bailey I'm thankful you lived so close to me while I worked on this project because so often you were my motivation to get work done – spending time with you meant the world to me. Heidi and Ollie, I'm grateful to have been invited to spend time with you in Kansas – it was truly a gift of renewal in the middle of this project.

Thank you, Kristine Koster, Tim Davis, Desiree Nickel, Lee Hrenchuk, Carissa Comeault, Faye Suderman, Denise Hickie, Aminah Effendy, Deb Raven and friends at UM Masters. Each one of you has played an instrumental and inspirational role in helping me achieve my goals. You are all brilliant and talented people and I am blessed you are my friends.

To my husband, Eric Gluck, I owe you the greatest debt of gratitude. You have provided me with endless encouragement, support, patience and love. You truly are a gift.

Table of contents

Abstract	<i>i</i>
Acknowledgements	<i>ii</i>
Table of contents.....	<i>iii</i>
List of tables.....	<i>vi</i>
1 General introduction.....	1
1.1 Change in governance	1
1.2 Purpose and research questions.....	3
1.3 Thesis outline	5
2 Literature review	6
2.1 Government to governance.....	6
2.1.1 Changes in governing and increasingly complex societies	8
2.1.2 Rationale for policy regime analysis.....	9
2.2 Policy regime analysis	10
2.2.1 Policy change.....	13
2.2.2 Policy change within the context of sustainable development and sustainable forest management	16
2.2.3 Drivers of change: internationalization, globalization, politics and governance.....	18
2.3 Manitoba's forest landscape, forest industry and a brief history of natural resource governance.....	20
2.3.1 Manitoba's forested landscape	20
2.3.2 Manitoba's forest industry	22
2.3.3 A brief history: European settlement in Manitoba, the formation of the province and governing natural resources.....	24
2.3.3.1 Constitutional recognition and protection of Aboriginal rights in Canada	30
3 Methodology.....	32
3.1 Research approach and design	32
3.1.1 Philosophical assumptions	32
3.2 Data collection.....	33
3.2.1 Qualitative document analysis	33
3.2.2 Semi-directed interviews.....	34
3.3 The interview guide	36
3.3.1 Main questions	38
3.3.2 Probing questions.....	38
3.3.3 Follow-up questions	39
3.3.4 Question clarity	40
3.4 Interview participants	40
3.5 Researcher bias.....	44
3.6 Replicating research.....	47

3.7	Practical components of interviewing.....	48
3.8	Data analysis technique and validity of results.....	49
4	<i>The evolution of Manitoba’s forest policy regime: change in ideas and actors since the 1980s</i>	51
	<i>Abstract</i>	51
4.1	Introduction	51
4.1.1	Characterization of major forest eras.....	51
4.1.2	Emerging paradigm: sustainable forest management	53
4.1.3	Manitoba’s forest sector	55
4.1.4	Objectives	56
4.2	Methods	57
4.3	Results	60
4.3.1	The evolution of ideas in Manitoba’s forest policy regime	60
4.3.1.1	Changes in legislation and policies since the 1980s.....	60
4.3.2	New ideas in Manitoba’s forest policy regime: participant views.....	64
4.3.2.1	Public involvement.....	67
4.3.2.2	First Nations and Aboriginal involvement.....	68
4.3.3	Implementation of new ideas in Manitoba’s forest policy: participant views	69
4.3.4	The evolution of actors in Manitoba’s forest policy regime.....	70
4.3.4.1	The main actors and their roles: provincial government, forest industry and First Nation	70
4.3.4.2	The federal government	76
4.3.4.3	Environmental non-government organizations and non-government organizations .	78
4.3.4.4	Stakeholder advisory committees	79
4.3.4.5	Rural municipalities.....	79
4.3.4.6	Manitoba Agriculture and private woodlot forestry.....	81
4.3.5	Characterization of Manitoba’s forest policy community: participant views	82
4.4	Discussion	83
4.4.1	The sustainable forest management era: new ideas in Manitoba’s forest policy regime.....	83
4.4.1.1	Manitoba in a Canadian context.....	83
4.4.1.2	Why Manitoba’s forest legislation is lagging behind	85
4.4.2	Sustainable forest management era: new actors in Manitoba’s forest policy regime.....	88
4.4.2.1	First Nations.....	89
4.4.2.2	The federal government	91
4.4.2.3	ENGOS and NGO, SACs, RMs, conservation districts, Manitoba Agriculture, and private woodlot forestry	93
4.4.3	Characterizing policy change in Manitoba’s forest policy regime	95
4.5	Conclusion	100
4.6	References	102
5	<i>Perceptions of the relationships and prospects for change in Manitoba’s forest policy network</i>	106
	<i>Abstract</i>	106
5.1	Introduction and objectives	106
5.2	Conceptual frameworks	109

5.2.1	Patterns and processes of policy change	109
5.2.2	Barriers to change in forest policy regimes	112
5.2.3	Aboriginal actors in sustainable forest management.....	113
5.3	Methods.....	115
5.4	Results.....	118
5.4.1	Perceptions of past and future change in Manitoba’s forest policy regime	118
5.4.2	An increased role for Aboriginal actors in Manitoba’s forest policy regime	120
5.4.3	Institutions and actors perceived as barriers to forest policy change.....	122
5.4.3.1	Forest tenure as an institutional barrier to change	122
5.4.3.2	Characteristics of the provincial Forestry Branch: an institutional barrier to change	123
5.4.4	Barriers to the full expression of Aboriginal actors in Manitoba’s forest policy regime	125
5.5	Discussion.....	129
5.5.1	Manitoba’s forest policy regime follows a normal pattern of policy change	129
5.5.2	Resistance to change provided by institutional features of Manitoba’s forest policy regime	131
5.5.3	Potential sources of tension that could lead to paradigmatic change	134
5.5.4	Potential for paradigmatic change in Manitoba’s forest policy regime	139
5.6	Conclusion	142
5.7	References.....	145
6	<i>Overall conclusions and reflections.....</i>	<i>149</i>
6.1	Major conclusions.....	149
6.1.1	Changing values in Manitoba’s forest policy regime.....	149
6.1.2	Absence of change in Manitoba’s forest policy regime	150
6.1.3	Patterns of change and expectations for the future of Manitoba’s forest policy regime ...	153
7	<i>Appendix A – Interview guide.....</i>	<i>155</i>
8	<i>Appendix B – Introductory letter to participants</i>	<i>157</i>
9	<i>Appendix C – Interview consent letter</i>	<i>159</i>
10	<i>Appendix D – Researcher’s personal reflections on biases and thesis process</i>	<i>162</i>
11	<i>Appendix E – Characterization of major forest eras.....</i>	<i>169</i>
12	<i>Appendix F – Participants’ views of Manitoba forest policy objectives</i>	<i>172</i>
13	<i>References</i>	<i>175</i>

List of tables

Table 3.1.	The number of interview participants and the actor group they represented	43
Table 4.1.	Trends in forest management and policy in Canada since the 1980s	54
Table 4.2.	The number of interview participants and the actor group they represented	59
Table 4.3.	Major ideas reflected in Manitoba’s legislation, policy and annual reporting since the 1980s	61
Table 4.4.	Major policy objectives identified by interview participants, who are represented by individual codes	65
Table 4.5.	Perceptions of legislation, policies, and operations in Manitoba’s forest policy regime	71
Table 4.6.	Participants’ views of the roles of the provincial government (central and regional arms) and the forest industry in Manitoba’s forest policy regime	73
Table 4.7.	Participants’ views of the current and emerging roles of Aboriginal people in Manitoba’s forest policy regime	75
Table 4.8.	Participants’ views of the roles and legislative authority of the federal government in Manitoba’s forest policy regime	77
Table 4.9.	Participants’ views of the roles of Manitoba’s forest policy community actors	80
Table 5.1.	The number of interview participants and the actor group they represented	117
Table 5.2.	Participants’ expectations of future change in Manitoba’s forest policy regime	119
Table 5.3.	Perceived characteristics of the Forestry Branch viewed as barriers to change	125

1 General introduction

1.1 Change in governance

Through the 1987 Brundtland Commission Report, *Our Common Future*, sustainable development gained notoriety (Sneddon *et al.*, 2006). Sustainable development (SD) is defined as “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (United Nations, 1987, 54). This concept has economic, ecologic and social consequences because it calls for equality - between economic and ecological values, between societal actors with different socioeconomic status and between current and future generations (Adamowicz and Burton, 2003; Sneddon *et al.*, 2006). As a subcategory of SD, sustainable forest management (SFM) was conceptualized as a mechanism for balancing multiple economic, ecological and social forest interests (Luckert and Salkie, 1998; Rametsteiner and Simula, 2003). SFM was adopted into Canada’s forest policy regime in the early 1990s through national forest policies (Adamowicz and Burton, 2003; Ballhorn, 2005; Hessing *et al.*, 2005, ch. 3). The 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), the 1993 Helsinki Process, the 1994 UN Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD), 1994 Intergovernmental Working Group on Forests (IWGF), 1995 Montreal Process, and the 1995 Intergovernmental Panel on Forestry (IPF) (Adamowicz and Burton, 2003; Hessing *et al.*, 2005; Van Kooten and Vertinsky, 1999) all played important roles in integrating sustainability into forest management and legislation.

Although SD and SFM have been touted as mechanisms to balance development and environmental interests, implementation has been difficult (Robinson, 2004). The

difficulty is due in part to the complexity of the concepts (Adamowicz and Burton, 2003). Furthermore, these concepts have been inappropriately used to further economic development agendas that have contributed to greater environmental degradation and social inequality (Sneddon et al., 2006; Robinson, 2004; Adamowicz and Burton, 2003). Despite these limitations, sustainability terms have become rooted in the vocabulary of government, industry, non-government organizations (NGOs) and academics. Moreover, debates over these terms have generated dialogue about opposing interests and values and tradeoffs about desired futures (Robinson, 2004). One thing is certain, however, interest in SD has renewed calls for deliberative democracy (Sneddon *et al.*, 2006) and enhanced opportunities for public involvement in decision making (Robinson, 2004).

Enhanced opportunities for public involvement and deliberative democracy are associated with new forms of governance. Governance is no longer a limited activity conducted by individual governments. It is a process that involves government as well as non-government actors in achieving collective action and ordered rule (Milward and Provan, 2000; Pal, 2006; Loughlin, 2004). Furthermore, governing has become increasingly difficult due to the complex nature of contemporary problems (Tellier, 1989) associated with globalization, shifting political culture, and new ideas about governance and public management (Pal, 2006). The extent of complexity associated with current governance is articulated well by Schmithusen and Dubé (2007, pp. xv-xvi):

Participation in decision-making, access to information, transparency and accountability are starting to influence policy and legislative planning in many sectors. Institutional frameworks are being changed to reflect policies promoting local decision-making and community-based initiatives in a wider variety of fields. Decentralization is becoming important as a strategy for reform of the public sector. It also becomes evident that maintaining the natural resource base and

managing it in a sustainable manner cannot be tackled by one single public policy domain or one body of specific legislation alone. Effective solutions for most societal problems have to be found through the different agencies, policy actors, and stakeholders concerned. In forestry, water management, fisheries, land use, wildlife and other areas, the emphasis is on moving away from exclusive stated competencies to stronger management responsibilities and property rights vested in private individuals and companies, subnational government bodies and local cooperatives and municipalities.

The focus of this project is how the role of the government shifts as decision making processes become more decentralized and involve a wider range of non-state actors.

1.2 Purpose and research questions

To determine how Manitoba's forest policy regime has been influenced by SFM and contemporary governance trends, this research sought to gain a better understanding of the evolution of forest governance in the province. The purpose of the research was to explain the evolution of Manitoba's forest policy regime from a governance-centered perspective. In other words, this project focused on the principles, people and institutional arrangements that guide forest policy decision making.

The research questions were:

1. How have the values and norms that support public forest policies changed in Manitoba?
2. What has changed with respect to public participation in forest policy decision making in Manitoba, with a particular focus on participation of Aboriginal¹ people?

¹ The terms Aboriginal actors and First Nations are both used throughout the text. It is recognized that these terms are distinguishable. Aboriginal people, as defined by the Canadian Constitution, 1982, include "Indian", Inuit and Métis people. Here, the terms First Nation(s) people or community are used when people or a community are recognized according to the governing structure or band for that community.

3. What new arenas of public action have emerged in Manitoba's forest policy regime?

Identifying a change in the values and norms that support public forest policies helps clarify if concepts associated with SFM, such as ecosystem preservation and public involvement in forest management decision making processes, have become integrated into Manitoba's forest sector. Identifying changes in public participation and new arenas of public action will help indicate if new actors are involved in forest decision making processes. This change would represent a change in values and norms, as well as a change in forest governance. The extent of change in Manitoba can be useful for determining how well international and national changes in forest policies translate to a provincial level. This information will help determine if forest policies have changed or if they can be expected to change. Furthermore, this information may provide an explanation for changes in policy and patterns of policy development, as well as insight about the role of government in forest governance.

The project was part of a larger comparative study with three other Canadian provinces: Ontario, Québec and New Brunswick. Teams in these other provinces addressed similar questions and the combination of these projects will highlight how changes in public policy have translated into changes in forest policies in Canada. This understanding will help to assess what kind of change may be required in the forest policy sector and if these are acknowledged by policy makers. It will also help determine if there is a capacity to

However, both terms are used interchangeably throughout the text as well according to the term used in a particular documentary source that is cited or by an interview participant.

change how forest policies are developed and who is involved in developing these policies.

1.3 Thesis outline

My research questions are addressed in the ensuing chapters and organized in the following way. The next chapter (Chapter 2) is divided into two main sections; a literature review regarding governance and policy change and an overview of the Manitoba context. The first main section describes governance and changes in governance, especially with respect to governing in increasingly complex societies. This discussion is followed by one on the evolution of policy analysis, which provides support for policy regime analysis, a framework that guided this research. Policy change is then introduced and discussed within the context of SD and SFM. The context section presents the physical characteristics of Manitoba's landscape and an introduction to Manitoba's forest industry. This is followed by an historical overview of early human activity and settlement in the province, along with a brief political history of the creation of Manitoba as a province. Finally a section on the efforts that have been made to define Aboriginal and treaty rights is included.

Chapter 3 follows the section on Manitoba and contains my research methodology. The focus here is on the epistemological and ontological assumptions that supported the research and on a discussion of research validity. Chapters 4 and 5 are structured as individual journal articles. Chapter 4, to be submitted to *Forestry Chronicle*, is entitled "The evolution of Manitoba's forest policy regime: change in ideas and actors since the 1980s". This chapter describes the fundamental principles that guide Manitoba's forest

policy regime and how changes in these principles have become embedded in, and have influenced, the regime. This chapter also describes the main actors involved in the regime and how they have evolved along with the overarching concepts. Finally, emergent opportunities within the regime are discussed along with institutional barriers.

Chapter 5, to be submitted to the journal *Environments*, is entitled “Perceptions of the relationships and prospects for change in Manitoba’s forest policy network”. This chapter describes the relationships among the provincial government, the forestry industry and Aboriginal actors in order to determine if Manitoba’s forest policy network is evolving to include emerging Aboriginal actors. The policy network structure will likely remain unchanged and policy development will continue to follow an incremental pattern of change. However, members of the policy network raised concerns that have the potential to escalate into conflict, which could lead to paradigmatic change. Additionally, incremental steps toward Aboriginal forestry represent another source of potential paradigmatic change in Manitoba’s forest policy regime. The final chapter (6) contains a summary of the major findings.

2 Literature review

2.1 Government to governance

The term governance, which was once used synonymously with the word government, has changed (Rhodes, 1996; Stoker, 1998). It now reflects changes from top-down, command and control type governing to a new form that is more inclusive and co-operative. Stoker (1998, p. 17) stated that government was used to “refer to the formal institutions of the state and their monopoly of legitimate coercive power. Government is

characterized by its ability to make decisions and its capacity to enforce them. In particular, government is understood to refer to the formal and institutional processes which operate at the level of the nation state to maintain public order and facilitate collective action". Milward and Provan (2000) also provided a similar definition of government. Stoker (1998) held that *process* is the key difference between government and governance. The idea of process rather than outputs can be more clearly understood by comparing Stoker's (1998) definition of government with the definition of governance provided by Milward and Provan (2000).

Milward and Provan (2000. p. 360) defined governance as "... a more inclusive term, concerned with creating the conditions for ordered rule and collective action, often including agents in the private and nonprofit sectors as well as within the public sector". The outputs in both definitions are facilitation of order and collective action; however only the process of governance achieves these outputs through the inclusion of private and non-profit actors. Through the inclusion of partnerships and/or cooperation with actors outside of government the process is viewed as being a bottom-up, steering process rather than a top-down, directed process, as would be the case with government (Loughlin, 2004; Pal, 2006).

Based on the above discussion, governance is defined in this study as an emerging form of governing where multiple actors from private, nonprofit and public sectors, including government, work together on decision-making processes (but not necessarily decision making), to facilitate maintenance of public order and collective action.

2.1.1 Changes in governing and increasingly complex societies

The need to redefine governance or to distinguish governance from government corresponds with the literature on the increasing complexity associated with governing modern societies of today. Hjern and Porter (1981, p. 211) argued that, “the scope of the public sector in Western democracies has dramatically expanded since the late 1940s as it has tried to keep pace with ever more pervasive externalities, the increasing uncertainties facing industry, and demands by citizens for more social services”. Although this rationale for change was provided by Hjern and Porter (1981) to describe change in the public sector since the 1940s, much of this rationale could also be identified as drivers of more recent shifts in governance.

Governing in Canada is increasingly complex because the issues to be governed have international connections and consequences (Tellier, 1989). Examples of these issues include “competitive international markets, a global economy, global warming, the collapsing cod fishery, environmental pollution, drug abuse and other social issues (Tellier, 1989). Another degree of complexity is associated with enhancing the delivery of public services and the involvement of multiple actors (Milward and Howard, 2000). According to Milward and Howard (2000, p. 359), “Nonprofits, firms, and governments all play a role in the new world of public policy. This means that public services are jointly produced. No one organization is able to produce all the services that individual clients need”. Concomitantly, Loughlin (2004, pp. 11-12) argued that, “... as society becomes more complex and differentiated, the traditional method of governing from above – government – becomes more difficult” (pp. 11-12). Through this review it is

evident that societies have become more complex and their values have changed.

Therefore, the task of governing has also become increasingly complex, leading ideas of governance to emerge and evolve. Furthermore, the complexity of issues is confounded by monetary restraints (Tellier, 1989). Despite these challenges, efforts to improve governance in Canada have focused both on establishing effective institutions, structures and leaders, as well as, serving Canadian citizens by decentralizing governance and enhancing accountability and capacity (Tellier, 1989).

2.1.2 Rationale for policy regime analysis

It is evident through the above discussion that both the nature and context of challenges facing society (i.e., the public) has changed internationally and in Canada. When the nature of the challenges change a corresponding shift in public policies and policy analysis is expected (Pal, 2006). However, approaches to policy analysis differ. For example, policy analysis may have its basis in positivist philosophies and therefore rely on rationalism, empiricism and objectivity (Howlett *et al.*, 2009; Pal, 2006). The contrasting post-positive approach relies on “political and social analysis of public problems and policy-making processes and outcomes” (Howlett *et al.*, 2009, p. 26). To exemplify the difference further, positivistic policy analysis tends to focus on quantifiable measures and outcomes, while a post-positive approach would focus more on understanding the reasons for policy change over time and normative considerations, e.g., the standards and norms that guide policy change (Howlett *et al.*, 2009; Pal, 2006). Due to its emphasis on objectivity and empiricism positivism excludes other ways of knowing (Pal, 2006), while post-positivists believe that “(positivist) empirical analysis needs to be

combined with (post-positivist) normative analysis because the two are inseparable...”
(Howlett *et al.*, 2009, p. 26).

2.2 Policy regime analysis

Although policy analysis traditionally has been based on a positivist philosophical approach that focused on empiricism and economic traditions, change has become evident. Contemporary approaches to policy regime analysis can be better understood by considering the linkages between different theories associated with public policy, i.e., inter-organizational theory, policy networks and policy regime analysis. Inter-organizational theory has been linked to policy networks, which can be defined as “the sets of formal and informal institutional linkages between government and other actors structured around shared interests in public policymaking and implementation” (Rhodes, 1996, p.1244). By reviewing inter-organizational theory it becomes evident that there is a link between this theory and the work on policy regime analysis, even though Milward’s (1982) approach existed in a time when positivism and rationality were the main thrust of policy analysis.

To analyze a policy system Milward (1982) suggested that “the first empirical task is to develop a conceptual map of all of the actors and organizations involved and determine how they interact in a specific policy domain (p. 464).” Although the author identified the ‘first empirical task’ of analyzing a policy system, it can be argued that much of his discussion on policy domains, communities and systems, as well as, decision-making networks corresponds with the concepts of policy regime analysis. For example, Milward (1982) described a policy domain as the “act of a legislative body which mandates the

establishment of a governmental presence in a particular functional area (p. 465)”. In describing policy regimes, Wilson (2000) used ‘specific issue areas’ (p. 257) and Howlett (2002) described policy regime analysis existing at the “meso or sectoral level” (p. 5).

Although Milward (1982) distinguished among policy domains, community, system, and decision-making networks, there are points of comparison between these and the objectives of policy regime analysis. For example, his description of policy community described the involvement of “intellectuals contributing ideas in good currency, interest groups, professional associations, and others with an interest in a particular policy. Thus, the policy community constitutes a form of social network in the sense used by social anthropologists, because it is shaped by patterns of relations in which each individual has developed a communications linkage with at least one other member of the network but is not necessarily fully connected to every other member (p. 465)”. Howlett’s (2002) description of policy regime analysis or policy regimes is similar in the sense that identifying the actors (perhaps synonymous with Milward’s (1982) ‘intellectuals’) and their interactions are a part of what it means to analyze a policy regime. Howlett (2002, p. 16) described a policy regime as being “...concerned less with understanding a specific political or economic arrangement, such as a particular administrative agency or policy relationship, than with the identification, description, and analysis of the overall tenor and types of interactions existing among institutions, actors, and ideas that tend to congeal into relatively long-term, institutionalized patterns of policy and policy-making”.

This comparison between Milward's work on policy systems and Howlett's later work on policy regimes identifies that policy analysis considers all of the actors, ideas and institutions involved in complex and interacting systems (Howlett, 2002). While important contributions to policy studies are made through empirical analyses of these relationships, qualitative approaches to policy analysis are becoming more prevalent as a chosen policy analysis tool to address the increasing complexity of issues and relationships. The policy regime approach taken by Howlett (2002) overcomes the deficits associated with a rationalist (positivist) approach because its focus is not limited to empirical analysis and its scope extends beyond the field of economics to include other fields of study such as social science. The regime approach deals with the complex nature of current governance because it acknowledges all components and the interconnected relationships that exist within a policy regime. Furthermore, it is within the capacity of the regime approach to conduct policy analysis at the sectoral level, while also considering other interconnected sectors and/or subsectors (Howlett, 2002). In other words the regime approach is open in such a way that interactions between different sectors, like forestry and agriculture, and subsectors, like protected areas and tenure, are examined to understand how policy development is influenced by these relationships.

As a result of sectoral level policy analysis being criticized as insufficient for addressing the current climate of policy change, new approaches have been developed (Hoberg and Morawski, 1997; Rayner *et al.*, 2001). These approaches are not limited to a single sector and analysis is conducted between two or more sectors or alternatively, the subsectors within a sector are identified and considered. Hoberg and Morawski (1997) demonstrated

that significant policy change occurred in British Columbia when the forestry and Aboriginal regimes became intimately interconnected. They argued that policy change could occur through “sector intersection”, which they described as “the overlap of actors and institutions that comprise policy regimes for different sectors” (p. 390). Another model of policy analysis examines the range of interactions existing among and between a sector and its numerous subsectors (Rayner *et al.*, 2001). In this example certain subsectors are identified as ‘critical subsectors’ and these have the ability to facilitate or impede policy change despite what has occurred in other less critical sub-sectors. Tenure arrangements and Annual Allowable Cut (AAC) have been identified as ‘critical subsectors’ which impeded changes in the forest sector even though changes had occurred in other sub-sectors such as land management (Rayner *et al.*, 2001). These ideas of sectoral intersection and sub-sector analysis are incorporated into Howlett’s (2001) conceptualization for analyzing forest policy regimes as actors, ideas and institutions are interconnected and have an influence on the forestry sector and therefore are a pertinent part of explaining the forest policy regime.

2.2.1 Policy change

Policy analysis, network analysis and policy regimes are areas of interest related to policy change, i.e. identifying change, as well as the causes associated with it. Within these policy development systems, there are a range of components and interactions that exist and can lead to policy change. However policy change can also be characterized by patterns of change. These patterns have been characterized as incremental, paradigmatic, and as a combination of both. When periods of incremental change are disrupted by periods of paradigmatic change the pattern is described as punctuated equilibrium

(Baumgartner and Jones, 1991). Change is often characterized as being incremental, abrupt or paradigmatic; however there is a certain degree of ambiguity that exists with respect to these terms.

Incrementalism in government decision making and policy change involves “a fragmented political process in which decision makers have limited knowledge, respond to political pressures, engage in limited successive comparisons, and make small tentative adjustments in existing policies. Incrementalism explains stability” (Wilson, 2000, p. 248). Policy stability has been similarly described by Howlett (2002). Wilson (2000) argued that although policy regime components (power, paradigm, organization, and policy) cultivate stability, policy regime change is possible when these components are significantly and abruptly altered, stressed or when alternatives emerge. Howlett (2002), however proposed that policy variation can be characterized by both the mode of change, i.e., incremental or paradigmatic, and the speed of change, i.e., rapid or slow. For example, although paradigmatic change is generally viewed as rapid change it could occur slowly as well (Howlett, 2002) and cumulative incremental change in the same direction could lead to paradigmatic change (Cashore and Howlett 2007; Howlett and Cashore, 2009).

Patterns of policy development have also been described as normal and atypical. Normal policy change has been identified as a common form of government policy development where policies change incrementally, which creates long-term stability and promotes the status quo (Howlett *et al.*, 2009). Atypical policy change, on the other hand, is associated

with significant deviations from the status quo, which are associated with the emergence of anomalous ideas and actors (Howlett *et al.*, 2009).

Endogenous sources of change arise from issues and knowledge that incite new ideas among existing actors, while exogenous sources are associated with a change in actors which is fostered by external disruptions that lead to significant deviations from the status quo. New actors can include societal actors who are involved in the external disruption or those who are affected by the subsequent changes. New actors can also include “policy specialists and interested parties” emerging from interconnected subsectors (Howlett *et al.*, 2009). Furthermore, combinations of exogenous and endogenous changes in policy goals, objectives and/or settings characterize paradigmatic change (Howlett and Cashore, 2009). For example, when changes occur in policy goals and exogenous forces are the cause then change is classified as paradigmatic (Hall 1988). However, this classic example of paradigmatic policy change identified by Hall was reconceptualized by Cashore and Howlett (2009). These authors classified four types of paradigmatic change which exemplified different combinations of exogenous or endogenous sources of change and transformation at different levels of policy development, i.e., issue identification to policy implementation. This means that paradigmatic change does not only occur when policy goals change in the face of exogenous pressures nor is incremental change only the result of endogenous shifts in ideas. Paradigmatic policy change can also occur when exogenous forces alter policy settings, even if policy objectives remain stable (quasi-homeostatic model of policy change), or when endogenous forces result in changes in policy instruments over time, thereby forcing policy objectives to change in order to

catch up (neo-homeostatic model of policy change). Paradigmatic change can also occur when objectives and settings are transformed endogenously because the policy goals are ambiguous enough to allow for this type of change. One final model of change, homeostatic, involves an exogenous source of change disrupting a stable pattern of incremental change and shifting the system to a new pattern of stable, incremental change. (Cashore and Howlett, 2007; Howlett and Cashore, 2009).

2.2.2 Policy change within the context of sustainable development and sustainable forest management

Wilson (2000) identified the clean air policy in the United States as an example of regime change and the emergence of a new policy paradigm. Based on his explanation of regime change (see discussion above), similar arguments can be made for sustainable development as an example of regime change. Corresponding with Wilson's (2000) work, one can identify exogenous sources of change associated with a new sustainable development/sustainable forest management policy paradigm. For example, the 1987 Brundtland Report can be viewed as an international event, i.e., external stressor/enabler, associated with sustainable development. Doern (1993, p. 174) argued that sustainable development's "main boost into the lexicon of public debate occurred when it became the central concept of the prestigious Brundtland Report of 1987". From this point on the concept of sustainable forest management emerged as a result of international events, specifically the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) and the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002 (Gulbrandsen, 2003; Schmithusen and Dubé 2007).

Regime change may have also occurred through a ‘spillover effect’. This spillover effect can be broken down into two parts to help identify how it is associated with sustainable development and sustainable forest management. The first part involves identifying changes in the state level regime that impact broad policy and policy regimes (Wilson, 2000). Gulbrandsen (2003) showed that this has occurred, and argued that “during the last decade, states have agreed on international instruments to promote sustainable forest management and protect biodiversity in all types of forests” (p. 95). The second part of this spillover effect holds that impacts can be uneven, producing significant change in one policy area and little change elsewhere (Wilson, 2000). Ballhorn’s (2005) work supports this. He argued that the forest sector has probably made the most progress with respect to sustainable development.

Despite the predominance of exogenous catalysts of change associated with sustainable development and sustainable forest management, there is not a consensus that regime change has occurred. In fact, sustainable development has been identified as “a latent paradigm seeking to become a fully fledged one” (Doern, 1993, p.174). Over a decade later, this view has not changed. Ballhorn (2005, p. 27) concluded that, “Canada has committed itself to working towards sustainable development and has taken action to incorporate it into domestic policy and law. However, sustainable development is only in its infancy as regards its application and still much more involved in the abstract than operationalized in practice, in policy or in law. When operationalized, as has been the case for forests, it has a potential to be transformative”.

2.2.3 Drivers of change: internationalization, globalization, politics and governance

The increasingly complex nature of governing has been attributed to the internationalization of issues (Tellier, 1989) and globalization (Skogstad, 2000). Skogstad (2000) presented two opposing arguments, both implicating globalization as a driver of change (p.811):

First, it is argued that the perceived sphere of action within which public authorities are able to act has narrowed as a result of the action of private economic actors (transnational corporations) and international institutions. Students of the international political economy couch this transformation in terms of a loss of national sovereignty or a decline of the nation state. Public policy analysts speak of a loss of state capacity as policy instruments are lost or rendered ineffective, and pressures for policy convergence mount. Second, economic globalization yields imperatives to be economically competitive, which reinforce pressures for a retrenched public sphere and alignment of policy instruments and outcomes with those in other countries. At the same time, and paradoxically, competitiveness imperatives may lead the state to expand into new activities.

Skogstad (2000) concluded that the public policy arena in Canada has been influenced by globalization (and regionalization), despite it being too early to identify the degree of the influence. In addition to globalization, Pal (2006) argued that shifting political culture and new ideas about governance and public management are interconnected drivers of change that have had implications for governance. Pal (2006) identified governance as both a driver of change and as being driven by change, which explains how interconnected both public policy and governance are and therefore how difficult they can be to differentiate (Pal, 2006).

When looking closely at the drivers of change identified by Pal (2006) it becomes apparent that these drivers evolved in the public policy arena in a way that allowed it to

become more inclusive of multiple actors where the state, i.e., government, is considered just one of the actors. For example, economic and cultural globalization means that markets, as well as communications and therefore cultures, are no longer bound by territorial borders. Pal (2006, p. 63) stated:

In short, the traditional association between public policymaking and the territorial boundaries of the nation-state has been severely challenged in the last decade. Both the source of policy problems and their potential solutions now lie as much outside the boundaries of the state as they do within. This is not to say that states are irrelevant or that they cannot tackle major policy issues. The nation-state will remain as a fundamental organizing unit for contemporary industrialized societies, but the sort of control and dominance that they once enjoyed both over the policy process and the intellectual resources required to analyze it is waning. The ways in which policy problems are defined will change, as will the range of instruments and strategies to deal with them.

Another source of change identified by Pal (2006) is the “politics of difference”. This source of change includes an emphasis on improving democratic processes and the ways societal members are involved and can participate. According to Pal (2006), the politics of difference also recognizes people’s rights and their uniqueness, particularly indigenous peoples and women who previously had limited to no rights. The lack of recognition for these minority groups along with an absence of rights held by these groups has contributed to a diminished sense of trust and confidence in institutions and the actors that support them (Pal, 2006). Pal (2006) identified this change as a ‘decline in deference’. The final driver of change identified by Pal (2006) is governance and public management in the mode of new public management (NPM). NPM is a “focus on performance appraisal and efficiency; disaggregating and decentralizing public bureaucracies; the use of market mechanisms and of contracting out to foster competition; financial management; partnerships” (Pal, 2006 p. 88). Pal (2006, p. 86) concluded that “governing is about making choices, and choices are still very much available despite the

inevitability of these forces... The changed context for policymaking does not mean the end of choices, simply different constraints, and different choices within those constraints”.

2.3 Manitoba’s forest landscape, forest industry and a brief history of natural resource governance

2.3.1 Manitoba’s forested landscape

Manitoba is referred to as a “prairie province”, yet the majority of the province rests on Precambrian shield (Welsted *et al.*, 1996), which formed between 2.6 to 1.7 billion years ago (Bannatyne and Teller, 1984), and approximately two thirds (347, 710.19 hectares) of the province’s total land area is made up of forested land (Natural Resources Canada, 2011). The geological history of Manitoba dates back 3.5 billion years; however the province’s current landscape was largely shaped by the retreat of the most recent Wisconsinan ice sheet, approximately 11,000 to 7,500 years ago (Corkery, 1996). The landscape has been classified into six ecozones, 16 ecoregions and 93 ecodistricts (Smith *et al.*, 1998). This classification system breaks the landscape into clusters of similar characteristics with ecozones being the broadest category, followed by ecoregions and then ecodistricts. The six Ecozones in Manitoba are the Southern Arctic Ecozone, the Taiga Shield Ecozone, the Boreal Shield Ecozone, the Boreal Plain Ecozone, the Prairies Ecozone and the Hudson Plain Ecozone (Smith *et al.*, 1998). In Manitoba, forestry activity occurs in most of these ecozones, however industrial forestry is predominant in the Boreal Shield and the Boreal Plain Ecozones. There is also some forestry activity occurring in the Prairies Ecozone, however this area is largely dominated by agricultural activity. Of the three most northern ecozones, the Southern Arctic

Ecozone, the Taiga Shield Ecozone, and the Hudson Plain Ecozone, forestry only occurs in the southern parts of the Taiga Shield Ecozone. Subsistence hunting and trapping, recreation, hydro development and mining exploration are more dominant activities in northern Manitoba (Smith *et al.*, 1998).

Furthermore, the forest land is divided amongst three forest zones; the boreal forest, the broadleaf/mixedwood forest, and small broadleaf forest (Manitoba Conservation, 2011). The boreal forest or northern coniferous forest is the largest forest zone and, accordingly, it supports the bulk of the forest industry in the province (Manitoba Conservation, 2011). The broadleaf/mixedwood forest or aspen parkland supports several small forest operations, and contains some of the most productive forests in the province (Manitoba Conservation, 2011). The small broadleaf forest stands are mainly managed privately as woodlots (Manitoba Conservation, 2011).

The province ranks fifth in Canada in terms of total forest area (26.3 million ha) and merchantable volume of timber (Manitoba Conservation, 2001). Nearly two thirds (36 million ha) of the province's total land area consists of forests and other wooded land (Natural Resources Canada, 2007). Approximately 95% percent of the forest and other wooded land is under provincial jurisdiction, while the federal government has authority over 2% and private ownership accounts for the remainder (3%) (Natural Resources Canada, 2011). The province of Manitoba allocates harvesting rights to forestry companies largely through long-term, area-based, license agreements called Forest Management Licenses (FMLs). According to Manitoba Conservation (2011), FMLs

cover almost half (12.2 million ha) of Manitoba's total forest and wooded land area and 82% of the province's Crown timber is harvested by FML holders. Forest resources are also allocated through volume-based licenses, called Timber Sale Agreements. These licenses are mainly held by Quota Holders who harvest approximately 15% of the province's Crown timber. The remaining 3% of Crown timber harvested is for firewood, which is allocated through public timber sales auctions (Manitoba Conservation, 2011).

2.3.2 Manitoba's forest industry

Like many Canadian provinces, Manitoba's economy and culture are influenced and shaped by the predominance of boreal forest landscape and the forest sector. There are three FML holders in Manitoba: Tembec (FML 01), Tolko Industries Ltd. (FML 02) and Louisiana-Pacific Canada Ltd. (FML 03). Tembec (FML 01) permanently closed its newsprint mill in September 2010 (Tembec, 2010) and the other two FML holders, Tolko Industries Ltd. (FML 02) and Louisiana-Pacific Canada Ltd. (FML 03) had periodically reduced operating capacity in 2008 and 2009. The closure of the Tembec mill was attributed to a combination of a decline in the newsprint market and the cost structure of the mill (Tembec, 2010). Similar factors resulted in a reduced operating capacity at Tolko Manitoba in The Pas. For example, Tolko Manitoba (2009) identified low housing starts, high Canadian dollar, and a provincial penalty associated with export quotas and duties as contributing factors associated with an already declining economy that forced the company to reduce their operating capacity.

In 2006, the forest sector generated 7,500 direct jobs, and realized revenue of \$14 billion dollars in 2005 from total manufactured forest goods. The wood product manufacturing

industry generated 53 percent of this revenue, the paper product manufacturing industry generated 37 percent and the logging industry generated the remaining 10 percent (Natural Resources Canada, 2007). Economic opportunities associated with forestry have more recently been explored for the potential benefits they may provide for Aboriginal and northern communities. This is a growing area of interest especially in Manitoba where 13.6 percent of the population (150,000 people) is Aboriginal. This is the third largest population of Aboriginal people in Canada (Government of Manitoba 2007a, 2007b) and the predominant population base of Manitoba's forest communities (Manitoba Conservation, 2011). Despite their large presence in forest communities, Aboriginal people are under-represented in Manitoba's forest economy (Manitoba Conservation, 2006). However, the provincial government has acknowledged a connection between Aboriginal people and the forests and a corresponding need to increase involvement and collaborative efforts with Aboriginal people. Involvement opportunities that have been explored have involved non-timber forest products, special timber allocations and co-management opportunities (Government of Manitoba, 2006).

In addition to economic benefits, forests provide Manitobans with cultural, spiritual and recreational opportunities as well. Recent efforts have been made to protect culturally important wildlife species (Pine Marten and Boreal Woodland Caribou), work with First Nations to protect significant areas of the boreal forest (East Side of Lake Winnipeg nomination for UNESCO World Heritage site) and address a continually increasing demand for campsites, cottage lots and hunting opportunities (Government of Manitoba, 2005).

2.3.3 A brief history: European settlement in Manitoba, the formation of the province and governing natural resources

Human occupancy of the land in Manitoba dates back to the end of the last period of glaciation, approximately 12,000 years ago (Pettipas, 1984). Colonization from southern and western directions first occurred in the western portion of Manitoba due to the presence of glacial Lake Agassiz, until approximately 7,000 years ago when all glacial ice melted and the lake drained into the Hudson Bay (Teller, 1984). Southern Manitoba was colonized from the north and the west in approximately 2,500 B.C. and the province was further colonized from the east approximately 200 B.C. to A.D. 1650 (Nicholson, 1996). Archaeological evidence, i.e., projectile points and ceramics, suggests that prehistoric cultures occupied parts of Manitoba from approximately A.D. 100 (Nicholson, 1996). Following the presence of prehistoric cultures the main occupants of Manitoba, from approximately A.D. 1500 to 1850, were the Assiniboine, Cree and Ojibwa people (Nicholson, 1996).

Beginning in the early 1600s English explorers sailed into the Hudson Bay (Morton, 1967) and Captain Thomas Button, was recognized as the first European to stand on Manitoba soil (Beresford, 1953) in the winter of 1612 to 1613 (Morton, 1967). French explorers Médard Chouart des Groseilliers and Pierre-Esprit Radisson were vital to the development of England's fur trade interests through Hudson Bay. In 1670, the Hudson Bay Company was created and the company was given exclusive trading rights on all land draining into the Hudson Bay (aka Rupert's Land, including the area that would later become Manitoba) (Whitcomb, 1982). Despite access to this vast area, the Company

carried out much of its trading activity in the area known today as James Bay because “there they could compete most effectively with their French rivals on the St. Lawrence” (Morton, 1967, p. 13). French and English explorers and fur traders competed to control the Hudson Bay and the coastal fur trade until the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713, when France ceded these interests to Great Britain (Whitcomb, 1982, p. 2). This treaty indirectly prompted the French explorer Pierre Gaultier de Varennes, Sieur de la Vérendrye (referred to as La Vérendrye) to further develop the fur trade west into the Winnipeg basin and also to discover the “western sea” (Morton, 1967, p. 26). La Vérendrye was responsible for advancing French exploration, protecting the best route to the western sea and intensifying competition between the French and English fur trade due to a strategic series of fur trading forts he established from Lake Superior through to the Red River and Dauphin during the 1730s and 1740s (Friesen, 1984; Morton, 1967; Whitecomb, 1982).

Competition between the French and English was a reoccurring theme in North American history and this was true in the history of the fur trade as well. Although the French held control of a number of fur trading posts by 1760, these were eventually deserted because the traders were called to the defense of New France (Morton, 1967). In 1759, France was defeated in the battle on the Plains of Abraham and the entire Colony of New France was acquired by Great Britain through the Treaty of Paris, 1763. Included as a part of this colony was the territory now known as the provinces of Ontario and Québec (Hogg, 2006). After Britain’s victory, control over the fur trade switched in favour of the English; however this was brief as the Montréal fur traders re-emerged with support from Anglo-American, British and French investors (Friesen, 1984). The “French-Nor-Wester

system” prospered from the high level of integration the French fur traders developed with Aboriginal people; something the British had not developed as fully, at least initially (Friesen, 1984). The success of trade networks developed by these Montreal fur traders led to the creation of the North West Company (NWC) in 1783-84 (Friesen, 1984). The NWC and the HBC were rival fur trading companies whose violent competitiveness finally came to a close in 1820 when the NWC and the HBC were united (Morton, 1967) as a new HBC, which had both administrative and financial stability from being a chartered company and “the field experience and flexibility of the Nor-Westerners” (Friesen, 1984, pp. 83-84).

The union of these two companies stimulated permanent settlement in the Red River area because, as Jackson (1970, p. 83) described, this area was “the center of the buffalo hunt for both of the great trading companies at the beginning of the nineteenth century and remained the focus for the united companies until after the creation of Manitoba as a province of Canada in 1870.” However, part of the stimulus for uniting these two companies was to restore order to the fur trade and the Red River Settlement. According to Friesen (1984, p. 83), “...the financial and personnel problems of the North West Company, the inadequacy of Canadian law and administration, the violence within the western interior, and the injury to the interests of both investors and Indians precipitated British government support for a compromise agreement.” The prevalence of violence prior to this union was largely due to the competition that existed between the HBC and the NWC fur trade, however unrest also stemmed from an alliance the NWC made with Métis (descendants of French fur traders and Aboriginal women) to protect land they

occupied from being permanently settled by new European settlers. According to Friesen (1984, p. 82), “the British Colonial Office was equally dismayed by the continual outbreaks of violence and the welter of legal disputes” involving new settlers and the two companies.

The amalgamation of the two major fur trading companies was not the only important outcome of this period of unrest; another would indirectly set the stage for the creation of the Province of Manitoba. The Métis conviction that “they had an identity separate from both the Europeans and the Indians” and “their political interests would henceforth be defined as the right to run buffalo and to live freely according to the custom of the country” emerged from this instability (Friesen, 1984, p.80). This fervor of the Métis to protect their culture and rights to the land they occupied continued and played a role in the development of the Province of Manitoba.

However, before the province of Manitoba was created the Dominion of Canada was established. This new Dominion of the United Kingdom parliament began when New France was acquired by Britain as previously discussed. Through the Constitution, 1791, the colony of Québec was separated into two provinces, Upper and Lower Canada, which were dominated by English-speaking and French-speaking people respectively (Hogg, 2006). In 1840, these two provinces were rejoined through the Union Act, 1840 to form the province of Canada, which would later be joined with the province of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to form the Dominion of Canada through the British North America Act (BNA Act), 1867 (later renamed the Constitution Act, 1867). As a part of the BNA

Act, 1867 (section 146), an allowance was made for the territory of Rupert's Land to become a part of the Dominion of Canada. This opportunity eventually led to the creation of the province of Manitoba, first as a federal territory in accordance with s. 146 and then as a province through a federal statute (Hogg, 2006).

Part of the impetus for the creation of Manitoba stemmed from the interests of Métis people who remained committed to protecting their culture and land rights since the Battle of Seven Oaks 1816, which was a result of the longstanding conflict between the HBC and the NWC. Louis Riel (1844-1885) was an educated Métis whose upbringing and familial influence provided him with experience to lead the Métis people to protect their rights, land and culture against the new Dominion of Canada. Riel's battle began when he stopped the new Dominion of Canada from conducting a survey of his people's land and ended with Riel gaining provincial status for the area of Rupert's Land, which formed the province of Manitoba in 1870 (Jackson, 1970; Whitcomb, 1982).

Although Manitoba was recognized as a province after 1870, the rights to its Crown land and natural resources remained with the Dominion of Canada, which was intent on creating a railway linking the east to British Columbia (Jackson, 1970). This applied in Saskatchewan and Alberta as well; however all other provinces gained control of their natural resources when they became provinces within the Dominion of Canada. In fact, the division of powers between the provinces and the Dominion of Canada was established through the BNA Act, 1867 (which, as noted above, was later renamed the Constitution Act, 1867). Part VI of the Constitution Act, 1867 outlined the distribution of

legislative powers; s. 91 granted certain powers to Parliament and s. 92 granted certain powers to the provincial legislatures (Hogg, 2006). Part VII, s. 109 described provincial land and resources tenure rights (Hessing *et al.*, 2005).

Through the Natural Resources Transfer Act, 1930, which was passed by both Manitoba and Canada and ratified by the British Parliament in the BNA Act, 1930 (later renamed the Constitution Act, 1930), authority over natural resources were transferred from the Dominion of Canada to the province of Manitoba (Saskatchewan and Alberta went through similar negotiations and legislative processes.) (Jackson, 1930; Stevenson and Webb, 2003).

In 1982, another important change respecting constitutional authority over natural resources and the environment occurred when Canada embarked on major constitutional reform. Provincial powers over natural resources were increased when section 92A Non-Renewable Natural Resources, Forestry Resources and Electrical Energy was established in the Constitution Act, 1982 (Hessing *et al.*, 2005; Hogg, 2006). Hessing *et al.*, (2005, pp. 62-63) summarized the main constitutional changes brought about by section 92A and these changes included an increase in provincial powers over natural resources. However, this was not the only important outcome of the Constitution Act, 1982. Hogg (2006, p. 69) identified five others;

...the adoption of domestic amending procedures (ss. 38-49), a Charter of Rights was adopted (ss. 1-34), aboriginal rights were recognized (s. 35), equalization was guaranteed (s. 36)... and the Constitution of Canada was defined and given supremacy over other laws (s. 52).

Hogg (2006, p. 69) also recognized a major shortcoming of the Constitutional Act, 1982, which he stated “failed to accomplish one of the goals of constitutional reform, and that was the better accommodation of Québec within the Canadian federation.” Attempts to ‘better accommodate’ Québec since this time have either failed (Meech Lake and Charlottetown Accord) or were weak, i.e., lacked constitutional support (“resolution to recognize Québec as a “distinct society” and a regional veto statute”) and therefore the issue has essentially remained unresolved (Hogg, 2006, p. 72).

Another issue that has not yet been resolved and also intensified as a result of the Constitution Act, 1982 is that of Aboriginal rights and title as discussed below.

2.3.3.1 Constitutional recognition and protection of Aboriginal rights in Canada

Through the Constitution Act, 1982, existing Aboriginal and treaty rights were acknowledged. Prior to 1982, Aboriginal interest in the land from before European settlement had been recognized through two court cases, i.e., the *Calder* case in 1973 and *Guerin v. The Queen* in 1984, and these rights were not constitutionally protected. However, these court cases did have an impact, specifically the *Calder* case, 1973 because it led to a modern day treaty process, i.e., land claim settlements (Hogg, 2006). Subsequent to the Constitution Act, 1982 further court cases have attempted to clarify s. 35 and what it means by “existing Aboriginal and treaty rights”.

The foundation of constitutionally protected Aboriginal rights, as described by Hogg, (2006; 2009), involved four key court cases. The first case is *R. v. Sparrow*, 1990, followed by *R. v. Van der Peet*, 1996 and *R. v. Powley*, 2003 and finally *Delgamuukw v.*

British Columbia, 1997. The *Sparrow* case, 1990 confirmed s. 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982, which solidified constitutional protection of Aboriginal rights. This case confirmed that Aboriginal rights extinguished before 1982 were not protected through s. 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982, although in situations where arrangements were unclear, constitutional protection would apply. Through this case it was also determined that where uncertainty existed, with respect to treaties and other arrangements, rulings should be made in favor of Aboriginal people in order to honour the fiduciary relationship that the government is required to uphold (Hogg, 2006).

The *Sparrow* case 1990 was followed by the *Van der Peet* 1996 and *Powley* 2003 cases. These cases were important because they clarified the time period of “existing” Aboriginal and Métis rights, respectively. In other words, activities carried out by Aboriginal people prior to the arrival of Europeans defined Aboriginal rights, whereas Métis rights were defined by the activities carried out prior to European control (Hogg, 2006). Additionally, the *Delgamuukw* 1997 case defined Aboriginal title, which is recognized as existing since the time of European sovereignty. Although Aboriginal rights and title are defined according to European arrival or European sovereignty, they are also different because the former refers to Aboriginal activity rights, while the later refers to Aboriginal occupancy rights (Hunter, 2009). The *Delgamuukw* case was also critical because it acknowledged and sanctioned the use of Aboriginal oral history as evidence for both declaring and resolving issues of Aboriginal titles and rights (Hogg, 2009).

One final but crucial consideration acknowledged by Hogg (2009) about the constitutional basis of Aboriginal Rights is the duty to consult and accommodate, which was the result of the *Haida Nation v. British Columbia*, 2004. Through this ruling the Crown is required to consult with Aboriginal people in cases where questions of Aboriginal rights, Aboriginal title or land claims exist but where decisions have not yet been made. The *Haida*, 2004 case along with s. 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982 provide a level of protection in cases where development or activity could pose a threat to an Aboriginal interest where a final decision about that interest is pending.

3 Methodology

3.1 Research approach and design

The approach used in the study was qualitative, founded on a combined interpretivist and constructionist perspective. The work focused on key policy actors, i.e., people and organizations involved in influencing, making decisions about, or developing forest policies in Manitoba. The research design was both extensive, i.e., involving diverse actors from several regions of the province, and intensive, including a regional Stakeholder Advisory Committee working with one of the FML holders in the province.

3.1.1 Philosophical assumptions

Two differing, though connected, approaches were adopted to guide this work. The first was Creswell's (2003) research design framework which is a sequential process for conducting research. Through this process philosophical assumptions supporting the research approach (qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods) were identified along with the strategies of inquiry, data collection methods and data analysis techniques that

would be used. The second approach was Nelson's (1991) interactive, adaptive approach, which allowed for a degree of flexibility to be incorporated into the work. Nelson (1991) argued that the reality of graduate research is that it is a process that rarely follows in sequential steps and therefore opportunities to learn and change as the research progresses should be built into the process. This capacity is built in by allowing the researcher to continually acknowledge and include diverse values and then adapt the research accordingly (Nelson, 1991).

In addition to the two broad approaches mentioned above, this qualitative research was guided by two philosophical assumptions. The first, an epistemological position known as interpretivism, asserts that it is impossible for a researcher to separate herself-himself from her-his research subject, and an implication of this is that social science questions are best addressed through transactional (or dialogical) methods (Bryman and Teevan, 2005). The second assumption is an ontological one called constructivism or constructionism. Constructivists hold that social phenomena are constructed by social actors based on their social encounters and interactions (Bryman and Teevan, 2005). In other words, every interpretation of the same account will vary according to each person, (including researchers) because each person creates their own reality based on their perceptions of the world they have encountered (Bryman and Teevan, 2005).

3.2 Data collection

3.2.1 Qualitative document analysis

In this project data were collected from both documents and interviews. The document review was guided by a technique called qualitative content analysis, which is a

technique used to discover the underlying themes of a chosen document set without defining categories prior to examination (Bryman and Teevan, 2005). This approach allows categories to emerge and prevents important themes from being overlooked (Bryman and Teevan, 2005). The document collection included Manitoba statutes and regulations related to forestry activities. The Forest Act from 1930 to present was the main statute in this collection. Annual reports on forestry from the 1930s to present were also included in the collection. All statutes, regulations and annual reports were found in Manitoba's Legislative Library. These documents were reviewed first to gain insight into activities and policies through time. They were then reviewed along with Manitoba Natural Resources and Manitoba Conservation policy documents from the 1980s to present. Through the document collection an evolution of major themes was extracted. The results were focused on changes since the 1980s because during this decade The Constitution 1982 was assented to in Canada and sustainable development was introduced internationally.

3.2.2 Semi-directed interviews

The semi-directed interviews conducted for this research were categorized according to a main set of interviews and a stakeholder advisory committee. An interview guide was employed as a tool to lead the participant in a conversation that directly addressed the project objectives. According to Rubin and Rubin (2005, p. 4), "qualitative interviews are conversations in which a researcher gently guides a conversational partner in an extended discussion." In the interviews the tone was less conversational largely because I directed the interview by asking questions to which the interview participants responded. However, there were cases where participants offered extended and encompassing

responses and clarified responses upon request, which gave the interview a more conversational feeling. I made efforts to cultivate a conversational tone by being familiar enough with the questions so that they were not read directly from the interview guide, which is thought to make the participant feel comfortable enough to provide the best information that they could.

A conversational approach to interviewing whereby researchers follow up on responses is thought to be advantageous because more detailed information can be obtained thereby improving the quality of the data (Rubin and Rubin, 2005). Furthermore, qualitative interviews are intended to allow participants enough flexibility to prevent them from feeling restricted or disempowered. In addition, thoroughness and accuracy are attained by using the most appropriate manner to address relevant information. In other words, the clearest explanation of the evolution of Manitoba's forest policy regime was obtained through the variation and nuance in participants' responses to interview questions. Following leads, addressing discrepancies and missing information, and asking questions that do not lead the participant to provide a specific response are viewed as ways for researchers to attain thorough and accurate data. In this project, there were cases where leads were not recognized and therefore were not pursued, which may have limited the data and this shortcoming was due in part to my inexperience as an interviewer but also due to the lengthy nature of these interviews. However, research validity was not unduly compromised because the length of the interviews tended to generate a sufficient amount of accurate information.

3.3 The interview guide

An interview guide (Appendix A) is a series of logically organized, open-ended questions and the one employed in this project was based on an interview guide developed in collaboration with Dr. Guy Chiasson and his research team. This guide was developed for the larger collaborative project, of which this study was a part. The interview guide was evaluated to ensure that it could be used to meet the objectives of this study. Although I determined that the questions were logically organized, I did not always ask them in the same order. In some cases question order was not maintained due to the length of the interviews. There were also cases where not all questions were asked, i.e., where participants signaled they did not have enough time for the entire interview or participants provided lengthy responses to other questions. In situations where participants provided detailed responses they often covered relevant information or they provided unique information that may not have been provided had every question been asked. Interview participants were not interrupted while they responded to questions as this did not seem like an appropriate way to cultivate the conversational tone sought after in these interviews. According to a constructivist philosophy, maintaining question order is important because the quality of qualitative data can be influenced by the variation between interviews and the order questions were asked. In this case, the objective was to explain the evolution of Manitoba's forest policy regime, which involved understanding the different roles of actors, their inter-relationships and long-term institutional arrangements that influence forest policy decision making. From an interpretivist perspective the best way to achieve this objective is to allow the interview to flow in a way that allows the participant to answer the questions in a way that allows him/her to

provide the best information. This information is achieved by allowing participants room to provide information the way they want to provide it and not restricting them to providing information the interview wants.

The use of open-ended questions also allowed participants to interpret and respond to questions the way they wanted because there were no predetermined responses. This approach is thought to improve data quality because responses provide depth, detail and nuance that would be missing from predetermined responses. Responses to the open-ended questions asked in these interviews provide a clear picture of the evolution of Manitoba's forest policy regime, particularly with respect to the relationships between actors and the roles that actors play.

Despite the variation and nuance that was attained through open-ended questions, there was also a degree of redundancy in responses, particularly with respect to questions about major forms of forest tenure in Manitoba. This suggests that some questions could have been addressed by conducting a survey/questionnaire with predetermined responses prior to the interview. The use of both a survey and an interview may have allowed more time for follow-up questions and provided an opportunity for some quantitative data to be collected. A mixed methods approach, i.e., an approach that incorporates both qualitative and quantitative approaches, was considered. However, it was ruled out because the main project protocol was to contact the interview participant only once. Within these parameters, building rapport (discussed below) with interview participants through open-

ended questions that allowed for conversations to transpire was thought to be an appropriate way to yield the best information possible.

3.3.1 Main questions

The interview guide was organized according to two sets of questions, main questions and probing questions, which according to Rubin and Rubin (2005) are the two components that define an interview. The main questions provided the interview participant with an opportunity to interpret and respond to the questions as they wished, while also providing information that addressed the research questions. These questions required the interview participant to provide a more detailed answer rather than a simple yes or no reply, although this did occasionally occur. Finally, the main questions were not intended to elicit opinions, but perceptions. Opinion questions can lead the interviewee to respond in specific ways throughout the interview, which may bias the results (Rubin and Rubin 2005).

3.3.2 Probing questions

In some cases main questions were not specific enough to elicit a detailed response. Sometimes the interviewee did not understand the question, but rather they perceived it differently than intended or they did not realize the depth of response that was being sought. In these cases probing questions were used. Probing questions help the interview participant to provide information if they were having difficulty doing so: “probes help you manage the conversation by regulating the length of answers and degree of detail, clarifying unclear sentences or phrases, filling in missing steps, and keeping the conversation on topic” (Rubin and Rubin, 2005, p.164). Probing questions differ from

prompting questions, which “should be used only as a last resort” (Bryman and Teevan, 2005, p.78). Prompting questions, if they are used, involve suggesting an answer to the respondent and therefore require the same prompt be used for all interviewees (Bryman and Teevan, 2005).

3.3.3 Follow-up questions

Follow-up questions are used to expand upon a response that the interviewee provides. These questions help a researcher access more detailed information and they allow interviewees an opportunity to help shape the research through the answers they provide. Interviewees may also identify topics that the researcher may have overlooked or been unaware of. The key to preparing follow-up questions during an interview is to listen carefully as oversimplifications, new ideas, stories or missing information may all be opportunities to inquire (Rubin and Rubin, 2005).

Generally all of the questions on the interview guide should be asked, but there is freedom for the participant to guide the research through their response. In this project, there were instances where participants responded to questions through responses to other questions. In other cases, not all of the questions were asked because participants offered an extended response that addressed the research questions but further emphasized information and perspectives that were important to them. In these cases, I felt participants brought forward information that they would not have if questions were asked in a specific manner. The flexibility allowed diverse views to be presented.

3.3.4 Question clarity

The language used in the interview questions was relevant, general and understandable (Bryman and Teevan, 2005), e.g., “please tell me about the evolution of forest policies in Manitoba”. However, the questions about policies were at times unclear for participants and a few asked for further clarification. This mainly occurred when participants wanted clarification in definitions of policy. The participants were told it was up to them to define what policies meant in order to allow them to provide a fuller perspective. It turned out policy was a somewhat vague term and was used to refer to policies that were enforceable, voluntary, government or industry developed or all of the above. Variation also existed in the question about traditional knowledge. Bias existed partially because this question was placed within the question set about the role of Aboriginal actors. Also there were a few interviews where I first asked participants if they were familiar with the term traditional knowledge before asking them about its role or place in forest policies. In some cases I tried to explain what this term could mean by providing an anecdotal comparison of the knowledge held by a hunter and a university student. A standard definition to explain this term in every interview would have reduced the bias that the anecdotal comparison may have added (see prompting questions below). Despite this bias there was a consensus among most participants that traditional knowledge or local knowledge however it was understood or defined had a role to play in forest policies.

3.4 Interview participants

Research quality is enhanced when the application of results extend beyond the scope of the research (building and testing theory). Research quality is also improved by involving experienced (first hand experience or directly involved) and knowledgeable (well

informed) participants who represent a variety of perspectives (contradictory, overlapping, and nuanced) (Rubin and Rubin, 2005). Incorporating multiple perspectives, especially conflicting ones, is called disconfirming evidence and it is viewed as a measure to ensure accuracy and address threats to research quality (Creswell and Miller, 2000). Involving a diverse group of participants who held different and diverging perspectives are also viewed as a way to triangulate the data (and thereby maintain research credibility) because doing so allows the researcher to better identify common and consistent themes.

Background research was conducted to determine that the participants were suitable, i.e., had knowledge of or experience with forestry and/or forest policy in Manitoba. Actor groups were chosen based on public policy and governance literature and they were experienced, knowledgeable and well informed. As well, they represented a variety of perspectives that were contradictory, overlapping and nuanced. There were cases where participants felt they could not respond to all the questions due to their area of expertise, but they all had valuable information to provide, and a level of redundancy as well as uniqueness was found in every interview. As the scope of this project is so broad, it was unreasonable to expect participants to be knowledgeable or directly involved in all components of forest policy. However, this variation in knowledge or areas of expertise provided diverse perspectives. It should also be noted that there were cases where the chosen participant was unavailable to participate and another was chosen as a replacement. A participant chosen to represent Métis actors was inaccessible and a replacement was not sought due to time constraints and the number of interviews that were already being conducted. Furthermore, the range of participants may be seen as

favouring government and industry representatives more than activist groups, however the total number of industry and government participants was 12. These two actor groups have traditionally been the predominant actors in Canada's forest policy regime. The other actor groups are considered to be more contemporary actors even if there is debate about the degree of their involvement. In this project, the number of actors outside of the provincial government and the forest industry totaled 17. Due to the complex nature of actor groups and their interrelationships this division among traditional and contemporary actors was a way to include a diverse range of participants. However, this division may have resulted in underrepresentation of individual actor groups, which could be rectified by conducting more interviews.

Semi-directed interviews were conducted with 29 participants identified as key actors in Manitoba's forest policy regime, i.e., people from organizations playing a role in influencing, making decisions about, or developing forest policies (Table 3.1). These participants were divided almost equally among urban and rural representatives and all participants, except for one were Manitoba residents. The Stakeholder Advisory Committee included one representative from each of the provincial government, industry, an Aboriginal organization, an ENGO, along with three participants representing different recreational interests and one representing broad scale land use management. Five participants were female and four of them were a part of the main interview set. Participants' confidentiality and freedom to participate was emphasized to reduce the possibility and incentive for providing false information (Bryman and Teevan, 2005). As a part of ensuring confidentiality names of organizations were not included even though

Table 3.1: The number of interview participants and the actor group they represented

Interview set	Actor group	Number	Participants interviewed
Main Group	Provincial government (2 departments, 4 branches)	4	
	Forest industry	6	
	Aboriginal organizations	2	
	Federal government	1	
	Environmental non-government organization (ENGO)	2	
	Non-government organization (NGO)	2	
	Academics/educators	3	
	Private land holder	1	
Stakeholder Group	Provincial government	1	
	Forest industry	1	
	Aboriginal organization	1	
	ENGO	1	
	NGO	1	
	Recreational interest groups	3	
Total		29	

actor groups were coded and these codes were maintained in the results to enhance researcher transparency. Due to the small and close nature of Manitoba’s forest policy regime the names of organizations may have led to a breach of confidentiality.

Believability, also thought to enhance research quality by increasing confidence in the results, was sought by choosing the appropriate participants who provide true and informed responses. To ensure believability, participants were informed that they were not under any obligation to participate, which helped assure the participants that there was no reason to provide false information. Believability was increased by: 1) asking interviewees only about information they knew about and were willing to discuss; 2) ensuring information was first hand; and 3) asking selected redundant questions of the same interviewee as a way to verify responses, but also asking a few redundant questions to different interviewees as a way to verify the reliability of the interview (Rubin and Rubin, 2005).

3.5 Researcher bias

To help ensure that quality data were collected, I followed an interview model developed by Rubin and Rubin (2005) called the Responsive Interviewing Model. Through this qualitative research process and in conjunction with the requirements of the University of Manitoba Ethics Review Board I had an obligation to protect participants from harm, which was partially achieved by asking broad questions (see the above description of open ended questions) and by being aware of my own ideas, opinions and beliefs in order to ensure that I did not impose these upon the participants (Bryman and Teevan, 2005). Although I did not impose my views, except perhaps in the definition of traditional knowledge, a level of influence likely existed due simply due to my presence. However, this level of influence is difficult for any interviewer to avoid. The final requirement of the Responsive Interviewing Model that was incorporated was a flexible and adaptive design (see the section on Nelson's (1991) interactive, adaptive approach). According to this approach, careful listening is required to ensure the participant is heard correctly and to avoid hearing what is expected or hoped for. Careful listening allowed me to learn and then adapt the interview as necessary, although this took some practice. In transcribing I found a number of questions were overlooked, however the same question was not consistently overlooked. As previously discussed, this occurred in some cases because answers were provided in previous questions and in others they were overlooked. Questions were often overlooked because the interviews were long. I generally felt tired after the interviews and I sensed interview participants felt this way as well. At the end of one interview a participant said "I'm going to go sit quietly at my desk" (G313). I asked another participant if they had anything else to add to which the response was "No I think

that's it. You've picked my brain completely (I36). This occurred despite efforts I took to avoid interview exhaustion. For example, I was well rested and prepared, I limited interviews to one per day (in most cases) and I kept notes during interviews to remain alert.

One of the benefits of using qualitative interviewing as a strategy of inquiry was that I was able to directly engage participants by developing rapport with them, which is thought to elicit more detail. However, rapport development required some effort and skill and is not guaranteed through the interview process. To build rapport with the people letters were sent (by mail or email) introducing the project and asking them to participate (see the introductory letter, attached as Appendix B). All appointments were confirmed with participants and interviews were conducted at their home or office (unless they preferred otherwise). I was punctual and cordial to all participants and required every participant to review and sign the interview consent letter (Appendix C) in my presence. The use of an audio recording device (to be discussed later) was confirmed and most participants permitted the use of this tool. In retrospect, I felt good rapport was developed with all participants; however there were interview participants that seemed nervous. One participant specifically told me after the interview that he would have said more if I had not used the audio recorder. This occurred even though this participant permitted its use. Other participants chose not to respond to certain questions by claiming they had inadequate knowledge to respond. I felt participants' avoided these questions due to their political nature, a perceived lack of confidentiality or they misinterpreted what was being asked.

In reviewing the transcripts my bias also became apparent in other ways. For example, I was least flexible with participants who were interviewed first which can be attributed to lack of comfort and experience. There were situations where I did not request more detail because I was unsure how to ask or I felt the participant did not want to be questioned further. Another place where researcher bias existed was in interviews with Aboriginal and female participants. The interview guide was followed the least during these interviews. Although these were conducted after I had gained some experience I felt it was important to refrain from restricting these interviews as much as possible to ensure that I let these participants' greatest concerns emerge without intervening. This is based on an assumption of cultural pluralism that "insists that equality can be achieved only by treating people on the basis of their group affiliation and in some cases treating them according to different rules" (Pal, 2006, p. 67).

Although researcher bias had a presence in this research project I tried to be mindful of personal assumptions, beliefs and biases and then disclose these as best I can (researcher reflexivity). Despite these efforts, the research was validated further by having participants verify their transcribed interviews to ensure their intended meaning was conveyed. This is called member checking and Rubin and Rubin (2005) argued that accuracy is achieved through precise representation of the interviewee's narrative.

Another way to ensure that research validity was maintained, despite biases that influenced the research, was by providing an audit trail. An audit trail is a record of

research activities and decisions (Rubin and Rubin, 2005). Although records were kept they were not included in the appendices as the details are onerous and all necessary information for replication is present. However, some of my personal reflections on experiences that have influenced me and serve as a source of researcher bias were included (Appendix D). Yet another way to ensure validity is through peer review. In this case the project advisors and committee members reviewed all work within the scope of this project.

Finally, research validity could also have been increased through pretests and pilot studies (Creswell and Miller, 2000). These were not conducted here but initial interviews were conducted with people with whom I was acquainted. This was to reduce feelings of nervousness because I knew these participants were knowledgeable on the subject and were not skeptical of my intentions. There were also too few interviews to be able to conduct pretests and pilot studies.

3.6 Replicating research

Results are credible when they can be replicated. Including research participants who were well informed, knowledgeable and provided a variety of perspectives was important for maintenance of credible research because it helped to ensure that the data collected could extend beyond the realm of this research project (Rubin and Rubin, 2005).

Research quality was also enhanced through transferability, i.e., the extent to which research findings apply to other contexts. This project could be compared with investigations done in other forest policy regimes in Canadian provinces and elsewhere.

Additionally, this work could transfer to other environmental resource management contexts and public policy arenas.

Moreover, research findings that are consistent over time are considered to be dependable, which is another way research quality is measured. To ensure dependable research, themes were identified through semi-directed interviews, qualitative content analysis and an historical review of Manitoba's forest policy regime. Following a similar approach another researcher would be expected to identify similar themes; however temporal elements may result in additional themes being identified. Finally, confirmability is another way to improve research quality. Confirmability means that other investigators should come to the same conclusions as the initial investigator and in this project confirmability was achieved through triangulation among types of data collection and the number and nature of the interview participants. The use of a research guide also increased confirmability as future researchers would be able to ask similar questions (Creswell and Miller, 2000).

3.7 Practical components of interviewing

Increased confidence in the results and the overall research quality was achieved through a number of practical interview procedures. These included the use of a good-quality audio recording device, a quiet and comfortable interview setting and making notes following the interview (Bryman and Teevan, 2005). Recording devices and batteries were tested for reliability and clarity, and notes were also taken during the interview to compensate for information that was lost due to interference. The recording device failed to work properly during a few interviews. However, interviews were transcribed shortly

after the interviews were conducted and notes were made based on the interviewers' recollection. Although this provides an opportunity for interviewer bias it is reduced because interviews were transcribed shortly after the interview was conducted.

3.8 Data analysis technique and validity of results

Data analysis began once the first interview was conducted. In order to adapt the interview process if necessary interviews were transcribed as soon as possible.

Transcribing is a process of translating the interview into a written document. It was especially crucial to transcribe interviews that were not recorded on an audio cassette because notes make less sense and memory fades the more time passes. It is still important to transcribe recorded interviews because of technical difficulties. In some cases notes were inadequate to determine exactly what was said, but there was no significant loss of information. Additionally, one interview was not immediately transcribed and this interview was also not recorded and therefore it was crucial to have the interview transcripts reviewed by the participant.

Once interviews were transcribed they were read through to get a general sense of the interview and repeated themes were tracked. I began the coding process by reviewing three transcripts and making another list of codes from the content in these interviews and made the first list of codes by reviewing both lists.

Interviews and notes were transcribed and analysis was conducted using data processing and analysis software (QSR International's NVivo qualitative data analysis software, QSR International Pty Ltd. Version 7, 2006). Interview questions were coded

systematically, and codes were refined, revised and re-categorized until analysis was complete. Another system of codes was employed during analysis to protect the confidentiality of participants and their corresponding organizations. Letter codes were given to associate each participant with the actor group she or he represented and used as a tool for comparative analysis. These codes have also been maintained as a part of the final text to enhance transparency, which is a tool for ensuring validity in qualitative research. Additionally, qualitative content analysis was conducted to triangulate the results.

4 The evolution of Manitoba's forest policy regime: change in ideas and actors since the 1980s

Abstract²

Forest operations, policies and governance structures have been encouraged over the past few decades to become more inclusive of multiple values and of the people holding these values. To identify if these types of changes have occurred in Manitoba, government legislation and policy documents were examined and semi-directed interviews were conducted. In Manitoba, new ideas about ecological preservation and enhanced democratic opportunities have been incorporated into forest policies, but not in forest legislation. Furthermore, public involvement has expanded and more people are involved through an advisory capacity. However, institutional stability ensures the provincial government and the forest industry maintain decision-making responsibility.

Keywords: forest policies, forest governance, sustainable forest management, sustained yield, Manitoba's forest policy regime, public involvement, Aboriginal participation

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 Characterization of major forest eras

The evolution of provincial forest legislation in Canada has been characterized by five trends or eras: 1) Unregulated Exploitation; 2) Regulation for Revenue Generation and Profit; 3) Conservation; 4) Forest Management (Howlett and Rayner, 1995); and, 5) Sustainable Forest Management (Ross, 1997). Similar trends in natural resource and environmental policy (Hessing *et al.*, 2005) and additional trends in forest management (Kimmins, 1991, 1995) and forest use (Burton *et al.*, 2003) have also been identified (Table 4.1; Appendix E).³

Forest and natural resources exploitation was largely unregulated prior to the early 1800s.

Beginning in the early to mid 1800s governments began to generate revenue from

² This chapter will be submitted for publication in *Forestry Chronicle*, and conforms to the journal's author guidelines.

³ A more detailed version of Table 4.1 can be found in thesis Appendix E.

resource extraction activities, which they accrued through stumpage fees and ground rents (Hessing *et al.*, 2005; Ross, 1997; Howlett and Rayner, 1995). These fees became a part of Manitoba's forest policies when *The Forest Act* was established in the 1930s after the federal government transferred authority over natural resources (Manitoba Forest Service, 1931). Following the era of Regulation for Revenue Generation and Profit, began the era of Conservation when the limits of available forest resources were recognized and regulations were further developed to control harvesting (Hessing *et al.*, 2005; Ross, 1997; Howlett and Rayner, 1995). In Manitoba, the Conservation era also started with the establishment of *The Forest Act*, and this corresponded with longer term allocations of forest resources based on land area rather than timber volume (Ross, 1997). In the early 1900s, forest resources were secured through regeneration and protection efforts (Ross, 1997), such as the implementation of long-term forestry allocations and national parks and forest reserves (Hessing *et al.*, 2005). Additionally, efforts to suppress fires, promote natural regeneration, and conduct forest inventory activities were initiated (Howlett and Rayner, 1995). Attempting to balance economic growth and use of forest resources in perpetuity, sustained yield (SY) management (Howlett and Rayner, 2001; Ross, 1997) was a key idea of the Conservation era. In Manitoba, SY management plans were established in the late 1940s in conjunction with forest surveys and identified as part of forest management activities (Somers, 1948). Sustained yield became institutionalized in the Forest Management era through legislated long-term, area-based tenure arrangements (Ross, 1997; Howlett and Rayner, 1995). It then continued to be a leading idea in all future forest management eras (Hessing *et al.*, 2005; Ross, 1997).

4.1.2 Emerging paradigm: sustainable forest management

Since the 1980s multiple forest uses, complex ecological and social values, and the need for wider public involvement have been increasingly recognized in forest management (Table 4.1). Some have described the changes in management witnessed during this period as revolutionary (Burton *et al.*, 2003; Kimmins, 1991). Such changes are associated with the emerging Sustainable Forest Management era. The most recent paradigm corresponds with the introduction of sustainable forest management (SFM) principles. On par with SD, SFM has been defined as “the maintenance or enhancement of the ecological, social and economic components of forested areas” (Adamowicz and Burton, 2003, p. 45). An important milestone in the integration of SFM into Canada’s forest policy regime was its adoption in Canada’s first national forest strategy in 1992 (Adamowicz and Burton, 2003; Ballhorn, 2005). The Canadian Council of Forest Ministers has established six criteria for establishing SFM. The scope of these criteria ranges from maintaining biological and ecological components and functions nationally and globally, to maintaining economic and social benefits for future generations (CCFM, 2003). SFM was viewed as a mechanism for balancing development and environmental interests (Howlett and Rayner, 1995) or addressing diverse interests of multiple societal actors (Wellstead *et al.*, 2002; Sinclair, 2002; Hammersley *et al.*, 2003; Reed and McIlveen, 2006). Additionally, enhanced democracy and increased opportunities for meaningful public participation are seen as necessary for achieving SFM (Hammersley *et al.*, 2003). However, new societal actors and their interests have yet to become institutionalized in forest policy making (Howlett and Rayner, 1995) and forest management and governance continue to be largely carried out by government and

Table 4.1. Trends in Canadian forest management and policy since the 1980s

Trends ¹	Associated ideas			
	1980	1990	2000	2010
Sustained Yield Timber Management	Long-term, area-based forestry allocations or tenure arrangements awarded to industry; industry responsible for replacing harvested trees Forest managed for timber			
Management Era	Increased environmental activity, protection & regulation Government more involved in environmental regulation			
Ecological “Scientific” paradigm	Ecological science acknowledged Forests valued for many reasons			
Scientific Forestry	Forests used for many reasons Forest management is ecosystem based			
Sustainable Forest Management	Multiple forest values & functions Sustainable forest ecosystems Ecological and social considerations Increased demand for inclusive participation in forest management & decision-making processes			
Social and Emerging Paradigm	Increased pressure for protection of ecological forest components and ecosystems as well as social values nature, biodiversity, old growth forests, ecosystems, and aesthetic and spiritual values associated with forests			
Modern Era	Biocentric values in addition to utilitarian values Increased demand for public involvement Landscape design (manage forests over large temporal and spatial scales)			

¹: Scientific Forestry and Modern Era (Burton *et al.*, 2003); Management Era (Hessing *et al.*, 2005); Timber Management Era and Sustained Yield Timber Management (Howlett and Rayner, 1995); Ecological “Scientific” paradigm, social and emerging paradigm (Kimmins, 1991, 1995).

industry (Howlett and Rayner, 2006, 1995; Hammersley *et al.*, 2003). Essentially, the main actors responsible for the institutionalization of SY have maintained a stronghold, which has stifled the materialization of the emerging SFM paradigm (Howlett and Rayner, 1995). This raises concern about whether the integration of SFM into language and policy is enough to achieve sustainable development and diminish environmental and social degradation.

4.1.3 Manitoba's forest sector

In Manitoba, forests make up a major part of the landscape and forestry contributes significantly to the province's economy. Manitoba ranks fifth in Canada in terms of total forest area (26.3 million hectares) and merchantable volume of timber (Manitoba Conservation, 2001). Forestry provides approximately 6,700 direct jobs. In 2008 wages and salaries totaled \$229, 699, 000, and revenue generated from manufactured forest goods totaled \$1, 106, 257, 000 (Natural Resources Canada, 2010).

The province of Manitoba allocates harvesting rights to forestry companies largely through long-term, area-based license agreements called Forest Management Licenses (FMLs). According to Manitoba Conservation (2011), FMLs cover almost half (12.2 million ha) of Manitoba's total forest and wooded land area and 82% of the province's Crown timber is harvested by FML holders. Forest resources are also allocated through volume-based licenses, called Timber Sale Agreements. These licenses are mainly held by Quota Holders who harvest approximately 15% of the province's Crown timber. The remaining 3% of Crown timber harvested is for firewood, which is allocated through public timber sales auctions (Manitoba Conservation, 2011).

Until recently, there were three FML holders in Manitoba: Tembec (FML 01), Tolko Industries Ltd. (FML 02) and Louisiana-Pacific Canada Ltd. (FML 03). Tembec permanently closed its newsprint mill in September 2010 (Tembec, 2010), while Tolko and Louisiana-Pacific periodically reduced operating capacity in 2008 and 2009. The closure of the Tembec mill was attributed to a combination of a decline in the newsprint market and the cost structure of the mill (Tembec, 2010). Similar factors resulted in a reduced operating capacity at Tolko Manitoba in The Pas. For example, Tolko Manitoba (2009) identified low housing starts, a high Canadian dollar, and a provincial penalty associated with export quotas and duties as contributing factors associated with an already declining economy that forced the company to reduce its operating capacity.

Forests and forest related activities have been recognized as a potential avenue for Aboriginal people to pursue economic and social interests (Stevenson and Webb, 2003, p. 66). In Manitoba 13.6 percent of the population (150,000 people) is Aboriginal. This is the third largest population of Aboriginal people in Canada (Manitoba 2007a, 2007b) and the predominant population base of Manitoba's forest communities (Manitoba Conservation, 2011). Despite the large presence of Aboriginal people in the province they are under-represented in Manitoba's forest economy (Manitoba Conservation, 2006).

4.1.4 Objectives

Given the rapid emergence and uncertain nature of SFM and given the importance of forest resources in Manitoba, this paper focuses on identifying new and emerging ideas that may have influenced Manitoba's forest policies and its actors. In addition, emphasis is put on examining changes in the forest policy community and network. The policy

community is made up of actors who have interests in a policy area thereby providing a source of ideas, whereas the policy network is made up of some of the actors from the policy community that interact with one another to debate and make decisions about policies in a particular policy area (Howlett *et al.*, 2009).

The aim of this article is to identify if governance and policy development processes in Manitoba's forest policy regime have changed in response to the emergence of SFM. To address this goal the following questions will be answered: 1) have new ideas been introduced in Manitoba's forest policy regime since the 1980s?; and, 2) have new actors entered Manitoba's forest policy community and/or network and if so how have their corresponding roles changed? The expectation was that characteristics of Canada's most recent forest management eras would correspond with changes in Manitoba's policies; new actors would play a role in introducing new ideas and be involved in decision-making processes in Manitoba's forest policy regime; and government and policy development processes would have changed since the 1980s.

4.2 Methods

Howlett's (2001) policy regime analysis was used as a guiding framework for the research. For Howlett (2001, p. 16).

A policy regime is concerned less with understanding a specific political or economic arrangement, such as a particular administrative agency or policy relationship, than with the identification, description, and analysis of the overall tenor and types of interactions existing among institutions, actors, and ideas that tend to congeal into relatively long-term, institutionalized patterns of policy and policy-making.

Howlett (2001) identified business, government, labour, academics, lawyers, recreationalists, environmentalists and Aboriginal groups as the main forest policy regime actors in Canada. These actors were used as a guideline to determine key actor groups involved in Manitoba's forest policy regime. Semi-directed interviews were conducted with 29 participants who represented different groups of actors involved in influencing, making decisions about, or developing forest policies (Table 4.2). The research design was both extensive, i.e., involving diverse actors from several regions of the province, and intensive, including a regional Stakeholder Advisory Committee working with one of the FML holders in the province. To overcome threats to research quality, participants were directly involved or had firsthand experience in Manitoba's forest policy regime and represented diverse actor groups with opposing views. All participants, except for one, were Manitoba residents. Approximately one third of the participants held positions in urban centres, while the remaining two thirds were from rural Manitoba and 5 out of 29 participants were female.

Interviews lasted approximately one hour and questions were largely predetermined and existed as part of an interview guide (Appendix A). Interviews and notes were transcribed and analysis was conducted using data processing and analysis software (QSR International's NVivo qualitative data analysis software, QSR International Pty Ltd. Version 7, 2006). Interview questions were coded systematically, and codes were refined, revised and re-categorized until analysis was complete. Another system of codes was employed during analysis to protect the confidentiality of participants and their corresponding organizations. Letter codes were given to associate each participant with

Table 4.2. The number of interview participants and the actor group they represented

Interview set	Actor group	Number	Participants interviewed
Main Group	Provincial government (2 departments, 4 branches)	4	
	Forest industry	6	
	Aboriginal organizations	2	
	Federal government	1	
	Environmental non-government organization (ENGO)	2	
	Non-government organization (NGO)	2	
	Academics/educators	3	
	Private land holder	1	
Stakeholder Group	Provincial government	1	
	Forest industry	1	
	Aboriginal organization	1	
	ENGO	1	
	NGO	1	
	Recreational interest groups	3	
Total		29	

the actor group she or he represented and the codes were used as a tool for comparative analysis. The codes have also been maintained as a part of the final text to enhance transparency, which is a tool for ensuring validity in qualitative research. Additionally, qualitative document analysis was conducted to triangulate the results. The document set included legislation and regulations, as well as non-legally binding policy documents and annual forestry reports. The Forest Act and regulations as well as annual reports were reviewed from 1930 to present. All other documents included were either assented to or published since 1980. Policy documents and legislation from the 1980s to present were examined to identify new ideas, i.e., concepts and considerations, which have informed Manitoba's forest policy regime.

4.3 Results

4.3.1 The evolution of ideas in Manitoba's forest policy regime

4.3.1.1 Changes in legislation and policies since the 1980s

Consistent with major trends in Canadian forest management and policy, new ideas were introduced into Manitoba's forest policy regime through recent legislation (Table 4.3, Appendix F). Since the 1980s seven pieces of legislation related to Manitoba's forest policy regime were introduced: 1) *The Ecological Reserves Act*; 2) *The Environment Act*; 3) *The Endangered Species Act*; 4) *The Provincial Parks Act*; 5) *The Sustainable Development Act*; 6) *The Forest Health and Protection Act*; and, 7) *The East Side Traditional Lands Planning and Special Protected Areas Act*. Through this legislation, environmental and ecological protection, as well as consideration for social values, was introduced. The creation of this legislation also showed increased government regulation

Table 4.3. Major ideas reflected in Manitoba's legislation, policy and annual reporting since the 1980s

Government initiatives and reporting		Major ideas			
		1980	1990	2000	2010
Manitoba legislation	<i>The Ecological Reserves Act, C.C.S.M. c. E5, 1981</i>	Research, enjoyment & preservation of ecological features			
	<i>The Environment Act, C.C.S.M. c. E125, 1987</i>	Protection & maintenance of the environment to sustain a high quality of life (social & economic development, recreation & leisure opportunities)			
	<i>The Endangered Species Act, C.C.S.M. c. E111, 1990</i>	Protect & enhance the survival of endangered & threatened species			
	<i>The Provincial Parks Act, C.C.S.M. c.P20, 1993</i>	Protect (12%) of natural lands & quality of life			
	<i>The Sustainable Development Act, C.C.S.M. c.S270, 1997</i>	Implement & promote sustainable development in public sector & industry & society respectively			
	<i>The Forest Health and Protection Act, C.C.S.M. c. F151, 2007</i>	Protect tree, forest & ecosystem health			
	<i>The East Side Traditional Lands Planning and Special Protected Areas Act, C.C.S.M. c. E3, 2009</i>	Government-to-government relationships Land use & resource management planning with Aboriginal communities Protection from development & other activities			
Manitoba's forestry policies	<i>Objectives for the 80's (1980)</i>	Sound and responsible management			
	<i>Manitoba Forest Management Plan 1981-2000 (1981)</i>	Optimal economic utilization of forest resources; scientific, administrative, economic and social considerations associated with forests and forestry; (Integrated resource management)			
	<i>Forest Management Guidelines for Wildlife in Manitoba (1989)</i>	Integrated resource management through increased interaction between the forest and wildlife branches			
	<i>What You Told Us Workbook on Forests (1991)</i>	Sustainable development			
	<i>Applying Manitoba's Forest Policies (1993)</i>	Sustainable forest management			
	<i>Manitoba's Forest Plan towards Ecosystem Based Management (1995)</i>	Ecosystem-based forest management			
	<i>Next Steps: Priorities for Sustaining Manitoba's Forests (2002)</i>	Scientific and traditional knowledge; ecological and socioeconomic values; economic development and co-management opportunities with			

		Aboriginal communities; policy revision
Annual reports	<i>Manitoba Conservation Forestry Branch Annual Reports (1980 – 1990)</i>	Sustained yield
		Sustainable development
		Integrated resource management
	<i>Manitoba Conservation Forestry Branch Annual Reports (1990 – 2010)</i>	Ecosystem-based management

for environmental protection and introduced broad scale management. Additionally, more inclusive participation in forest management and decision-making was introduced in Manitoba's forest policy regime through *The Sustainable Development Act* and *The East Side Traditional Lands Planning and Special Protected Areas Act*. Furthermore, the most recent legislation acknowledged government-to-government relationships and engagement with Aboriginal communities on land use planning and resource management.

A similar evolution of ideas was identified in non-statutory forest policy documents and Annual Reports from Manitoba Conservation's Forestry Branch. The scientific principles of SY, introduced in the 1940s during the Conservation era, were maintained and existed as main ideas in policies and reports in the 1980s. However, new ideas about multiple forest uses and management (integrated resource management), forest ecosystems and inclusion of Aboriginal communities and traditional knowledge have also been introduced. Principles of SFM were introduced in the early 1990s and the public was involved in a process of identifying the roles that government, industry and the public were to play in achieving SFM. These recommendations were compiled into a document entitled *What You Told Us* (Manitoba Natural Resources Forestry Branch, 1991) (Table 4.3). The objectives of the most recent policy document, *Next Steps: Priorities for Sustaining Manitoba's Forests (2002)*, identified multiple values and considerations, such as traditional ecological knowledge (TEK), stewardship and co-management and economic development opportunities for Aboriginal communities (Table 4.3).

Although numerous changes have been made in terms of the introduction of new legislation and policies, modifications to *The Forest Act* since the 1980s have been limited. However, updating the Act was identified as a policy objective in *Next Steps: Priorities for Sustaining Manitoba's Forests (2002)* and some amendments were made in 2009.⁴ These changes included prohibiting logging in most of Manitoba's provincial parks and replacing the definitions of sustained yield capacity and sustained yield management with a definition for forest management license. The definition of the latter term included the phrase "...providing timber on a sustained yield basis...". Furthermore, based on a search of terms in 2011, *The Forest Act* did not include any of the following words: sustainable, sustainability, aboriginal, First Nation, ecosystem, ecology or environment. However, a search for social, as in social values or considerations, revealed section 11, which indicates that timber harvesting rights may be allocated to people or organizations to improve social and economic well being of an area or community.

4.3.2 New ideas in Manitoba's forest policy regime: participant views

The range of policy objectives identified by the research participants corresponded roughly with the changes in legislation and policies since the 1980s that were identified in section 4.11. Participants identified objectives such as increasing economic opportunities, ecosystem protection, mechanisms for public involvement (PI) and consultation with First Nation and Aboriginal actors. They also identified SY and SFM as policy objectives (Table 4.4).

⁴ The changes to The Forest Act occurred in 2009. All interviews were conducted in 2008.

Table 4.4. Major policy objectives identified by interview participants, who are represented by individual codes

Identified objectives	Interview participants
Revenue generation	G313, I49, G421, V15
Rural economic development	G421, V15, V214
Job creation	I13, I515
Sustained yield ¹	G110, G211, G313, I36, I49, I722, N117, N227, S119, VS526
Sustainable forest management ²	A112, A216, CDS628, E11, E22, E37, F129, G110, G211, I24, I36, I49, I515, G421, S324
Environmentally friendly forestry activities	A216, I13, I24, I515, CDS628, G110, G313, I24, I36, I49, V214, VS526
Forest and ecosystem protection	V214, VS526
Public involvement ³	A216, E37, G313, I49
Aboriginal involvement ⁴	E11, G313, I49, VS526
Balancing multiple values ⁵	A216, CDS628, E11, E22, I36, N117, N227, PGS425, V216

¹ An additional objective included in this heading was maintaining a perpetual fibre supply

² Additional objectives included in this heading were sustainable development, sustainability, or maintaining resources for future generations

³ Consultation was also included with this heading

⁴ This heading also included integrating First Nations and Aboriginal people into resource sharing, capacity building, and respecting traditional forest use

⁵ This heading also included balancing planning with environment (sustainable forest management), triple bottom line (economic, environmental, and social values), Two pillars; Sustained yield (ensure future wood supply) and accommodate other values, wise use of natural resources for the benefit of all Manitobans, and Ecosystem protection and (compatible) forestry activities; Aesthetic, recreational, intrinsic and economic values

Most participants identified a shift from SY or sustainable fibre towards SFM. Many described forest policies as inclusive of multiple objectives and forest values (aesthetic, recreational, intrinsic and economic) or they recognized a need to balance ecosystem protection with forestry activities (Table 4.4).

...There's been a move more towards accommodating multiple values.... We've gone from policies that just strictly looked at sustained yield... making sure there's an adequate supply of wood fibre... in the long term...to multiple values and addressing all the other concerns that are out there... wildlife... water quality... First Nations ... recording spiritual sites or places that are important...So there definitely has been a shift in that direction over the last, certainly in the last twenty years (N227).

However, many participants indicated that government forest policy remained focused on economic values derived from forestry activities and maintaining a steady flow of fibre (Table 4.4).

I'm not saying it's always been the case in...government forest policy that they're ignoring the other forest components, but really it's about, annual cuts... about managing a steady flow of fibre as opposed to annual cuts managing an entire ecosystem, even though indirectly they do... (N117).

Contrasting perceptions about the need for protected areas were also identified. Protected areas are a forest management consideration associated with increased and diverse interests in forests. As part of a wider recognition of the ecological value of forests, one ENGO participant acknowledged increased government receptivity to protected areas lobbying (V214). However, a government participant provided a somewhat contrary view. This participant (G211) identified a reduced level of development activity in parks since the 1990s as well as resistance towards protecting areas.

I think there is one tension in society that still exists and that's the tension between what the Americans have dubbed the wise use movement and the need for protected areas ... The wise use movement ... implied that protected areas weren't needed, that with ecosystem based management we could log everything, that we were wise enough to know how to manage and I think that is a fallacy. Adaptive management is gonna be the

order of the day. We're gonna make mistakes. We need to adapt and fix those mistakes and without having protected areas we'll never know and never be able to do that. I would like to see more support for protected areas from the forest sector and I still see great resistance to protected areas that are off limits to logging (G211).

4.3.2.1 Public involvement

Other contemporary components that participants identified included increased legitimization of new actors (F129) and opportunities for public involvement (PI), as well as a growing interest and demand for transparency and accountability (I13, N117, PGS425).

... years ago [industry] just worked with the government on plans and the public really never got involved, unless we were doing something in someone's backyard...now... we have lots of public meetings...so if people want to...know what's going on, it's pretty easy...(I1).

Before my time, forestry was about harvesting trees, but over time forestry takes a more integrated approach to management and society is interested in accountability and in what's done with the natural resources (PGS425).

Increased PI, transparency and accountability were also viewed as mechanisms to improve the quality of decisions (G110, PGS425) and to foster change (V15).

One trapper in the back of the room can speak up and say something that could shake up the entire system of how we manage forestry ... So I think whether it's hit or miss that, that access and connection to the public is vital (V15).

PI opportunities were largely described as open house public meetings and community consultations (E22, E37, G110, G211, I13, I214, I722, N227, V15). These, for the most part, were viewed as opportunities to provide input at the operational level, not to share in policy decisions, decisions about allocating resources, decision-making processes (E22, E37, G110, G211, I13, N117, N227) or as opportunities that fostered power sharing (G211). PI opportunities were also described as processes that were dominated by

government and industry, impenetrable, controlled in a top-down manner (V15), time consuming, complex (I49, N227) and overly technical.

...the whole stakeholder thing is just huge now... there's so many people involved in not necessarily making decisions on the landscape but feeding into the decisions on the landscape that are still ultimately controlled by the province and whatever company or industry is actually doing the activity on the ground...it's become highly complex... (E11).

Opportunities limited to providing feedback (I13) or those that emphasized process rather than results (F129, G313) were described as ineffective. Doubts were expressed as to whether these opportunities changed management practices, or resulted in better-managed or more sustainable forests (E37, F129, G313).

I've started to see a change in attitude around the involvement of the public in forest management decision making... But whether, what's happening on the ground is more sustainable or not, I mean, I can't comment. As I said, as far as the stats I've looked at, we keep cutting more fibre every year... (E37).

4.3.2.2 First Nations and Aboriginal involvement

Greater consideration for, and actual inclusion and participation of, Aboriginal actors were also recognized.

... there's also been a shift... in terms of First Nations involvement, First Nations and northern people... So rather than be idle... people who've sat on the margins of the industry, they're now participants in that industry and want that industry to be...managed in a way that better aligns itself... with traditional uses. That doesn't necessarily mean not using it all, but it means thinking in terms of what's our impact on the seventh generation... (E22).

Two participants indicated that there were efforts focused specifically towards involving First Nations in forest education and employment (I36) and in decision making (F129). However, PI opportunities available to Aboriginal actors were largely identified at the operational level (G211, I49, I515) rather than in decision-making processes.

... the authority for decision making is still at the industry level, it would seem to me... Other than... if there's a block of land that's owned by (a First Nation), well they're the decision maker not (the forestry company) (E22).

An additional shift associated with Aboriginal actors was awareness of revenue sharing and capacity building as well as increased recognition, awareness and appreciation of traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) (Table 4.4).

[The place for TEK is] the same place as any other sort of local knowledge or ideas... we want to have as many different ideas at the table when we're trying to design policy as possible. So during policy design... it's good to have input from lots of different sectors and stakeholders and I know First Nations don't want to be considered a stakeholder, but they hold a point of view... they have ideas, values and traditions related to the forest, that need to be considered when designing policy. So they need to be part of those discussions... (E37).

4.3.3 Implementation of new ideas in Manitoba's forest policy: participant views

In addition to recognizing a range of policy objectives – from fibre supply to ecosystem protection to Aboriginal involvement – participants also had views about how change had been implemented. Participants viewed the least amount of change in *The Forest Act*.

They also indicated there was a need to update the Act and efforts were being made to do so. However, the Act was also described as “*flexible enough that new things can be accommodated*” (N227). Participants acknowledged new ideas being brought in by non-forestry legislation and forestry policies. One participant identified *Next Steps: Priorities for Sustaining Manitoba's Forests (2002)* as a policy document that recognized new ideas (E37), while others specifically implicated *The Environment Act* (N117) and environmental licensing (E11) as a collaboration and public involvement mechanism.

Participants' perceptions of change at the operational level varied. Some participants identified changes in operations, while others indicated changes in policy objectives had

not been implemented and still others indicated that forest management had not improved (Table 4.5). Participants recognized a lack of protected areas within FMLs (VS526), increased annual harvesting levels (E37), and greater emphasis on long-term employment rather than forests (V15) as indications that change had not actually occurred although policy objectives may have changed on paper.

Yes, [forest management] has improved. In terms of the actual forestry that's been done on ground...there's been changes – more attention to wildlife habitat, more attention to protected areas...fifteen or twenty years ago it was forest companies and the provincial government and they really didn't care about anybody else. (F129).

...yes there's definitely been change... we've moved along... through these different...indicators, trying to identify indicators of sustainability, sustainable forest management, integrated forest management - all those things that have sort of moved beyond the... pure sustained yield model, right? ...I don't think the law has changed beyond the sustained yield model, whether the policy has resulted in changes that...on the ground... are taking us more towards sustainable forest management, I think the jury's still out. As far as I know, the companies cut more fibre every year, so I don't know how we're getting more sustainable as we're cutting more wood from the forest (E37).

An ENGO (V15) participant indicated changes in operations had occurred because the forest industry was now required to protect or limit damage to ecological components, such as wildlife habitat, water and soil. However, an industry participant indicated that operating in a “sustainable manner” was “good for business. It's not just about the environment” (I515).

4.3.4 The evolution of actors in Manitoba's forest policy regime

4.3.4.1 The main actors and their roles: provincial government, forest industry and First Nation

A number of participants identified the provincial government (CDS628, S223) as the

Table 4.5. Perceptions of legislation, policies, and operations in Manitoba's forest policy regime (Codes appearing in parenthesis represent individual participants.)

		Perceived change	Perceived continuity	Other perceptions
Forestry legislation	The Forest Act		Has not changed	In need of change
			Does not address contemporary issues (N117)	Flexible enough to accommodate new ideas (N227)
			Does not reflect principles of sustainable forest management	
			Informed by principles of sustained yield	
			Public not involved in awarding forest management licenses (E11)	
Non-forestry legislation	The Environment Act	Brought new ideas into Manitoba's forest policy regime (E11, N117)		
Forest policies	Policies, guidelines, forest management planning	Brought new ideas into Manitoba's forest policy regime	Forest policy is about annual harvest rates and a continual fibre supply (N117)	Policies have changed but the changes have not been implemented
		Reflects principles of sustainable forest management		
Forest operations	Operations, forest management	Have changed and include consideration for whole ecosystems (I722) and ecological and environmental values (wildlife, water quality, protected areas) (F129, G421)	Remain focused on fibre rather than ecology (N117)	Uncertain operations are improved or more sustainable (E37, V15, VS526)

main policy actor and the authoritative decision maker (Table 4.5) even though other actors and interests were recognized as being involved or having an influence (E37, F129, I13, N117).

Manitoba Conservation is the key policy actor in Manitoba's forest policy regime. Anything to do with forest policy still comes out of Manitoba Conservation, whereas I think all the others have an interest in forest policy, but that's still the organization that makes the key policy decisions. So that hasn't really changed. All others have an interest in it, but the driver of policy change is still that organization (F129).

However, one industry participant described government, industry and First Nations “at the top” (I722), while another participant described government and industry occupying the centre and being surrounded by all other actor groups (E37). This participant described Crown forest resources as the provincial government’s responsibility with all Manitoba citizens and local and regional stakeholders having “a stake in how that land is managed” (E37).

In addition to managing Crown resources on behalf of the public, the role of the provincial government was described as setting and developing regulations and policies based on broad objectives (Table 4.6). An ENGO participant (V15) described the role of the provincial government as a facilitator of industrial logging rather than forest preservation. This participant’s description of the forestry department contradicts his/her perception of how the forestry department is viewed by others. This participant said that, “most people think the forestry department is there to save or help out the forests”. At a regional level, the provincial government’s role was viewed as implementing and enforcing policies and regulations, while also building relationships with rural and Aboriginal communities (Table 4.6).

Table 4.6. Participants' views of the roles of the provincial government (central and regional arms) and the forest industry in Manitoba's forest policy regime (Codes appearing in parenthesis represent individual participants.)

Provincial government (Forestry Branch – central)	Provincial government (Forestry Branch – regional)	Forest industry
Manage & allocate Crown resources on behalf of the public (E37, N117)	Manage & allocate Crown resources on behalf of the public	Generate revenue (E37, I49, I515, I722, VS526)
Develop regulations & policies	Implement & enforce policies & regulations (E11, I24, I49, I515, I618, N117, N227, PGS425, S119, S223, S324, V15, VS526)	Support & participate in government policy making (I13, I36, I49, I515)
Authoritative (institutionalized) decision maker (F129, I13, S119, S223, VS526)	Build relationships with rural & Aboriginal communities	Challenge government policies
		Drive government actions/decisions (P18)

Participants recognized a relationship between the provincial government and the forest industry. This relationship was based on the government allocating rights to harvest forest resources. A number of participants described forest management licenses (FMLs) as the major form of tenure and associated these with the majority of forested land and forestry activities in Manitoba (CDS628, F129, E37, G211, G313, I49, I36, N117, N227, PGS425, V214). Participants also described the industry playing a role in influencing, developing, reviewing, or challenging government policies even though profitability was viewed as the ultimate purpose of the forest industry (Table 4.6). One industry participant indicated that the government made policy based on activities that were already being conducted in the forest industry.

In addition to government-industry relations, participants also described relationships between the provincial government and Aboriginal actors and between the latter and industry. The recognition of Aboriginal and treaty rights through constitutional amendments was associated with a change in Aboriginal involvement, and actors were viewed as being involved politically through government-to-government relations and forestry and land use planning and management (Table 4.7). A vital and emerging avenue for increased involvement of Aboriginal people is through consultation processes and specifically the duty to consult (DTC), which was identified through Supreme Court rulings on Section 35 of the constitution. Additionally, participants described Aboriginal actors being involved at the operational level through employment opportunities, and as independent loggers and contractors (Table 4.7).

Table 4.7. Participants' views of the current and emerging roles of Aboriginal people in Manitoba's forest policy regime (Codes appearing in parenthesis represent individual participants)

Current roles	Emerging roles
Operations	Government-to-government negotiations (A211, E22, G211, I13, I515, I722, VS526)
Employment; tree planting	Consultation; Duty to consult protocols
Independent loggers; contractors (A21, E22, I515, I722, V15, VS526)	
Forestry and land use planning (A216, A320, E11, PGS425, S223, V15)	
Resource management boards	

I know [Aboriginal people] make their views known, at least some of them, through various... tribal councils... There's been some changes, just in general, with respect to things like Community Interest Zones, which have come into existence on areas in relation to First Nation reserves. They have the opportunity to respond to development including forestry. I would think mainly the positions they have pushed was primarily to gain access to fibre so that they can create jobs and economic opportunities for their nations ... something else that's come along... is the Constitution Section thirty five, Rights to Consult and Accommodate. And that's very much being played out in an evolving process, as to what ... it means to accommodate...what it means even to consult (VS526).

On the ground, First Nations peoples are playing roles right from operating the trucks that are driving on the logging roads, through to having resource management boards that are dealing directly with the forest license holder, through to being very influential at the political level, both nationally and politically. If you want to operate in this province you better recognize that you're going to deal with Aboriginal people (E22).

4.3.4.2 The federal government

The role of the federal government was described as setting high-level policy objectives and developing the National Forestry Strategy. They were also described as representing and promoting the Canadian forest industry internationally (Table 4.8). The Canadian Council of Forest Ministers (CCFM) was identified as the arm of the federal government responsible for national level forest initiatives and policies (E11, V214). Opportunities for the provincial government to provide input in national level policies were identified (G110, I722). Furthermore, there was some expectation that national policies would disseminate down to the provincial level. However, the influence and role of the federal government in Manitoba was largely viewed as limited because of the provincial government's constitutional authority to control and manage natural resources (E11, E22, G110, G211, I36, V15, V214). Furthermore, this decentralized authority over natural resources across the nation was identified as an inhibitor of developing national strategies (F129, N117, G421).

Table 4.8. Participants' views of the roles and legislative authority of the federal government in Manitoba's forest policy regime (Codes appearing in parenthesis represent individual participants)

Roles	Legislative Authority
Setting high level policies and promoting national forest initiatives (National Forest Strategy) (I49, I722, N117)	<i>Indian Act</i> (G313, I36, N117)
Funding agency; funding partner with province; funded the Manitoba Model Forest (E37, G211, I36, V214)	Fisheries and oceans
International involvement; promote Canada's forest sector; involved with softwood lumber dispute (I36, V214)	Migratory birds

The role of the federal government... is to demonstrate some leadership in what should be expected from good forestry and they do a pretty good job...[in] the last forest strategy they talked about rights and responsibilities of First Nations, ecosystem based management, watershed stuff, it talks about a lot of things that are very contemporary around... forestry being encompassing of all resources. My concern is that does not get translated into provincial policies... (N117).

... the five year strategy...that they come up with periodically ... it's window dressing... a sales document to the world of what a great job we're doing of managing our lands...there's no federal money behind it to try and make these actionable items...it's a way for Canada to try and look like it's a leader on the global scale (G421).

Participants indicated that the federal government was involved in Manitoba's forest policy regime because they had legislative authority over Aboriginal people through the *Indian Act*, as well as legislative authority over fisheries and oceans and migratory birds. They were also acknowledged as a funding agency or partner with the province and for providing monetary support for the Manitoba Model Forest (Table 4.8).

4.3.4.3 Environmental non-government organizations and non-government organizations

The role of ENGOS in Manitoba's forest policy regime was perceived as persuading the public and pressuring government for policy change about environmental protection and ecosystem preservation. In contrast, NGOs were described more as research partners (Table 4.9). One NGO in particular, the Manitoba Model Forest (MF), was perceived as having an increasingly important role in Manitoba's forest policy regime because the MF was viewed as providing an opportunity for multiple actors to work together on social issues and research related to forestry and to build trust among actors (I36, N227).

ENGOS were also implicated in Manitoba's forest policy regime because the environmental movement, campaigns and lobbying were viewed as triggers that altered

the way government and industry viewed forestry (E11, N117). In some cases participants referred specifically to environmental campaigns from British Columbia or the environmental movement from California.

... I think there was a turning point in the late eighties with the environmental movement... and the need for protection, the need for more incorporation of other values into forestry. I think there was a huge public backlash, principally on the industry that governments had to respond to obviously. So I think that was the real big kick, frankly, that got the industry and government to view forestry a little bit differently and so it's been progressive since I would say late eighties (N117).

4.3.4.4 Stakeholder advisory committees

Participants perceived stakeholder advisory committee (SAC) members as representing various interests associated with public interest groups. These members were perceived as providing input and information, often in the form of concerns or issues, from their respective association to the forestry company or vice versa (Table 4.9). The purposes for providing information varied from helping the forestry company avoid controversy over environmental issues (S119) to benefiting forest policies by contributing multiple values and opinions (CDS628). One ENGO representative described his / her role as a SAC member as challenging the status quo (Table 4.9).

4.3.4.5 Rural municipalities

Participants perceived rural municipalities (RMs) being involved through PI opportunities and SACs. Participants indicated RMs needed to have input (G211) and be informed (I36). They were also viewed as interacting with industry over operational issues and economic benefits of forestry development, i.e., contributions to local economies and employment opportunities.

Table 4.9. Participants' views of the roles of Manitoba's forest policy community actors (Codes appearing in parenthesis represent individual participants)

Actors	Roles
Stakeholder advisory committees	Represent public interests; provide two way information from associations to industry and vice versa (A320, E11, I24, S119, S223, S324, VS526)
	Challenge status quo (VS526)
Non-government organizations	Working with other actors on research initiatives
Environmental non-government organizations	Further interest in protection and preservation by persuading the public and pressuring government for policy change
Rural municipalities	Involved through public involvement opportunities and SACs (G211, G313, I216)
	Rural municipalities interact with industry when concern over operations, employment and local economic issues (CDS628, E11, E22, F129, I13, I24, S119, VS526)
Conservation Districts	Interact with other actors on local issues (CDS628)
	A stakeholder advisory committee member
Private Forestry	Promote interests of private woodlot holders
	Provide education for private woodlot and land holders

RMs have a role to play by being informed. They're on the stakeholder advisory committees... Do they really care that much about whether this area is managed this way or another way? I don't think so, not in comparison to environmentalists. They are more concerned with employment numbers, how their roads will be affected, how many people will be able to live in the community... it's a lot of - is the mill going to be there? Are there people that are employed there? Are there tax dollars coming and also how does this affect their infrastructure? (I36).

RMs were perceived as becoming increasingly involved, largely through afforestation projects, private land and woodlots (I722) due to a perceived demand for fibre from private land (I722, P18).

4.3.4.6 Manitoba Agriculture and private woodlot forestry

In Manitoba, the Department of Agriculture offers extension services for private land forestry and woodlot management. Participants described forestry and agriculture as independent policy regimes (E37, I722, P18, G421). One participant attributed the independence to the departmental structure of the provincial government.

...there's probably little discussion between departments on major policy issues... the departments work quite independently...make decisions and sometimes shock other departments. There's some definite blind siding. Because you have a responsibility, a jurisdiction or a particular constituency that you're responsible for and by nature it's a complicated process to try and come up with policy in the first place. The more people you include in it the more complex it gets (G421).

Furthermore, the independence of the forestry regime from the agricultural regime was viewed as leading to problems, such as incorrect land classification (E11, G421), inappropriate use of land, and a lack of foresight in determining the most appropriate use of land (P18, G421). One participant (P18) perceived the Forestry Branch as having an aversion to small-scale forestry despite the fact that private forestry made an important contribution to the forest sector in terms of the amount of forest products it produced.

Furthermore, this participant identified mixed views about whether private land forestry should be a part of the Department of Agriculture or the Forestry Branch.

...putting the private land forestry in the agricultural department ...is in the long run the proper way to do it. Not that it's necessarily philosophically the best way to do it, because really forestry should be managed by the forestry branch but we've seen that the forestry branch is either unable or unwilling to do it and so therefore moving it to agriculture which is a relatively prominent and well financed department is by default the best way to do it... (P18).

The increased demand for fibre from private land was identified as an issue because forestry on private land is unregulated. However, participants also indicated that efforts have been made to educate private land holders about the best use of their forested land, i.e., managing woodlot forests sustainably (Table 4.9). Participants indicated that public concern, woodlot programs, and government and industry interaction encouraged these education initiatives (E37, I722, G421, V15).

4.3.5 Characterization of Manitoba's forest policy community: participant views

Manitoba's forest policy community was described as small and integrated (F129) and the overall relations among actor groups were described as cordial and lacking high profile land use disputes.

I think in general [the relationship between actors is] actually pretty good. I think it's probably seventy five to a hundred percent better than it was ten years ago, because there's trust being built...the industry is giving..., sharing..., publishing information and I think it's being respected. I think First Nations are starting to give information, maybe some traditional ecological knowledge. Trappers are giving information on where their cabins are or where their trails are and they're realizing that that works in the planning process. That those values... are mapped... they're identified and the planner will see them and he has ... to talk to them and figure out that mitigation (I36).

[Manitoba's forest policy regime] is a very small policy community with a very tightly knitted policy community ... and it always seems to be sort of the same people, the same organizations, who are involved in... any policy initiatives...(F129).

According to one participant (F129), the industry players were too few, the timber and ecology were not highly valued, and there was ample wild land and protected areas, and thus conflict was relatively minimal. A corresponding sentiment was that there were more pressing issues than forestry, namely those related to water, oil, mining and climate change (E11). One participant (I36) indicated that the relationships among actors were better than they were a decade ago because trust was being built and actors were sharing and providing information to one another. However, another participant (E22) indicated that conflicts did exist, particularly with respect to large forestry allocations and co-management and planning with First Nations.

Manitoba is... somewhat unique in the sense of the size of some of the forest management licenses... It's a huge land base really that the provincial government has given them jurisdiction and tenure over... it's not without some conflict, especially when it comes to forest management and co-management with First Nations and community participation in planning and so on (E22).

4.4 Discussion

4.4.1 The sustainable forest management era: new ideas in Manitoba's forest policy regime

4.4.1.1 Manitoba in a Canadian context

The analysis of legislation, policies and annual reports revealed that characteristics of the most recent forest management eras can be seen in Manitoba's forest policy regime over the past three decades. For example, SFM principles were introduced through legislation and policies in the late 1980s. Later, ecosystem-based management was introduced as a strategy for achieving SFM. Most recently, particular attention has been paid to increased

opportunities for PI and initiatives to develop economic opportunities for Aboriginal communities. Additionally, consultation and partnerships with First Nations have received greater attention from government and industry, as well as First Nations and Aboriginal communities. Participants also recognized efforts to balance economic, ecological and social values, an important part of SFM (Robinson, 2004 and Sneddon *et al.*, 2006). Recognition of the need for this balance indicates awareness of SFM as being part of Manitoba's forest policy regime. In addition to SFM, PI and DTC, enduring economic objectives, such as revenue generation and employment, were found in forest policy and legislation and identified by the interview participants.

Although new ideas have been identified in Manitoba's forest policy regime, there have been few changes to *The Forest Act* since the 1980s - the most recent and significant exception being the prohibition of logging in most provincial parks. Unlike Manitoba, forest legislation nationally and in many other provinces changed in the late 1980s to mid-1990s to include integrated management, or sustainable development or aspects of it, e.g., balancing economic, ecological and social values, and increased PI opportunities (Ross, 1997). In the mid-1990s British Columbia and Saskatchewan also changed their provincial forest legislation, *The Forest Practices Code of British Columbia Act*, S.B.C. 1994, c. 41 and *The Forest Resources Management Act*, S.S. 1996, c. F-19.1, respectively. In British Columbia, "sustainable use of forests" was identified and Saskatchewan's changes included sustainable development, conservation, and integrated forestland use plans (Ross, 1997). As well, in 1996 amendments incorporated SFM. Around the same time, Ontario created *The Crown Forest Sustainability Act*, S.O. 1994, c. 25, which

adopted sustainable development principles for forest management, i.e., “to manage the forests to meet the social, economic, and environmental needs of present and future generations” (Ross, 1997 p. 36). Additionally, Ontario’s legislative changes recognized management based on emulating natural processes, as well as recognition of Aboriginal and treaty rights. Furthermore, opportunities to create partnerships with Aboriginal people for forest planning became legislated. In the mid-1990s Québec’s Forest Act, S.Q. 1986, c. 108 (S.R.Q.c.F-41) was also amended to increase the role the public and local municipalities play in managing forests. Then in 2010 the Québec government published the “Consultation on sustainable forest management in Québec consultation paper”. This document outlines new objectives that will be included in the sustainable forest management strategy and regulations. These objectives are focused on enhancing the inclusion of public and Aboriginal nations’ values, ecosystem based management, forest products and economics. The adoption of the sustainable forest management strategy is mandated by the Sustainable Development Act (R.S.Q., c. D-8.1.1.) (Gouvernement du Québec, 2010).

4.4.1.2 Why Manitoba’s forest legislation is lagging behind

The lack of change to Manitoba’s Forest Act in comparison to amendments to forest legislation in other provinces indicates that Manitoba’s forest policies are lagging behind others. This lag is likely attributable to several factors; 1) “future shock in forestry” (Kimmins, 2002); 2) an impenetrable forest policy network (Howlett and Rayner, 1995); and, 3) intersectoral influences (Hoberg and Morawski, 1997). Kimmins (2002) borrowed Alvin Tofler’s (1970) term “future shock” to explain that both forestry institutions and professional forestry individuals have been unable to adapt and match the rate of change

in societal demands. As a result exploitative forestry, driven by economic benefits rather than ecology and multi-value ecosystem management, has largely been maintained (Kimmins, 2002). In Manitoba, forest harvesting continues to be guided by principles of sustained yield and institutionalized tenure arrangements remain a dominant feature of Manitoba's forest policy regime. Furthermore, these features have maintained a strong relationship between the provincial government and the forest industry, the two dominant actors in Manitoba's forest policy regime. These institutionalized features and relationships, which emerged from earlier forestry eras where ecosystem protection and societal participation were largely absent, make rapid adaptation difficult.

These institutionalized characteristics (SY harvesting, tenure arrangements, government-industry relations based on economic interests) of Manitoba's forest policy regime provide stability to Manitoba's forest policy network. However, new ideas and actors, associated with sustainability, are expected to alter the knowledge and values of policy communities and lead to conflicts associated with demanding more involvement in the policy network (Howlett and Rayner, 1995). One challenge identified in the Canadian forestry sector is that the policy community tends to be divided over what the fundamental values guiding contemporary forest management and policy development should be. This type of policy community is characterized as 'fractious' and as supporting a policy network that changes policies in a reactive and incremental way (Howlett and Rayner, 1995). In Manitoba's forest policy regime, both enduring economic features and contemporary ideas associated with SFM exist. Additionally, members of the forest policy community – First Nations, ENGOs, NGOs, the federal government and

other stakeholders – have demanded greater involvement in decision-making arenas. Although increased opportunities have been provided, these were largely at the operational level and associated with requirements to meet environmental licensing. These increased opportunities allowed for members of the policy community to provide input which fed into decision-making processes. However, recognition of the provincial government as the authoritative decision maker and limited change to *The Forest Act* indicate that close government-industry relations maintain the policy network. The entrance of new actors in a policy network is one way significant policy change can be made. Otherwise established policy networks continue normal processes of policymaking, i.e., furthering their material interests and resolving issues amongst themselves (Howlett and Rayner, 1995).

Unchanged or lagging forest policies in Manitoba are also attributable to inter-sectoral influences. In Clayoquot Sound, B.C. when the forestry regime and the Aboriginal regime conflicted with one another, changes were made to both forest and Aboriginal governance. As a result, intersecting sectors have become an important consideration as a source of policy change (Hoberg and Morawski, 1997). In Manitoba, new ideas associated with ecological considerations, PI and Aboriginal involvement have been introduced through non-forestry legislation (*The Environment Act*) and non-legally binding forest policies (operational guidelines). These developments indicate that intersecting sectors have fostered change. However, the degree of change that has occurred points out that in Manitoba the influence of intersecting sectors has either not fully developed or the impact has been different. New ideas associated with ecological

considerations, PI and Aboriginal involvement are not explicitly identified in forestry legislation (*The Forest Act*). Furthermore, the degree of change that has occurred at the operational level as a result of these new ideas has been questioned. Although some operational changes have been made to account for ecological considerations and there are more PI opportunities, doubt was expressed as to whether increased PI opportunities had improved forestry in any way. Furthermore, there was also a perceived absence of new protected areas and a lack of reductions in annual harvesting levels. The lack of change with respect to protected areas and harvesting can be attributed to the existence of ‘critical subsectors’ (Rayner *et al.*, 2001). For example, critical subsectors, such as tenure and timber supply, have maintained stability in forest sectors even though significant transformation has occurred in other subsectors like land management, particularly with respect to a larger role for policy community actors in decision-making processes (Rayner *et al.*, 2001).

4.4.2 Sustainable forest management era: new actors in Manitoba’s forest policy regime

Historically, identifying problems and then developing and enforcing corresponding policies and regulations were the responsibility of governments (Parsons, 2000; Wolfish and Smith, 2000). The forestry industry was highly implicated in this process as well (Hammersley *et al.*, 2003). However, over the past three decades there has been widespread recognition in Canadian forest management of the need for increased public involvement (Hammersley *et al.*, 2003). In Manitoba, the provincial government maintains decision-making authority and the forest industry has an influential role on government decisions. Despite recognition of this enduring relationship, the presence of

new actors was also legitimated and a demand for transparency and accountability in forest policy decision making was recognized. According to Sneddon *et al.*, (2006, p. 265):

The ideas and practices associated with deliberative democracy – open discussion, transparency of decision making, forcing policymakers to be accountable, reasoned and respectful debate – may be idealistic, but they are fundamental to the creation of green public spheres where the multiple ideals of sustainable development can be debated and refined, and where an empowered sustainable development social movement can coalesce.

New actors implicated by PI in forest planning and management include “local, forest dependent communities”, “the general public or global village” and traditional stakeholders including “industry, recreationalists, environmentalists, First Nations, unions and countless others” (Hammersley *et al.*, 2003, p. 117). In this project, the stakeholders were First Nations and Aboriginal actors, the federal government, ENGOs, NGOs, SACs, RMs, and Conservation Districts. Manitoba Agriculture and private woodlot forestry were also included.

4.4.2.1 First Nations

In Manitoba there were efforts to enhance decision-making opportunities for Aboriginal actors, however these were largely limited to land use planning and management on reserve or traditional lands. Unlike forest policy networks, land use decision making has undergone important changes with respect to widening the policy network, particularly in Manitoba where consultation and resource management decision-making processes involving Aboriginal people have been part of the government’s political agenda (Rayner *et al.*, 2001). The Manitoba government has identified increased involvement and collaborative partnerships with Aboriginal people as a part of their most recent forest

policy objectives. Furthermore, initiatives like the Pimachiowin Aki World Heritage Project (PPAWSP) on the east side of Lake Winnipeg have fostered partnerships with Aboriginal people through their involvement in governance and decision-making processes concerning the potential designation of this site (Lemelin and Bennett, 2010). Although Aboriginal traditional culture has become increasingly recognized through this project, the degree of authority First Nations will have in managing this area if it is awarded World Heritage designation is not clear (Lemelin and Bennet, 2010). The emphasis of this project was protected areas management and economic development through tourism rather than forest management or forestry, however the established connections among Aboriginal actors, government and industry through the PPAWSP may have the potential to lead to policy change. This has the potential to be another example of change through intersecting sectors (see section 4.1.2. above).

The PPAWSP was a recent and prominent example of a partnership between First Nations and the provincial government in protected areas management. The participants in this research identified, often in the context of the Duty to Consult, similar government-to-government relations in forestry. There have also been economic development efforts and attempts to involve Aboriginal actors in an advisory capacity in forest management. However, Aboriginal actors were largely identified as being involved at the operational level through employment opportunities, and as independent loggers and contractors. Broad-based collaboration and equitable power distributions, characteristics of “new forms of governance” (Folke *et al.*, 2005; Loughlin, 2005;

Visseren-Hamakers and Glasbergen, 2007), were not widely identifiable in Manitoba's forest policy regime.

Interest in revenue sharing and co-management partnerships are emerging in Manitoba. However these may be hindered by a tenure structure which favours long-term relations between industry and government (Ross and Smith, 2002), undefined Aboriginal and treaty rights, failure to open forest policy decision making, and a gap between provincial authority over forest resources and federal authority regarding Aboriginal peoples (Stevenson and Webb, 2003; Curran and McGonigle, 1999). Additional challenges will likely stem from efforts to align or amalgamate TEK with the science-based knowledge systems that currently dominate forest management. These two knowledge systems are based on fundamentally different epistemological beliefs and linguistic systems. This difference hinders the inclusion of TEK in forest management and policy development even though it is a recognized component of new relationships with Aboriginal actors (O'Flaherty *et al.*, 2008; Sherry *et al.*, 2005, Hawley *et al.*, 2004). Additionally, historical relationships have fostered mutual mistrust between Aboriginal and non-aboriginal people, and an emphasis on professionalism provides validation for resource management based on scientific knowledge systems while discounting other systems (Hawley *et al.*, 2004).

4.4.2.2 The federal government

New approaches to governance recognize increased public involvement in decision-making processes. However, the predominance of government as the primary regulatory body and decision maker shows new governance has yet to become operational in many

parts of Canada (Parsons, 2000; Wolfish and Smith, 2000). This is also true of Manitoba where most actors, except government and industry, are involved through advisory roles that are influential but not authoritative.

Like most actors in Manitoba's forest policy regime, the federal government plays an influential, rather than authoritative role. In Manitoba, the overall view of the role of the federal government corresponded with its actual role. The Canadian Council of Ministers (CCFM) is responsible for national forest policies. They established criteria and indicators for SFM (Bernstein and Cashore, 2001), thereby entrenching these features in Canadian forest policy. The federal government also plays a role in bringing international policies to Canada and promoting and protecting Canadian forestry internationally. However, as a consequence of authority over natural resources being awarded to the province of Manitoba in 1930, the federal role in provincial forest policies has been diminished (Rayner and Howlett, 2009). This poses a challenge for implementing a comprehensive national forest strategy (Rayner and Howlett, 2009).

Although the overall view of the role of the federal government and its actual role corresponded well, a number of participants were uncertain of its role or described it simply as limited. This indicates that these participants are either unaware, unaffected or feel unaffected by federal activities. This situation helps explain why there is support for a comprehensive national forest strategy. Without one or without greater federal authority or influence, national policies associated with international issues do not impact provincial forest governance or at least not significantly.

4.4.2.3 ENGOs and NGO, SACs, RMs, conservation districts, Manitoba Agriculture, and private woodlot forestry

ENGOs, NGOs and SACs played an influential rather than authoritative role in Manitoba's forest policy regime as well. RMs and conservation districts were less recognized and influential, while Manitoba Agriculture and private woodlot forestry were excluded from Manitoba's forest policy regime. As mentioned above, ENGOs have been associated with the installation of environmental protection values and they were viewed as catalysts of change. NGOs were recognized for providing opportunities for multiple actors to work together on social issues and research related to forestry and to build trust among actors. In particular, the MF was identified as a forum for all actors to build relationships and to aim for a consensus on forest and forestry issues. Furthermore, the MF was recognized as playing a role in increasing the involvement of Aboriginal actors, incorporating TEK into forest planning and management, building trust among forest regime actors, and playing a role with respect to Aboriginal and treaty rights. The views of the MF correspond well with the objective of the federal system of model forests. Initiated in 1991 by Natural Resources Canada, model forests were to create a system of diverse stakeholders who would work collaboratively to identify and evaluate new management practices and make decisions about forest policies in order to promote sustainable management of provincial forests (Sinclair and Smith, 1997).

The MF was recognized as a forum for enhanced participation and involvement, more so than SACs. SACs provided involvement opportunities for diverse actors, however the role of SAC members was more focused on voicing concerns and providing input to the

forest industry. Less common, but opposing views were that SAC members challenged or supported the forestry industry's management planning activities and operations. SACs provide useful mechanisms for enhancing public participation and advancing social objectives of SFM. However, enhanced capacity for engaging "Aboriginal communities, broadening involvement beyond entrenched stakeholders, and finding ways to achieve shared decision making at normative and strategic levels of planning" need to be developed (McGurk *et al.*, 2006, p.824)

Although they were less recognized and less influential than other actors, RMs and Conservation Districts were mainly involved in Manitoba's forest policy regime through opportunities as SAC members. Here they could provide input into forest management planning at the industry level. Forest management responsibilities, however, were largely nonexistent. RMs were more involved when their constituents were concerned or affected by forestry activities and conservation districts were involved in integrated management and watershed level planning.

Manitoba Agriculture and private woodlot forestry were largely excluded from Manitoba's forest policy regime as they operate under the agriculture policy regime. However, concern was expressed over this arrangement mainly because private forestry was viewed as contributing to the forest economy in Manitoba. Consideration of private forestry in Manitoba where the majority of forested land is Crown owned is mostly important for comparison purposes with other provinces where private forestry is a more dominant feature. However, growing interest in afforestation and forest management

strategies that look to use agriculture for intensive forest production of fast growing species may provide a larger role for private forestry and Manitoba Agriculture in the future.

4.4.3 Characterizing policy change in Manitoba's forest policy regime

Dichotomies of old and new ideas, actors, policy instruments, policy objectives and policy goals were present in Manitoba's forest policy regime. Old ideas that were maintained included SY forestry, emphasis on economic forest benefits and attributes of forests that serve industrial forestry activities such as timber, pulp and paper, and a governance structure where the provincial government and the forest industry retain decision-making authority in a closed network. This last part speaks to the maintenance of old actors as well. In Manitoba, these two actors were viewed as the dominant actors in Manitoba's forest policy regime. However, there were also a range of new actors that were identified, which included First Nations, ENGOs, NGOs, Academics and SACs. In addition to these new actors, new ideas that were identified included SFM, consideration of ecological and social values, increased PI opportunities and an expanded forest governance structure. An old policy instrument that is an institutional feature of Manitoba's forest policy regime is *The Forest Act*, while the *Next Steps: Priorities for Sustaining Manitoba's Forests (2002)* was a new policy document. Within this new policy document a number of goals and objectives were identified, some of which were new while others were a continuation of the past. New policy goals were *maintaining sustainability of forest ecosystems* and *increasing partnerships for Aboriginal communities*, while policy goals that were a continuation of the past were *being leaders in sustainable forest based economy*. New policy objectives mainly involved increasing

traditional knowledge, enhancing forest stewardship, increasing co-management and economic development opportunities for Aboriginal communities and non-timber forest product development. Policy objectives stemming from the past, involved increasing scientific knowledge, forest renewal activities, and optimizing economic contributions from forest products.

According to Howlett and Ramesh (2002), the presence of new actors and ideas corresponds with a change in policy goals, while a change in programme specifications or policy objectives is associated with the presence of new ideas and old actors. As well, a change in policy instrument type is associated with the opposite combination, i.e., the presence of new actors and old ideas. In Manitoba's forest policy regime new ideas and actors were identified, which according to Howlett and Ramesh (2002) would be associated with a change in policy goals, however changes in objectives were also identified and these result from the presence of new actors and a continuation of old ideas. The two appear to contradict one another. However, the framework provided by Howlett and Ramesh (2002) also identified the corresponding configuration of subsystem change and the stability processes associated with these changes in actors, ideas and policies. This framework helps clarify what appears to be conflicting information in Manitoba's forest policy regime. To understand the changes and the way they occurred in Manitoba I will first discuss changes in policy instruments and follow this with a discussion of changes in policy objectives then goals.

A change in policy instrument type involves the presence of new actors and continuation of old ideas. The new actors emerge as a result of a systemic perturbation or a subsystem spillover (Howlett and Ramesh, 2002). Controversial environmental protests in British Columbia and California were identified by participants as catalysts of change. Additionally, there were international movements that promoted SFM and indigenous rights, and national changes, namely constitutional amendments that altered Aboriginal rights. These can be classified as external perturbations. However, change may have been catalyzed by a subsystem spillover because non-forest legislation (*The Environment Act*) and environmental hearings were also associated with change in Manitoba's forest policy regime. Change in policy instruments are associated with a policy stability process called path dependence (Howlett and Ramesh, 2002). Through this process the past essentially dictates the present and therefore the system remains stable (Howlett and Ramesh, 2002). In Manitoba's forest policy regime the policy instrument type changed with the creation of the *Next Steps* policy document. With respect to the change in policy instrument type there are two considerations. First, within this new policy document old policy goals and objectives were maintained alongside new ones, which exemplifies path dependence because new policy decisions are influenced by existing institutions and past decisions. In this case the existing forest institution that provides stability in the system is *The Forest Act* which brings us to the second consideration. The choice of the new policy instrument type further exemplifies path dependence because *The Next steps* policy document is not enforceable and therefore it does not conflict with or override *The Forest Act*, which is enforceable. Therefore the presence of new actors brought in by external perturbations

and subsystem spillovers may have led to a change in policy instrument type but the path dependence maintained by a forest institution led to a continuation of old ideas.

In the case of changes in program specifications or policy objectives that are associated with the presence of new ideas and a continuation of old actors, the former is associated with a policy change process called policy learning or venue change and the latter is associated with a stability process called closed networks (Howlett and Ramesh, 2002). Policy learning involves learning from other jurisdictions or an internal reflection process, whereas venue change involves an actor-directed shift that increases receptivity of actors interests in policy decisions (Howlett and Ramesh, 2002). These policy change processes allow new ideas to be incorporated, however new actors are unable to participate in debates and discourse because of the closed network that is maintained by existing actors (Howlett and Ramesh, 2002). In Manitoba new forest policy objectives associated with Aboriginal communities likely stemmed from venue changes as Howlett and Ramesh (2002) indicated that Aboriginal actors have been effective at venue shifting. Furthermore, it is likely that new ideas were introduced from learning from other jurisdictions since the Forestry Branch was described as a follower and because a number of other provinces, Québec, Ontario, Saskatchewan and British Columbia, have made legislated changes that acknowledge principles of SFM and SD or are aimed at increasing partnerships with Aboriginal communities (Ross, 1997). The closed network coincides with descriptions of government and industry as the key policy actors who held decision-making authority with all others feeding into the decisions but not making them. This suggests that new

actors have not penetrated the policy network where decisions about policy objectives are made.

Howlett *et al.* (2009) identified advisory committees and market mechanisms as types of policy instruments. Both of these were present in Manitoba's forest policy regime, which is indicative of another change in policy instrument type. These new types of policy instruments were administered by the forest industry. Therefore, this change occurred at the industry level where new actors have become involved through PI mechanisms. The lack of new ideas is explained by the enduring relationship between the provincial government and the forest industry, which is based on institutions like forest tenure arrangements and economic values associated with sustained yield. Furthermore, uncertainty surrounding the degree of change that occurred at the operational level in Manitoba's forest policy regime showed that changes within the scope of FML agreements were made more easily. For example, forest harvesting activities are done with greater consideration for maintaining and protecting riparian areas, whereas revenue sharing and co-management have been less successful. Even protecting land or settling land claims in traditional areas has been less successful particularly within FMLs. This lack of change corresponds with institutional stability supported by *The Forest Act* and recognized in the relationship between the provincial government and the forest industry. To recap, these new policy instruments were associated with the forest industry and they involved new actors. However, institutions and historical policy decisions maintained old ideas such as economic forest benefits and profitability which are the fundamental basis of the forest industry.

In the case of a change in policy goals there is a presence of new ideas and new actors. In this situation stability processes are absent and new actors emerge from systemic perturbations or subsystem spillovers and new ideas from policy learning or venue change. In the *Next Steps* policy document policy goals were both new and old. With respect to the new policy goals, according to Howlett and Ramesh (2002), this would suggest the presence of new actors and ideas. Therefore, it would appear that new actors and ideas have infiltrated the policy network where abstract policy goals are set. On the one hand the presence of new ideas and actors infiltrating this type of policy network may seem significant. However, if new actors are not involved beyond this stage and old actors continue to promote their interests in moving the abstract to concrete this could simply be an example of window dressing or lip service. Another consideration is the lack of change in *The Forest Act*. Although the *Next Steps* policy document contains new policy goals legislation has changed minimally indicating a lack of change in policy goals. Furthermore, this would suggest that neither new ideas nor new actors have penetrated the policy network where decisions are made about forest legislation in Manitoba.

4.5 Conclusion

Over a decade ago Howlett and Rayner (1995) made the argument that although interests of new societal actors have been recognized in Canada's forest policy regime they have yet to become institutionalized in forest policy decision making. A similar argument can be made for Manitoba today. New ideas associated with SFM have been introduced in Manitoba's forest policy yet sustained yield forestry continues to be institutionalized. Sustained yield forestry is associated with other institutional features like long-term

forest tenure arrangements and a stable relationship between the provincial government and the forest industry. Despite these characteristics promoting stability over the long term, changes have occurred. There is increased consideration of, and legislation for, ecological preservation and enhanced democratic opportunities in forestry activities. Therefore, even though forest legislation has not changed substantially, these ideas do influence Manitoba's forest policy regime. Furthermore, changes have occurred in policy goals, programme specifications and policy instrument types, thereby implicating new actors and new ideas in Manitoba's forest policy regime and showing and stability processes have fostered different types of policy change. For broader, more transformational change to occur in Manitoba's forest policy regime, change in policy networks that have maintained actors and old ideas is necessary. Although all four policy change processes identified by Howlett and Ramesh (2002) played a role in policy change in Manitoba's forest policy regime, the policy stability processes have been more predominant. Due to the expanding role of First Nations and changes in Manitoba's forest policy regime that have already been brought about by environmental legislation, transformational change in Manitoba is most likely to be initiated by a combination of subsystem spillovers and venue changes. This combination of subsystem change corresponds with a change in policy goals which could lead to changes in forest legislation, thereby having the potential to cause transformative change in the overall regime.

4.6 References

Adamowicz, W.L. and P. J. Burton. 2003. Chapter 2. Sustainability and sustainable forest management. *In* P.J. Burton, C. Messier, D.W. Smith and W.L. Adamowicz (eds.). *Towards sustainable management of the Boreal Forest*, pp. 41-64. NRC Research Press, Ottawa.

Ballhorn, R. 2005. The role of government and policy in sustainable development. *International Journal of Sustainable Development Law and Policy (JSDLP)* 1(1): 19-27.

Bernstein, S. and B. Cashore. 2001. Chapter 3. The international-domestic nexus: the effects of international trade and environmental politics on the Canadian forest sector. *In* M. Howlett (ed.). *Canadian Forest Policy Adapting to Change*, pp. 3-20. University of Toronto Press, Toronto.

Burton, P.J., Messier, C., Weetman, G.F., Prepas, E.E., Adamowicz, W.L., and Tittler, R. 2003. Chapter 1. The current state of boreal forestry and the drive for change. *In* P.J. Burton, C. Messier, D.W. Smith, and W.L. Adamowicz.(eds.). *Towards sustainable management of the Boreal Forest*, pp. 1-40. NRC Research Press, Ottawa.

Canadian Council of Forest Ministers (CCFM). 2003. *Defining sustainable forest management in Canada - Criteria and indicators 2003*. [online]. Available from http://www.ccfm.org/pdf/CI_Booklet_e.pdf
Last accessed March 22, 2011.

Curran, D. and M. M'Gonigle. 1999. Aboriginal forestry: community management as opportunity and imperative. *Osgoode Hall Law Journal* 37(4): 711-774.

Folke, C., Hahn, T., Olsson, P. and J. Norberg. 2005. Adaptive governance of social-ecological systems. *Annual Review of Environmental Resources* 30: 441-473.

Gouvernement du Québec, 2010. *Consultation on sustainable forest management in Québec consultation paper*. [online]. Available from <http://www.mmf.gouv.qc.ca>
Last accessed July 29, 2011.

Hamersley Chambers, F., and T.Beckley. 2003. Chapter 4. Public involvement in sustainable boreal forest management. *In* P.J. Burton, C. Messier, D.W. Smith, and W.L. Adamowicz (eds.). *Towards sustainable management of the Boreal Forest* pp. 113-154. NRC Research Press, Ottawa.

Hawley, A.W.L., Sherry, E. E., and C. J. Johnson. 2004. A biologists' perspective on amalgamating traditional environmental knowledge and resource management. *BC Journal of Ecosystems and Management* 5(1): 36-50. [online]. Available from www.forrex.org/jem/2004/vol5/no1/art5.pdf

Last accessed June 01, 2011.

Hessing, M., Howlett, M. and T. Summerville. 2005. Canadian natural resource and environmental policy. UBC Press, Vancouver.

Hoberg, G. and E. Morawski. 1997. Policy change through sector intersection: forest and aboriginal policy in Clayoquot Sound. *Canadian Public Administration* 40(3): 387-414.

Howlett, M. 2001. Chapter 1. Introduction: Policy regimes and policy changes in the Canadian forest sector. In M. Howlett (ed.). *Canadian Forest Policy Adapting to Change*, pp. 3-20. University of Toronto Press, Toronto.

Howlett, M. and M. Ramesh. 2002. The policy effects of internationalization: a subsystem adjustment analysis of policy change. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice* 4: 31-50.

Howlett, M., Ramesh, M. and A. Perl. 2009. *Studying public policy – policy cycles & policy subsystems*. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford university press, (p.298).

Howlett, M. and J. Rayner. 2006. Globalization and governance capacity: explaining divergence in national forest programs as instances of “next generation” regulation in Canada and Europe. *Governance: An international journal of policy, administration, and institutions*. 19(2): 251-275.

Howlett, M. and J. Rayner. 2001. The business and government nexus: principal elements and dynamics of the Canadian Forest Policy Regime. In M. Howlett (ed). *Canadian Forest Policy: Adapting to change*. pp. 23 – 64. University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario.

Howlett, M. and J. Rayner. 1995. Do ideas matter? policy network configurations and resistance to policy change in the Canadian forest sector. *Canadian Public Administration* 38(3): 382-410.

Kimmins, H.P. 2002. Future shock in forestry where have we come from; where are we going; is there a “right way” to manage forests? Lessons from Thoreau, Leopold, Toffler, Botkin and Nature. *The Forestry Chronicle* 78(2): 263-271.

Kimmins, H.P. 1991. The future of forested landscapes of Canada. *The Forestry Chronicle* 67(1): 14-18.

Kimmins, H.P. 1995. Sustainable development in Canadian forestry in the face of changing paradigms. *The Forestry Chronicle* 71(1): 33-40.

Lemelin, R. H. and N. Bennett. 2010. The proposed Pimachiowin Aki World Heritage Site Project: management and protection of indigenous world heritage sites in a Canadian context. *Leisure* 34 (2): 169-187.

- Loughlin, J. 2004. The “transformation” of governance: new directions in policy and politics. *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 50 (1): 8-22.
- Natural Resources Canada (NRCAN). 2010. The state of Canada’s forest. Annual report. [online]. Available at <http://canadaforests.nrcan.gc.ca/rpt>
Last accessed February 3, 2001.
- Manitoba Conservation. 2011. Aboriginal relations branch – goals, objectives and initiatives. [online]. Available at www.gov.mb.ca/conservation/arb/goals/index.html#current
Last accessed July 29, 2011.
- Manitoba Conservation. 2006. Five-Year Report on the Status of Forestry April 2001 – March 2006. Manitoba Conservation Forestry Branch. Winnipeg, Manitoba.
- Manitoba Conservation. 2001. Five-Year Report on the Status of Forestry 1996-2001. Manitoba Conservation Forestry Branch. Winnipeg, Manitoba.
- McGurk, B., Sinclair, A.J. and A. Diduck. 2006. An assessment of stakeholder advisory committees in forest management: case studies from Manitoba, Canada. *Society and Natural Resources* 19: 809-826.
- O’Flaherty, R.M., Davidson-Hunt, I.J., and M. Manseau. 2008. Indigenous knowledge and values in planning for sustainable forestry: Pikangikum First Nation and the Whitefeather Forest Initiative. *Ecology and Society* 13(1): 6. [online]. Access at <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol13/iss1/art6/>
Last accessed August 5, 2011.
- Parsons, E. A. 2000. Environmental trends and environmental governance in Canada. *Canada Public Policy*. XXVI. Special Supplement on the Trends Project S123-S143.
- Rayner, J. and M. Howlett. 2009. Implementing integrated land management in western Canada: policy reform and the resilience of clientelism. *Journal of Natural Resources Policy Research* 1(4): 321-334.
- Rayner, J., Howlett, M., Wilson, J., Cashore, B. and G. Hoberg. 2001. Privileging the sub-sector: critical sub-sectors and sectoral relationships in forest policy-making. *Forest Policy and Economics* 2: 319-332.
- Reed, M. G. and K. McIlveen. 2006. Toward a pluralistic civic science: assessing community forestry. *Society and Natural Resources* 19: 591-607.
- Robinson, J. 2004. Squaring the circle? Some thoughts on the ideas of sustainable development. *Ecological Economics* 48: 369-384.

Ross, M.M. 1997. A history of forest legislation in Canada 1867-1996 – CIRL occasional paper #2. Canadian Institute of Resources Law, Faculty of Law. The University of Calgary. Calgary, Alberta.

Ross, M., and P. Smith. 2002. Accommodation of Aboriginal Rights: The need for an Aboriginal Tenure. Synthesis report prepared for the Sustainable Forest Management Network, University of Alberta.

Sherry, E., Halseth, R., Fondahl, G., Karjala, M., and B. Leon. 2005. Local-level criteria and indicators: an Aboriginal perspective on sustainable forest management. *Forestry* 78 (5):513-539.

Sinclair, J. A., 2002. Public consultation for sustainable development policy initiatives: Manitoba approaches. *Forest Policy and Economics* 2: 319-332.

Sinclair, A.J., and D. Smith. 1997. Policy review The Model Forest Program in Canada: building consensus on Sustainable Forest Management? *Society & Natural Resources* 12(2): 121-138.

Sneddon, C., Howarth, R. B., and R. B. Norgaard. 2006. Sustainable development in a post-Brundtland world. *Ecological Economics* 57; 253-268.

Somers, J.G. 1948. Annual Report 1948 Forestry Branch. Department of Mines and Natural Resources.

Stevenson, M.G. and J. Webb. 2003. Chapter 3. Just another stakeholder? First Nations and Sustainable Forest Management in Canada's Boreal Forest (Ch.3). In P.J. Burton, C. Messier, D.W. Smith, and W.L. Adamowicz.(eds.). *Towards sustainable management of the Boreal Forest*, pp. 65-112 . NRC Research Press, Ottawa.

Visseren-Hamakers, I.J. and P. Glasbergen. 2007. Partnerships in forest governance. *Global Environmental Change* 17: 408-419.

Wellstead, A.M. Stedman, R.C. and J.R. Parkins. 2002. Understanding the concept of representation within the context of local forest management decision making. *Forest Policy and Economics* 5: 1-11.

Wolfish, D. and G. Smith. 2000. Governance and policy in a multicentric world. *Canadian Public Policy*. XXVI. Special Supplement on the Trends Project. S51-S72.

5 Perceptions of the relationships and prospects for change in Manitoba's forest policy network

Abstract⁵

Forest management and policy development have been evolving in response to principles of sustainable forest management (SFM). Through SFM, multiple actors with diverse interests and ideas have become implicated in forest policy. This paper examines the relationships and prospects for change in Manitoba's forest policy network, focusing on the provincial government, the forest industry, and Aboriginal policy actors. Twenty-nine semi-directed interviews were held with key individuals in Manitoba's forest policy regime. The relationship between the government and industry is institutionalized by the forest tenure structure, which provides the policy regime with stability and resistance to change. Accordingly, the research participants anticipated limited change to occur in the future and they expected changes to occur incrementally. These results indicate that transformative change is unlikely to occur in Manitoba's forest policy regime. However, participants also identified factors that could lead the policy regime to deviate from the status quo in a paradigmatic sense, e.g., reduced security of forest tenure arrangements, reluctance of the provincial government to redistribute power or resource allocations, reluctance of managers to recognize traditional ecological knowledge on par with western scientific knowledge was also identified. Such factors indicate that while it is most likely that change will continue to follow a normal pattern of incremental change, there is potential for paradigmatic change to occur. Paradigmatic change can occur when new actors are invited into the policy network during periods of conflict, when new actors promote their interests and these are adopted within the policy network, or when incremental change occurs cumulatively in one direction. In Manitoba's forest policy regime, escalated concerns could turn into conflict creating an opportunity for new actors. In fact existing government actors are slowly recognizing the interests of new Aboriginal actors, which could represent incremental steps towards Aboriginal forestry.

Keywords: Policy change, institutional barriers, sustainable forest management, Aboriginal forestry

5.1 Introduction and objectives

Forest policy and management in Canada date back to the early to mid-1800s following a time when unregulated forest activities prevailed (Burton *et al.* 2003; Hessing *et al.* 2005; Howlett and Rayner 1995; Kimmins 1991, 1995; Ross 1997). The government of the

⁵ This chapter will be submitted for publication in *Environments*, and conforms to the journal's author guidelines.

Dominion of Canada began to regulate resource extraction activities by charging stumpage fees and ground rents, thereby creating a source of government revenue. Regulations evolved further to control the extent of harvesting activities when limits to forest resources were recognized in the late 1800s to mid 1900s (Burton *et al.* 2003; Hessing *et al.* 2005; Howlett and Rayner 1995; Kimmins 1991, 1995; Ross 1997). From the early to mid-1900s sustained yield (SY) management was promoted through forest regulations and SY became institutionalized through legislated long-term, area-based tenure arrangements (Ross 1997; Howlett and Rayner 2001; Ross 1997). Sustained yield management attempts to achieve a perpetual supply of fibre by balancing the rate of forest harvest with that at which the forests grow (Howlett and Rayner 2001; Ross 1997). Sustained yield has continued to be a predominant idea in forest management (Hessing *et al.* 2005; Ross 1997) even since the 1980s when ecological preservation, multiple forest uses and values, and the need for wider public involvement emerged as important ideas. The emergence of these ideas associated with sustainable forest management (SFM) represented revolutionary change in Canada (Burton *et al.* 2003; Kimmins 1991). Sustainable forest management, with its roots in sustainable development, was viewed as a mechanism to balance economic development activities with social and environmental interests (Howlett and Rayner 1995). As such, SFM recognized diverse interests of multiple societal actors (Wellstead *et al.* 2002; Sinclair 2002; Hammersley *et al.* 2003; Reed and McIlveen 2006) and the importance of enhanced democracy and increased opportunities for meaningful public involvement (Hammersely *et al.* 2003).

The evolution of forest policy and management in Manitoba has followed a pattern of change similar to that found throughout Canada's forest sector. Initially forest regulation

in Manitoba involved extraction fees and rights to allocate forest resources. These became legislated in Manitoba's *Forest Act* in 1930 following the transfer of authority over natural resources from the Dominion to the province (Ross 1997). Approximately a decade later, SY management plans were established. Sustained yield continues to be a guiding force in Manitoba's forest policy regime, but new ideas associated with SFM have been introduced since the 1980s (chapter 4). For instance, new opportunities for public involvement (PI) have been provided by round table consultations on sustainable development (Sinclair 2002), the Manitoba Model Forest (MF) (Sinclair and Smith 1997) and industry stakeholder advisory committees (SAC) (McGurk *et al.* 2006). Although these represent mechanisms for enhanced PI, shortcomings have been identified in all three. The round tables were faulted because progress was obstructed by excessive deliberations, there was a lack of discussion and debate, and the consultations occurred too close to implementation rather than at a normative planning stage (Sinclair 2002). With respect to the model forest, Sinclair and Smith (1997) found that government and industry dominated the board of directors, and Aboriginal involvement was limited. Opportunities to be involved were provided, however there was little effort to develop mutual recognition and understanding across cultures. Furthermore, the power to implement ideas and projects developed by the MF was held by those "trained and socialized under the traditional paradigm of forest management" (Sinclair and Smith 1997: 136). Finally, SACs have also provided a useful mechanism for enhancing PI and advancing social objectives of SFM. However, meaningful engagement and normative and strategic decision making with Aboriginal people and emerging stakeholders was lacking (McGurk *et al.* 2006).

Despite these shortcomings in recent PI initiatives, it is apparent that the introduction of SFM has implicated multiple actors with diverse interests, and that Manitoba's forest policy regime is in a period of change. This article, therefore, examines sources of change with a specific focus on the past three decades, as well as barriers preventing the full expression of change. The article focuses on three groups of actors, namely the provincial government, the forest industry and Aboriginal people. The objectives of the paper are twofold: to describe the relationships among these three groups and to describe patterns and processes of change in Manitoba's forest policy regime. Insight into the relationships among these actor groups will help determine if there is space or potential opportunity for new actors to enter the closed policy network and how likely it is that Aboriginal actors will penetrate the policy network. Finally, the patterns and processes of change along with the emerging role of Aboriginal actors will help determine the potential for transformative change in Manitoba's forest policy regime.

5.2 Conceptual frameworks

5.2.1 Patterns and processes of policy change

Change in public policies in Canada in general, and more specifically Canadian forest policy, has been characterized as incremental in the sense that new policies essentially maintain the old policy while adding something new to it (Howlett 2002; Howlett and Rayner 1995). However, patterns and processes of policy development are not limited to incremental change. For example, policy change has been described as paradigmatic, incremental and as a combination of both. When periods of incremental change are disrupted by periods of paradigmatic change the pattern is described as punctuated

equilibrium (Baumgartner and Jones 1991). Patterns of policy development have also been described as normal and atypical. Normal policy change has been identified as a common form of policy development where policies change incrementally, creating long-term stability and promoting the status quo (Howlett *et al.* 2009). Atypical policy change, on the other hand, is associated with significant deviations from the status quo, and is associated with the emergence of anomalous ideas and actors (Howlett *et al.* 2009).

Sources of atypical policy change have been categorized as either endogenous or exogenous (Howlett *et al.* 2009). Endogenous sources of change arise from issues and knowledge that incite new ideas among existing policy actors, while exogenous sources are associated with a change in actors fostered by external disruptions leading to significant deviations from the status quo. New actors can include members of society who instigate and promote positions contrary to the status quo or who are affected by the subsequent changes. New actors can also include “policy specialists and interested parties” emerging from interconnected subsectors (Howlett *et al.* 2009).

Furthermore, combinations of exogenous and endogenous changes in policy goals, objectives or settings characterize paradigmatic change (Howlett and Cashore 2009). Cashore and Howlett (2007) classified four types of policy change that were characterized by combinations of exogenous or endogenous sources of change at different levels of policy development – from issue identification to policy implementation. In their view, paradigmatic change does not only occur when policy goals change in the face of exogenous pressures, nor is incremental change only the result

of endogenous shifts in ideas. When an exogenous source of change disrupts a stable pattern of incremental change and shifts it to a new pattern of stable, incremental change, this is called a homeostatic model of change. However, exogenous forces can also lead to paradigmatic change by changing objectives even when goals remain stable. This model is called quasi-homeostatic. When a change in policy goals is driven endogenously it is called neo-homeostatic, and when a change in objectives and settings is driven endogenously because the policy goals are ambiguous enough to allow for this type of change it is classified as a thermostatic model of change (Howlett and Cashore 2009).

A change in one policy sector has also been attributed to changes in a related sector, e.g., changes in the agricultural sector or the parks and protected areas sector influencing change in the forest regime. As well, changes in a policy sector can be affected by changes in related policy subsystems (and subsectors). Subsystem transformation is expected to lead to policy change (but does not necessarily do so) when policy community actors penetrate the policy network and bring new ideas into decision-making arenas (Howlett and Rayner 1995, Howlett and Rayner 2001). The policy community differs from the policy network in that decision making is restricted to the latter and the former serves as a source of policy ideas. Furthermore, policy network actors are directly involved with each other whereas policy community members, although they may overlap in ideas and interests, are often autonomous from one another (Howlett *et al.* 2009). Canadian forest policy networks have been dominated by government and forest industry actors (Howlett and Rayner 1995) and these types of closed networks are

recognized as stability processes that increase a policy system's resistance to change (Howlett and Ramesh 2002).

5.2.2 Barriers to change in forest policy regimes

Policy subsectors, especially critical subsectors, have the ability to influence policy change either by way of facilitating or impeding it (Rayner *et al.* 2001). Tenure arrangements and annual allowable cut (AAC) have been identified as critical subsectors that have impeded changes in the forest sector even though changes had occurred in related sectors, such as land management (Rayner *et al.* 2001). Forestry institutions, like tenure arrangements and the relationships they support, have also been shown to limit change brought about by external forces. For example, Hagerman *et al.* (2010) concluded that forestry institutions were an endogenous structure in British Columbia's forest sector that limited a shift in policies that would have entrenched adaptive management and better prepared forestry for climate change.

Another internal feature, associated with forest tenure systems, that has been shown to impede policy change is the structure of forest policy networks. Government and industry dominate Canadian forest policy networks, and all other actors make up the more peripheral policy community (Howlett and Rayner 1995). Forest policy networks in most Canadian provinces have been described as clientelistic because their members are limited to government and industry and the government, for various reasons, maintains the dominant position. In Manitoba, the forest policy network has been described as clientelistic because government and industry are the only two actors and the government

maintains the dominant position because the industry is less organized (Howlett and Rayner 1995).

5.2.3 Aboriginal actors in sustainable forest management

Given the closed network relationship between the government and industry in forestry, it is not surprising that Aboriginal involvement in forest governance, management and use remains limited. According to McGregor (2011: 8), “the policies and tools of systematic exclusion remain and continue to frame the discourse on SFM in Canada”. This is the case even though the role of Aboriginal people in Canadian natural resource governance, management and use has increased in the past three decades (Howlett 1994; McGregor 2011; Wyatt 2008). Constitutional changes in 1982, as well as court decisions, Aboriginal protests and international recognition through sustainable development and SFM have contributed to this trend (Howlett 1994; McGregor 2011; Wyatt 2008). However, in order to accommodate and foster an increased role for Aboriginal people, forestry institutions need to change (McGregor 2011; Natcher *et al.* 2009; Wyatt 2008). An example of such institutional changes is reformation of current tenure structures (Natcher *et al.* 2009; Wyatt 2008). Another is developing “a new relationship based on mutual reconciliation and co-existence” to replace the current relationships that have their basis in colonialism (McGregor 2011: 8). To accommodate and foster an increased role for Aboriginal people, there is a need for equitable recognition and inclusion of traditional ecological knowledge (TEK), increased access to resources, and redistribution of power over resource use decisions (McGregor 2011; Natcher *et al.* 2009; Wyatt 2008).

Aboriginal forestry that incorporates Aboriginal culture and SFM has gained increased recognition and is beginning to influence Canadian forestry (Parsons and Prest 2003). In categorizing Aboriginal forestry, Wyatt (2008) concluded that a consensus exists that excluding First Nations from forestry is unacceptable. However, the degree to which Aboriginal people will become involved and what their roles will be remains uncertain (Wyatt 2008). Wyatt (2008) provided five scenarios characterizing the role of Aboriginal people in forestry. The first is forestry excluding First Nations. The second is forestry by First Nations. In this scenario, First Nations might provide TEK to forest managers, but have few opportunities to be engaged in a meaningful way, or to modify forestry practices, management planning or existing forestry institutions to respect their own values or goals. The third, forestry for First Nations, is characterized by an unequal distribution of power between dominant forestry actors and Aboriginal actors. In this scenario, conventional forest regulations are largely unchanged; however there is some flexibility to allow for more Aboriginal involvement. In this scenario, TEK is integrated as part of a forest management strategy when it corresponds with science guiding forest management decisions. The fourth category, forestry with First Nations, involves changes to the existing regime whereby new tenure arrangements are established, distribution of power is equal allowing First Nations to pursue their own interests, and TEK is accepted on par with western science. Finally, in the fifth category, Aboriginal forestry, there is a shift from existing institutions towards ones that are established by First Nations according to First Nations interest and values. First Nations hold the right and responsibility to make final decisions, and although co-management and partnerships

with non-aboriginal actors are inherent there is mutual recognition of western and traditional knowledge systems and their philosophical underpinnings.

Aboriginal actors have played a role in promoting their interests to a point where policy developers are more receptive to their interests and their inclusion in policies (Howlett and Ramesh 2002). This source of change is called venue change (Howlett and Ramesh 2002) and it was identified as one of the most likely sources of transformative change in Manitoba's forest policy regime (Chapter 4). The interest in this research was, therefore, in examining the relationships among government, industry and Aboriginal actors to determine the likelihood that Aboriginal actors will effect policy change in Manitoba through venue change. As noted in the following section, Aboriginal participants were interviewed, along with a range of other participants representing actor groups in Manitoba's forest policy regime. The perspective sought was one that included a range of actors involved in contemporary forest governance.

5.3 Methods

This work employed Howlett's (2002) policy regime approach as a framework for analysis. The regime approach deals with the complex nature of current governance because it acknowledges all of the ideas, actors and institutions that play a role in the evolution of a policy regime. In this study, the regime approach provided an analysis tool that allowed for the forest sector to be the focus while also considering the influence of other sectors. Additionally, this approach considered how forest policy had evolved along with overarching ideas, like SY and SFM. Furthermore, it acknowledged multiple actors, their roles and how their presence and level of involvement influenced Manitoba's forest

policy regime. Finally, the regime approach identified institutionalized tenure arrangements and examined their role in the evolution of Manitoba's forest policy regime.

As part of this analytical framework, key actors in Canada's forest policy regime were used as a guideline to determine key actor groups in Manitoba's forest policy regime. Key actors identified in Canada's forest policy regime were business, government, labour, academics, lawyers, recreationalists, environmentalists and Aboriginal groups (Howlett 2001). Similar actor groups were included in this study. Semi-directed interviews were conducted with 29 participants who represented a range of actors involved in influencing, making decisions about, or developing forest policies (Table 5.1). The research design was both extensive, i.e., involving diverse actors from several regions of the province, and intensive, including a regional Stakeholder Advisory Committee working with one of the forest management license (FML) holders in the province. (Forest management licenses are the predominant approach used in Manitoba to allocate harvesting rights to forestry companies.)

To overcome threats to research quality, participants were directly involved or had firsthand experience in Manitoba's forest policy regime and represented diverse actor groups with opposing views. All participants, except for one, were Manitoba residents. Approximately one third of the participants held positions in urban centres, while the remaining two thirds were from rural Manitoba and 5 out of 29 participants were female. Interviews lasted approximately one hour and questions were largely predetermined and existed as part of an interview guide (Appendix A). Interviews and notes were transcribed

Table 5.1: The number of interview participants and the actor group they represented

Interview set	Actor group	Number
Main group	Provincial government (2 departments, 4 branches)	4
	Forest industry	6
	Aboriginal organizations	2
	Federal government	1
	Environmental non-government organization (ENGO)	2
	Non-government organization (NGO)	2
	Academics/educators	3
	Private land holder	1
Stakeholder group	Provincial government	1
	Forest industry	1
	Aboriginal organization	1
	ENGO	1
	NGO	1
	Recreational interest groups	3
	Total	29

and analysis was conducted using data processing and analysis software (namely QSR International's NVivo qualitative data analysis software, QSR International Pty Ltd. Version 7 2006). Interview questions were coded systematically, and codes were refined, revised and re-categorized until analysis was complete. Another system of codes was employed during analysis to protect the confidentiality of participants and their corresponding organizations. Letter codes were given to associate each participant with the actor group she or he represented and these codes were used as a tool for comparative analysis. The codes have also been maintained as a part of the final text to enhance transparency, which is a tool for ensuring validity in qualitative research.

5.4 Results

5.4.1 Perceptions of past and future change in Manitoba's forest policy regime

Change in Manitoba's forest policy regime was generally described by participants as incremental and slow, although two participants indicated that quick change was possible and had occurred when political parties changed (I515) or when high-level government actors were involved in the process (G313). A number of participants attributed change in Manitoba's forest policy regime to environmental campaigns and the environmental movement. However, a few participants indicated that major change had not occurred due to an absence of high-level conflict (F129) and limited acts of civil disobedience (E22), such as those observed in British Columbia and Ontario.

... there's been no defining event compared to a lot of other provinces. Like in Ontario, one of the defining events was the environmental assessment on forest lands in the mid nineties, which led to some fairly significant changes in forest policy in the province...it went over night from a sustained yield timber regime to an ecosystem regime. That hasn't happened in Manitoba. There's been no defining event (F129).

Although changes were expected to be small or to occur incrementally (CDS628, G110, P18, VS526), most participants anticipated many changes to occur in Manitoba's forest policy regime in the future. Table 5.2 outlines these changes along with the participants who identified them. With respect to legislation and policies, changes were expected in *The Forest Act* and in operations and management. Furthermore, sustainable management practices were expected to improve and become more widely accepted. Management practices were also expected to become more integrated and inclusive, which corresponds with expectations for a reduction in industrial forestry activity. However, it should be noted that one participant expected the demand for forest products to increase.

Table 5.2. Participants' expectations of future change in Manitoba's forest policy regime

Areas of change	Anticipated change	
Legislation	Updating <i>The Forest Act</i>	G110, N227, PGS425, P22
	Changing forest tenure arrangements	I13
Policies	More comprehensive forest practices document	PGS425
	Continued push for more accurate representation of what's on the landscape (forest measurement)	E11
Timber	Traditional forestry activities will have limited operating base	V214
	Move further away from managing resource for economic benefit	I49
	More mill closures, concern for forest industry	G211, I618, P22
	More demand on forest products	S223
Sustainability and SFM	Government and industry will be more comfortable with SFM	PGS425
	Enabling legislation to refine SFM activities	G110,
	Continue to move toward more environmentally sound, sustainable management practices	G211
Integrated land management	Better integration of multiple land use	E11, N117
	Better integration of stakeholder and Aboriginal people	E11, N117
Multiple use	Other forest uses (recreation, tourism, non-timber forest products) will increase	E11, G313, V214,
	Broader use of forests	G211
Aboriginal actors	First Nations forest management will increase	V214
	First Nations involvement will increase	A216, G211, G313, I36, I722
	More First Nations participation in policy discussions and influencing policy, equal players on a government-to-government basis	A112
	More First Nations control of policy development in their specific areas – more developed self-government	G313
	First Nations demanding greater involvement, becoming more organized and pursuing determining of their Aboriginal and treaty rights	
	Increased use and integration of traditional ecological knowledge	G211
	Revenue sharing or redistribution of stumpage fees to First Nations needs to be addressed	N227
Stakeholder involvement	Stakeholders will feel comfortable with their level of input and their role	G110
	Governments goal to make sure citizens think they are adequately involved	G110
	More collaboration on forest policy	I24, I515
	Increased involvement	I722
	More community involvement and control; better mechanisms for involvement	N227

5.4.2 An increased role for Aboriginal actors in Manitoba's forest policy regime

New opportunities that fostered an increased role for Aboriginal actors were identified within Manitoba's forest policy regime. These included consultation, particularly through the Duty to Consult (DTC) (A216), revenue sharing, government-to-government relationships (A216, G110) and the inclusion of TEK into forest policies (E22, G313, I36, N117, N227, V15). Some participants indicated these were mechanisms that were being pursued by Aboriginal actors (A216) and that they should be pursued further (V15).

...if we're going to talk economics, revenue, then [we] want to be the beneficiary of the revenue. Not totally vetoing anything that's going on but taking a reasonable and a practical approach to partnering with anybody who has an interest in [our] territory (A216).

Involvement of First Nations and Aboriginal communities and stakeholders was expected to increase. Furthermore, First Nations were expected to gain more control over management and policy development, and revenue sharing was identified as a key issue that needed to be addressed (Table 5.2). Government (G110, G313), industry (I36) and NGO (N227) participants identified continued interaction and efforts to work together as a strategy for building trust.

Aboriginal actors were viewed as emerging actors in Manitoba's forest policy regime (F129, G211, G313, I13, I36). They were described as having a voice and being influential at regional, local and operational levels (A21, E11, E22, G313, I618, G421, VS526). Their increasing role was associated with employment and education initiatives aimed at Aboriginal people. An industry (I36) participant indicated that Aboriginal people were targeted because many lived in communities in close proximity to forests and they are "the ones that have the greatest desire for those areas to be healthy".

Aboriginal actors educated in forestry were also perceived as having the potential to bridge gaps between the needs of forestry operations and First Nations and Aboriginal communities (G110). Furthermore, an increased role of Aboriginal actors was also associated with the recognition of Aboriginal and Treaty rights (A320, G211, G313).

... over the last couple a dozen years or so with the guarantee of Aboriginal and Treaty Rights in the Constitution, with various other policy changes reflecting the way the government does business with First Nations, they are becoming a more and more powerful voice in setting policy and that trend is continuing... across the board with natural resource management, they are becoming more and more powerful and are going to have more and more of a say with what happens with their traditional lands (G211).

Government and industry were described as recognizing their new obligation to engage Aboriginal actors (F129, G313, V15), and industry was also described as realizing there were benefits to engaging Aboriginal actors early (G313). However, tension between industry and First Nations was identified despite indications that partnerships were developing. One participant indicated that examples of good working relationships existed but that these were not as prevalent or as good as government reporting advertised. Furthermore, interactions among government, industry and Aboriginal actors were viewed as being made more complex by the uncertainty surrounding actors' roles and distribution of power because of emerging activities such as treaty land negotiations, government-to-government relations, revenue sharing, co-management or consultations (E11, E22, G313, I36, I49).

It seems like there are difficulties. It's going to take a lot of time to agree on some of the fundamentals, like traditional land use areas. The way that they are consulted, consultation protocols, resource revenue sharing is a big ticket item for lots of the First Nations... they have to sort out quite a few land issues before you can really go down that road. What kind of fundamental rights are gonna be given to the First Nations? For now the Crown says it's Crown land, but they're going down a path where, there's all sorts of cases before the courts so, things will shake out over time. But it takes time, it's time

consuming. Expectations are different I think from a lot of the First Nations than what government has (I49).

5.4.3 Institutions and actors perceived as barriers to forest policy change

5.4.3.1 Forest tenure as an institutional barrier to change

Forest tenure was viewed as a barrier to change because it is difficult to alter given that it is an institutionalized feature of Manitoba's forest policy regime. One participant indicated that forest tenure was unlikely to change because alternative industries were non-existent and because of the institutionalized strength of tenure arrangements and provincial authority over natural resources (F129). Others pointed to the legally binding nature of FML arrangements (G110, G313) and the lack of broad-scale land use planning initiatives (N117).

Institutionalized tenure arrangements were identified as limiting the influence of other regimes, as well as limiting change in other regimes. The agriculture regime was viewed as independent from forestry (E37, I722, P18, G421), which a few participants felt led to inappropriate land use and designation (E11, P18, G421). Specifically, forested areas were inappropriately designated as agriculture and forested areas were not used for a full range of values. Additionally, forestry and protected areas were viewed as distinct (N117) and colliding (E37) regimes. Tension between these management regimes was identified at the regulatory level, where decisions about forest tenure and protected areas (PAS) are made. It was also identified at a management level, where tension between management strategies, such as natural disturbance based management (NDBM), and protected areas management existed. Participants indicated that FMLs constrained the ability to establish

protected areas (Pas), and thought that protected areas should be established before FMLs (G211, V15).

Contrary to perceptions about the unchanging nature of forest tenure in Manitoba's forest policy regime, one industry participant (I13) indicated that FMLs did not provide the same degree of security to the forest industry that they had in the past. Furthermore, this participant cited an increasing role of First Nations and conflict over resources as a contributing factor of this insecurity.

A lot of time what the government's doing now with First Nations is they've got these resource boards and First Nations believe they have more control over the resource and so we don't believe we have security anymore in our timber. If you get into a conflict over timber with a First Nation, we'll be shut down and so what does the license area give you? Not much for security anymore (I13).

Additionally, the same participant (I13) indicated that at a time when the industry was losing more money than it was making firms could not afford to absorb the costs of the increasing responsibilities the government was shifting to them.

... I think there's going to be a real push back to say "this is a Crown resource, you manage it government!" We just want timber to run our mills and I think these license agreements are pushing companies into social areas and that's just not where companies want to go. If they're making lots of money they'd probably take on that, but when you're losing lots of money, you just start to say enough's enough (I13).

5.4.3.2 Characteristics of the provincial Forestry Branch: an institutional barrier to change

Institutionalized tenure arrangements were not the only barrier to change identified by the participants. The provincial Forestry Branch was described as resistant, reactive,

indecisive, non-transparent, and as having a tendency to allow shifting societal pressures to surpass policy change (Table 5.3). One government participant described the Forestry Branch as being more accepting of policy change in favour of economic benefits than policy change associated with societal demands for sustainable management. Furthermore, this participant characterized government as having a tendency to change policies incrementally rather than paradigmatically (G211).

... They're very ready to embrace change on the development side of the coin, new technologies that could create... new job opportunities, new investment opportunities. They're more reluctant to accept change when it comes to meeting the desires of society for sustainable management ... They were really more interested in just tinkering around the edges, rather than making a paradigm shift and a fundamental change (G211).

Although the government was described as resistant and reactive, they were also viewed as the authoritative decision maker (G110, I24, I49). The relationship between government and industry actors was perceived as either a one-way relationship where government set the rules and industry followed them (I24, S119, and S223, V15) or as a two-way exchange. Through this exchange, government and industry worked together to develop policies. However, the decision-making authority held by the provincial government was identified as a frustration to industry participants whose recommendations in policy deliberations were not accepted (I515, I24). Furthermore, industry participants felt the provincial government was not able to provide the direction and support they needed. For example, a few participants described forest certification schemes as having more comprehensive or better standards, in terms of SFM, than government (I36, I49, G421). However, there were also different perceptions about certification. For example, one industry (I49) participant indicated that certification led

Table 5.3. Perceived characteristics of the Forestry Branch viewed as barriers to change

Characteristics of the Forestry Branch	
Cautious	G313
Resistant to change	G211
Tendency to avoid controversy	P18
Reactive (rather than proactive)	E11, G313
Follower (not a leader)	E11, P18, V15
Low morale	V15
Low morale in retirement aged staff	P18
Decisions made behind closed doors	G211, N227, G421, V15
Prolong or avoid making decisions	I13, I515
Tendency to lag behind changing societal demands	G211, I36
Limited (monetary and scientific) resources	P18, G421, VS526

industry to be more progressive than the provincial government, while a provincial government participant viewed certification as having limited influence on forest policies (G313). Finally, a government representative (G421) indicated that more stringent requirements only assisted with governing and regulating industrial forestry activities.

5.4.4 Barriers to the full expression of Aboriginal actors in Manitoba's forest policy regime

Despite a perceived increase in the presence and role of Aboriginal actors in Manitoba's forest policy regime, contrary perceptions indicated that Aboriginal inclusion in decision making was inadequate (G313, I36) and even non-existent (I36). Additionally, participants indicated that policies were not yet being made in cooperation with Aboriginal actors (G313), nor had policies changed to include Aboriginal actors (G421). An Aboriginal participant (A320) indicated that Aboriginal people were excluded because *The Forest Act* did not reference Aboriginal people or culture.

Overall, participants indicated that PI opportunities for Aboriginal actors to provide input were available, but these opportunities were not well attended (CDS628, I36, N117,

N227, S119, V15). An NGO (N227) indicated there was a lack of certainty on how consultations should be carried out. This participant indicated that government, industry, and Aboriginal actors were all uncertain as to how to consult. However, an Aboriginal participant (A216) said that consultation with Aboriginal actors was as a secondary or tertiary goal for government. Another challenge for Aboriginal involvement was attributed to the *Natural Resources Transfer Agreement* (NRTA). Because of the NRTA, *“the province has the right to manage lands that fall on First Nations land...and nothing is going back to the First Nations”* (A112). Furthermore, the province has the authority to “justifiably infringe” on Aboriginal rights for conservation purposes (G313).

Furthermore, participants identified other limitations to a larger role for Aboriginal actors in Manitoba’s forest policy regime. For example, the NRTA was viewed as excluding Aboriginal people from enjoying monetary benefits of forestry that are currently realized by government and industry (A216, A112). This disparity was viewed as contributing to systemic social challenges faced by Aboriginal people in Manitoba.

Anything that’s being done in industry that involves resource extraction really is economic at the end of the day... there still is disparity in who the beneficiaries are and we see that every day in our nation. We see that with the loss of our connection to our cultural beliefs, our cultural practices. We see that from a social perspective with the high unemployment rate, the high addictions rate, the continued reliance on agencies or organizations that are outside of ourselves to provide our everyday living (A216).

As part of the systemic challenges, Aboriginal actors were described as landless (A320) and lacking resources (monetary, educational) or lacking access to resources (A320, I36, N117, PGS425), which impeded their involvement in forestry activities. As one participant pointed out, Aboriginal actors are constrained because of their diminished

capacity to become involved and because the government either lacks the capacity to assist or chooses not to given constraints of its own (G313). An Aboriginal participant (A112) and an industry (I36) participant indicated PI opportunities were underutilized because there was a lack of recognition, consideration and understanding of Aboriginal culture. These shortcomings were further associated with issues related to Aboriginal people being excluded and segregated (CDS628), as well as a lack of resources (N117) and a lack of trust (I36, N227). Many participants described Aboriginal communities as being heterogeneous, with different interests, issues, concerns and ways of life (A112, G211, G313, I36, I515, PGS425, P18).

Both an Aboriginal participant (A112) and a federal government (F129) representative held a contrary perception about the extent to which Aboriginal actors participated. These participants described Aboriginal actors as overwhelmed and exhausted by the number of invitations for involvement.

Like mechanisms for involvement, efforts to include TEK were also perceived as both limited (E37) and challenging (G211, G313). There was also a perceived reluctance to recognize and incorporate TEK into science-based forest policies (G211, G313, N117, N227) because TEK was unfamiliar or unknown to managers (G313) and was perceived as being prohibitive to certain developments (G211). Difficulties incorporating TEK were also attributed to a lack of dialogue between knowledge holders (N227) and epistemological differences between western science and TEK (E22, N227, V15). Part of the difference between the two ways of knowing is associated with the philosophical

basis for each knowledge system. One participant said that in western science “*we try not to have any kind of relationships [or] influence the knowledge that’s coming back to us*” (E22). In a similar vein, another participant (V15) indicated that a willingness to advocate was the difference between TEK and scientific attitude. In contrast to the objective, rational and empirical basis of western science, an Aboriginal participant (A320) described a spiritual basis of TEK. This participant said that, “*the Elders have so much knowledge and in some cases they know more than science, ‘cause they get their teachings from a lot of different perspectives and sweat lodges where they directly communicate with the creator about natural resources and how they’re directed on how to act in accordance with the land*” (A320).

Differences in knowledge systems were also identified through participants’ perceptions of how knowledge can be accessed. For example, one person indicated that “*beneficial knowledge of forest biology...should be accessible or given to the forest company*” (S119), while other participants indicated that access to knowledge held by Aboriginal actors had to be earned (E22). Moreover, participants perceived knowledge of Aboriginal people being withheld due to a lack of trust and communication (I36, V15).

... The problem is Elders are afraid to trust, afraid to share ... they have huge amount of knowledge to share about how the forest looked preindustrial, how moose movement and caribou movement happened or how the fishes moved... But I think it’s being lost and I think it’s going to be lost very quickly. I think that’s why we’re all kind of panicking and worrying and trying to work, is that we need this... And I think a lot of what happened in the schools for the Aboriginals is, well that’s what’s caused a lot of the hurt, as well as other issues, but I think that’s what caused a lot of that information to be lost and not shared (I36).

In addition, several participants recognized the distribution of power or authority over forest resources was unequal (N117, V15), and government and industry participants identified unwillingness on the part of government and industry to alter the power structure by forfeiting or redistributing their own control (G313, G211, I113).

...there are a lot of opportunities for First Nations people to participate in debate on policies. In terms of co-management or actually allowing them the management responsibility I think there's far less...they are involved in discussions and debate more than they ever have been in the past, but I don't think we've seen any kind of situation where the provincial government is willing to relinquish power and to give an equal role in managing (G211).

...complete surrender of policy development by the province is not an option, but I think that the more we are influenced by First Nations that they will have more and more control on policy development in their specific areas – developing self government...(G313).

In addition to an unwillingness to change, government and industry participants also indicated that they interpreted new activities differently than Aboriginal actors. For example, an industry participant (I13) viewed employment opportunities as their way of sharing monetary benefits with Aboriginal people. In another case, a government participant (G110) perceived government and industry as viewing issues about forest management and Aboriginal people differently than Aboriginal people. This participant described these issues as forest management issues for government and industry, but government to government issues for Aboriginal people.

5.5 Discussion

5.5.1 Manitoba's forest policy regime follows a normal pattern of policy change

Interview participants indicated that change in Manitoba's forest policy regime occurred slowly and incrementally except in certain circumstances when new political parties or

government leaders intervened and made changes occur quickly. The general impression of incremental change in Manitoba's forest policy regime corresponds with the way patterns of policy change have been characterized in Canada's forest policy regime (Howlett and Rayner 1995) and government policy development in general (Howlett 2002). Normal policy change involves incremental changes that create long-term stability and promote the status quo (Howlett *et al.* 2009). However, the punctuated equilibrium model of policy change is also recognized as a common pattern, where stable periods of incremental policy making are disrupted and then a new system of incremental policy making is established (Baumgartner and Jones 1991). The transition period can be associated with atypical policy change, which involves significant deviations from the status quo, and is associated with the emergence of anomalous ideas and actors (Howlett *et al.* 2009).

Although incremental change was most commonly recognized in Manitoba's forest policy regime, indicating a normal pattern of policy change, new ideas and actors have both been recognized as part of the regime as well. Some of the new ideas in the regime include sustainable forest management, Aboriginal rights, Aboriginal involvement, public involvement and ecological preservation (chapter 4). New actors are associated with these new ideas and they include Aboriginal people and communities, stakeholder (interest) groups, ENGOs, NGOs, academics, and private woodlot holders (chapter 4). Furthermore, interest in SFM was expected to continue and become further embedded in the regime, and the role of Aboriginal actors was expected to increase and gain power in Manitoba's forest policy regime in the future. As indicated above, the presence of new

actors and ideas is associated with atypical policy change, indicating that atypical policy change had occurred or had the potential to do so in the future. Moreover, the impetus for change in Manitoba's forest policy regime was associated with exogenous forces that included the environmental movement outside of the province and even outside of Canada and changes in non-forest legislation such as *The Environment Act* (chapter 4). Additionally, constitutional changes that recognized Aboriginal and treaty rights were seen as increasing the role of Aboriginal actors in Manitoba's forest policy regime.

5.5.2 Resistance to change provided by institutional features of Manitoba's forest policy regime

Change in Manitoba's forest policy regime is likely to follow a normal pattern because this is the tendency of government policy development and the pattern that has occurred in the past. As well, incremental change is likely to continue because of the nature of the forest tenure structure and the policy network. In Manitoba, forest tenure is difficult to change because it is legislated through *The Forest Act*, and in fact the participants viewed the FMLs as having institutional strength and as being difficult to alter. Tenure has been identified as a forest subsector capable of withstanding pressure to change even when substantial changes occur in other subsectors like land use planning (Rayner *et al.* 2001). This suggests that forest tenure in Manitoba can be classified as a critical subsector. According to Rayner *et al.* (2001), critical subsectors have the potential to limit change even when significant changes have occurred in other subsectors. Furthermore, tenure arrangements in Canadian forest policy regime have been shown to limit change brought about by external forces, such as international pressure for environmental protection (Hagerman *et al.* 2010).

Additionally, the tenure structure was seen as a barrier to change because it fosters independence of the forestry regime from other regimes, such as agriculture, protected areas and Aboriginal and treaty land settlements. Independent regimes like this, in combination with clientelistic policy networks, can lead to ineffective integrated land use planning and management (Rayner and Howlett 2009). In fact, clientelistic policy networks, in Manitoba (and Alberta) have shown resilience and a resistance to changes toward integrated approaches to managing natural resources at regional scales (Rayner and Howlett 2009). Again, this is an artifact of the nature of clientelistic policy networks because these networks only involve one societal actor which happens to be industry, the relations are directed by the state (the provincial government), and these two actors form the policy network because their material interests are the same (Howlett 1995). In contrast, policy community members have similar concerns but exist outside of the policy network because their material interests differ (Howlett 1995).

Furthermore, tenure arrangements through *The Forest Act* have provided institutional support to the relationship between the provincial government and the forest industry. As a result, the tenure structure further obstructs change in Manitoba because it helps maintain the traditional role of the provincial government as the authoritative decision maker and it fosters its reactive and resistant approach to change. This resistance and reluctance to change was suggested by several participants' views of the provincial Forestry Branch. For example, with respect to forest certification a government participant did not perceive forest certification schemes as influencing government

policies. Moreover, another participant viewed the government as relying on forest certification to indirectly regulate forest activities. Corresponding with these views, Manitoba's forest legislation has not changed to account for certification standards, but certification standards do require the forestry companies to adhere to provincial forestry rules. In other words, it appears as though the provincial government has decided to sit back and allow forest certification schemes to do the work of improving forestry activities. This allows the government to continue to operate in a reactive manner while appearing somewhat proactive. On the one hand it can report about improvements forestry companies have made to forestry activities on Crown lands, while also maintaining traditional goals of industrial forest management through an absence of change to *The Forest Act* (chapter 4).

How the participants perceived the relationship between the provincial Forestry Branch and the forest industry supports the classification of Manitoba's forest policy network as "clientelistic". This type of network involves the provincial government directing policy development, as opposed to the case of a "captured" policy network in which policy development is dominated by the forest industry. These two types of policy networks characterize all forest policy networks in Canada (Howlett, 1995). Given that actors who have the same material interests form policy networks and given that there are only two actors in Manitoba's forest policy network, it shows that although the provincial Forestry Branch is the dominant actor (because it maintains decision-making authority) it is not an entirely autonomous actor. According to Pal (1992: 112; 2006: 252), the characteristics of a "clientele pluralist" network are that the "state agencies are both weak and dispersed, as

are associational systems. Agencies rely on associations for information and support and allow them to participate in policy making”. These characteristics are apparent in Manitoba’s forest policy network. Manitoba Conservation is divided into branches, one of which is forestry, and then forestry is dispersed further into units and these are further dispersed among central and regional forester positions. Moreover, the perceptions described above suggest that the provincial Forestry Branch and the forest industry are both viewed as weak actors. Furthermore, the forest industry was viewed as being involved in policy making and the mixed perceptions regarding forest certification suggest that it is viewed as assisting with government regulations not necessarily as influencing them to become more progressive.

5.5.3 Potential sources of tension that could lead to paradigmatic change

Paradigmatic policy change can occur when tension between the dominant actors leads them to open up decision-making networks by inviting in new actors to promote their interests (Howlett and Rayner 1995). In Manitoba’s forest policy regime, tension was identified between the forest industry and the provincial government. For example, the forest industry expressed frustration with the provincial government because of a perceived lack of direction provided by the provincial government and because forest certification standards were perceived as being more stringent than government policies. Furthermore, a forest industry participant indicated that PI initiatives had been imposed upon the forest industry by the provincial government. Tenure agreements were described as lacking the same degree of security they once provided because of increased recognition of Aboriginal and treaty rights, which has resulted in operating restrictions within FMLs. These types of concerns could escalate and potentially lead resilient

institutional arrangements, such as tenure agreements, to destabilize. However, these concerns between the forest industry and the provincial government may not be as disruptive as they appear. In fact, Howlett and Rayner (1995) argued that conflict within the policy network over material interests is part of regular policy processes and does not necessarily lead to significant change if the nature of the network provides some resistance to this type of change. However, certification schemes may serve as an external source of change that incites new ideas within the policy network that could lead to paradigmatic change.

Another concern identified was the lack of integration between forest tenure decisions and other resource sector policy regimes. The lack of integration was identified as leading to inappropriate designation and use of land, as well as obstructing the establishment of protected areas. With respect to Aboriginal and treaty land settlements, this lack of integration was further compounded by the complex nature of provincial, federal and Aboriginal constitutional jurisdiction over natural resources. The Indian Act is governed by the federal government, yet the province has the authority to “justifiably infringe” on Aboriginal rights for conservation purposes.

The current forest tenure structure lacks Aboriginal focused license arrangements and has been identified as a barrier to Aboriginal involvement because of large capital investment required for a FML. However, there are special allocations that can be accessed by Aboriginal communities, and areas within FMLs have been excluded from harvesting activities and set aside as areas of special interest for Aboriginal communities. Although

these arrangements favour industry and serve as a challenge for Aboriginal communities, they reflect an increased recognition of Aboriginal values and rights. They indicate how Aboriginal interests are becoming increasingly involved and also how the forest industry and government have an obligation to involve Aboriginal interests to an even greater extent. As noted above, industry actors indicated that an increased responsibility to engage Aboriginal actors shifted on to them from government and the increased presence of Aboriginal actors in Manitoba's forest policy regime have reduced the security that tenure arrangements once provided them. This concern has been compounded because the forest industry was also feeling pressured by economic instability. In the face of these challenges, resistance and backlash from the forest industry is anticipated by one industry participant. Tenure insecurity has been identified as a potential source of confrontation between resource users and those regulating resource use (Natcher *et al.* 2009). The potential for conflict is inflated as resources are depleted (Natcher *et al.* 2009). Furthermore, confrontation and backlash by industry could result in a breakdown in the stable relationship between government and industry, which is a potential source of paradigmatic change (Howlett and Rayner 2009).

There was also a perceived reluctance on the part of government and industry to redistribute control over forest resources to Aboriginal actors in order to balance unequal power distributions, which could serve as a source of tension for Aboriginal actors. Moreover, Aboriginal people were described as "landless", which inhibited access to contracting opportunities thereby limiting access to positive economic spin offs from forestry. Furthermore, PI opportunities were largely viewed as opportunities to provide

input, rather than to participate in decision making. These kinds of characteristics have led similar opportunities to be deemed unsatisfactory by Aboriginal people in other Canadian provinces (McGregor 2011). Furthermore, as Natcher *et al.* (2009) have pointed out, the potential for conflict arises if Aboriginal people continue to find themselves on the margins of land management processes, and it is thus “imperative that genuine efforts are made towards reconciliation”.

The results revealed considerable uncertainty surrounding the roles that Aboriginal people could have in Manitoba’s forest policy regime, but an increased role was highly anticipated. Manitoba currently exhibits several characteristics from the first two categories of Wyatt’s (2008) typology of Aboriginal forestry. Aboriginal people have largely been excluded, however government and industry actors have recognized the importance of their participation in forestry. Furthermore, there are opportunities for employment in the forest sector and access to forest resources, although systemic socioeconomic and political challenges prevent these from being fully used. Currently, there is an absence of Aboriginal FML holders in Manitoba, however short term licenses or special allocations have been awarded to Aboriginal communities. There have also been efforts made to work towards co-management. Manitoba Conservation has memoranda of understanding signed by the Western Region Tribal Council and Opaskwayak Cree Nation (Manitoba Conservation 2011). The latter agreement has become an Agreement for Joint Management of Natural Resources, the focus of which is consultation and communication (Manitoba Conservation 2011). Consultations and opportunities to provide input and traditional knowledge were identified in Wyatt’s (2008)

first two scenarios for Aboriginal forestry. There is evidence from Manitoba's forest policy regime that indicate these activities are occurring, however, these opportunities are not associated with any reallocation of authority or redistribution of rights. This makes it difficult to gauge how well Aboriginal information and interests will be incorporated into forest management and policy. Furthermore, it raises questions about reciprocity and potential opportunities for Aboriginal communities to guide and govern forest management and policy even in areas that are classified as a First Nations' traditional territory.

In addition, Manitoba exhibits some of the characteristics of the third category, forestry for First Nations, which involves slightly greater levels of Aboriginal control and access as well as more inclusion of TEK. The results revealed that TEK was acknowledged as a means of supporting western science, however participants also acknowledged cases where western science was used to validate TEK (chapter 4). This indicates there is still reluctance to accept TEK and the uniqueness of Aboriginal knowledge systems. The epistemological and linguistic differences between TEK and science-based knowledge that have been identified as an obstacle to the integration of TEK into forest management and policy (O'Flaherty *et al.* 2008; Sherry *et al.* 2005; Hawley *et al.* 2004) have not been overcome in Manitoba. This problem has likely been confounded by an emphasis on professionalism, which can serve to validate science-based resource management while discounting other management perspectives (Hawley *et al.* 2004).

Characteristics of Wyatt's (2008) final two scenarios, forestry by First Nations and Aboriginal forestry, are largely absent in Manitoba's forest policy regime. New forestry tenure systems have not been developed, and if co-management and joint ventures exist, equitable distributions of power and management responsibilities are limited or non-existent (Lemelin and Bennett 2010). As identified previously, TEK is only beginning to be acknowledged and incorporated, and it is not recognized on par with scientific knowledge for guiding forest management. Furthermore, the interests of First Nations are not dominant, nor do First Nations have any authority to make decisions about forest resource allocation or development.

5.5.4 Potential for paradigmatic change in Manitoba's forest policy regime

Although a normal pattern of policy change has been predominant in Manitoba's forest policy regime, it is not impossible for paradigmatic change to occur here. In fact, change has already taken place in the regime at different policy levels, e.g., instrument type, goals and objectives, as a result of different combinations of new and old actors and ideas (chapter 4). However, the forest institutions in the province and the clientelistic policy network have, thus far, been able to resist the right combination of new actors and new ideas that would ultimately change policy goals and forest legislation and have the greatest potential to lead to a transformative or paradigmatic shift in Manitoba's forest policy regime.

Given that external sources of change have been identified along with changes in policy objectives (chapter 4), it is plausible that "quasi-homeostatic" paradigmatic policy change has occurred in Manitoba's forest policy regime. This model of policy change occurs

when exogenous sources alter policy objectives rather than policy goals (Rayner and Howlett 2009) which is what occurs in homeostatic change (Howlett and Cashore 2009). This type of paradigmatic change may have occurred in Manitoba because changes in forest policy objectives have occurred, however changes in forest legislation have not (chapter 4). Forest policies have become more inclusive of multiple actors and multiple values (chapter 4). In fact, the most recent policy document, “*Next steps priorities for sustaining Manitoba’s forests*”, includes protecting forest ecosystems, increased opportunities for and partnerships with Aboriginal communities, and promoting a sustainable forest economy. However, *The Forest Act* has not changed to include any of the following words: sustainable, sustainability, Aboriginal, First Nation, ecosystem, ecology or environment, although improving social and economic well being was identified (chapter 4).

Another way paradigmatic change may occur in Manitoba’s forest policy regime is through cumulative incremental change in one direction (Cashore and Howlett 2007; Howlett and Cashore 2009). This is a plausible explanation for the way different stages of forestry involving Aboriginal actors may progress. According to Wyatt (2008) “forestry excluding First Nations” is already deemed unacceptable and based on Manitoba’s forest policies and activities the province has already surpassed this scenario as well. Following the forestry excluding First Nations Wyatt (2008) identified four more scenarios. In Manitoba, elements from the second and third scenarios were present and there is little evidence of elements from the last two scenarios. However, Aboriginal and First Nation involvement in Manitoba’s forest policy regime is expected to increase which could

result in a change towards the last two scenarios. Following this logic, cumulative incremental steps away from the status quo would lead to Wyatt's (2008) final scenario, "Aboriginal forestry", in Manitoba.

Paradigmatic policy change may also result from influence and interaction between the forest sector and other sectors. For example, when the forestry regime in Clayoquot Sound, British Columbia collided with the Aboriginal policy regime, significant changes occurred in the ideas, actors and institutions that were a part of governing forests in that area (Hoberg and Morawski 1997). For example, the focus shifted from a solely extractive forest industry to one that incorporates values such as environmental sustainability. Furthermore, Aboriginal people are involved in partnerships with government and industry through interim measures agreements and new institutions were established, such as the Central Region Board and the Scientific Panel for Sustainable Forest Practices. The intersecting sectors resulted in increased Aboriginal governance and forest management capacity (Hoberg and Morawski 1997).

As Aboriginal actors in Manitoba's forest policy regime become more involved and organized, they have the potential to instigate the type of changes that occurred in British Columbia. Given that Aboriginal involvement is expected to increase, there is potential for the level of conflict to escalate as well. As Aboriginal and treaty rights continue to be clarified, land settlements will increase. These can be time consuming and restrict access for both industry and Aboriginal actors. Both of these factors may lead to frustration and tension among government, industry and Aboriginal actors. Should significant conflict

emerge from these tensions, they could catalyze paradigmatic change by changing the clientelistic nature of the forest policy network.

5.6 Conclusion

This research focused on three policy actors in Manitoba's forest policy regime: the provincial government, the forest industry, and Aboriginal people. The objectives of the paper were twofold: to describe the relationships among these actors and to describe patterns and processes of change in Manitoba's forest policy regime. The goal was to determine if there is space or potential opportunity for new actors to enter the closed policy network and how likely it is that Aboriginal actors will penetrate the network. The patterns and processes of change along with the emerging role of Aboriginal actors helped determine the potential for transformative change in Manitoba's forest policy regime.

Change in Manitoba's forest policy regime has thus far followed a normal pattern of policy change where incremental steps are taken and it is likely that policy change will continue to follow this pattern. However, there is potential for paradigmatic change to occur. Paradigmatic change may occur when significant conflict among policy network actors causes them to invite new actors into the network to help them further their own interests (Howlett and Rayner 1995). Paradigmatic change may also occur when there is a change in policy goals caused by the presence of new ideas and actors and when a policy stability process is absent (Howlett and Ramesh 2002). Finally, paradigmatic change may also occur when cumulative, incremental steps away from the status quo are taken (Cashore and Howlett 2007; Howlett and Cashore 2009).

There is potential for Manitoba's forest policy regime to undergo transformative change if old actors create space for new actors or if old actors recognize the interests promoted by new actors. This is possible even though the relationship between the provincial government and the forest industry is institutionalized by the forest tenure structure, which provides stability and resistance to change. This is because the clientelistic nature of the policy network means that government is not autonomously strong, which could lead to dissatisfaction and efforts to implement structural changes. Industry participants in Manitoba's forest policy regime indicated they were frustrated with the reactive and resistant characteristics of the provincial Forest Branch and with additional responsibilities, to involve Aboriginal actors that were shifted to them by the provincial government. Moreover, the forest industry also expressed concern over decreased forest tenure security, which was associated with the increasing role of Aboriginal actors and potential conflict over land use. This type of frustration could lead to conflict which could cause either actor to invite new actors to help promote their own interests (Howlett and Rayner 1995).

The increased recognition of Aboriginal rights and interests by the provincial government could indicate that the government has already begun to involve Aboriginal actors in a way that could lead to a change in network actors. However, it could also be indicative of a venue shift whereby Aboriginal actors have promoted their interests and gained receptivity of them within the policy network. There is evidence from Manitoba's forest policy regime that Aboriginal actors are increasingly exercising their rights and

demanding more meaningful involvement in forest governance and management, distribution of resource benefits, and allocation of rights.

As Aboriginal actors become more involved there is the potential for cumulative, incremental changes away from the status quo to occur. These incremental changes could eventually lead to paradigmatic change. Furthermore, a continuously increasing role of First Nations in the regime could lead to the presence of new actors and new ideas at the same time, which could lead to changes in policy goals. A change in policy goals could lead to change in forestry legislation, which could transform forest institutions.

Currently, Aboriginal forestry has not evolved to its full potential in Manitoba. Fully evolved Aboriginal forestry would include new forms of forest tenure, equitable power distribution, equal recognition and inclusion of TEK alongside scientific knowledge, authority to make decisions about forest resource allocation, and for First Nations interests to be dominant (Wyatt 2008). Whether Aboriginal forestry fully develops or not remains to be seen, and along with this uncertainty there is potential for conflict regarding this eventuality. Conflict could emerge in the form of resistance from current power holders who would be required to relinquish control or in the form of resentment from trying to adopt or amalgamate different knowledge systems. It will be imperative to identify and resolve such conflict because the role and involvement of Aboriginal people in Manitoba's forest policy regime is expected to continue to increase.

5.7 References

- Baumgartner, F.R. and B.D. Jones. 1991. Agenda dynamics and policy subsystems. *Journal of Politics* 53 (4): 1044-1074.
- Burton, P.J., Messier, C., Weetman, G.F., Prepas, E.E., Adamowicz, W.L., and Tittler, R. 2003. The current state of boreal forestry and the drive for change. Chapter 1. In *Towards sustainable management of the Boreal Forest*, P.J. Burton, C. Messier, D.W. Smith, and W.L. Adamowicz, eds. Ottawa, Ontario: NRC Research Press.
- Cashore, B. and M. Howlett. 2007. Punctuating which equilibrium? Understanding thermostatic policy dynamics in Pacific Northwest forestry. *American journal of political science* 51 (3): 532-551.
- Hagerman, S.M., Dowlatbadi, H., and Satterfield, T. 2010. *Synthesis* Observations on drivers and dynamics of environmental policy change: insights from 150 years of forest management in British Columbia. *Ecology and Society* 5(1):2.
URL: <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol15/iss1/art2/>
- Hamersley Chambers, F., and T. Beckley. 2003. Public involvement in sustainable boreal forest management. Chapter 4. In *Sustainable Management of the Boreal Forest*. P.J. Burton, C. Messier, D.W. Smith, and W.L. Adamowicz, eds. Ottawa, Ontario: NRC Research Press.
- Hawley, A.W.L., Sherry, E. E., and C. J. Johnson. 2004. A biologists' perspective on amalgamating traditional environmental knowledge and resource management. *BC Journal of Ecosystems and Management* 5(1): 36-50.
URL: www.forrex.org/jem/2004/vol5/no1/art5.pdf
- Hessing, M., Howlett, M., and T. Summerville. 2005. *Canadian Natural Resources and Environmental Policy Second Edition*. UBC Press, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.
- Hoberg, G. and E. Morawski. 1997. Policy change through sector intersection: forest and aboriginal policy in Clayoquot Sound. *Canadian Public Administration* 40(3): 387-414.
- Howlett, M. 2002. Do networks matter? linking policy network structure to policy outcomes: evidence from four Canadian policy sectors 1990-2000. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 35(2): 235-267.
- Howlett, M. 1994. Policy paradigms and policy change: lessons from the old and new Canadian policies towards Aboriginal peoples. *Policy Studies Journal* 22(4): 631-649.

- Howlett, M. 2002. Do networks matter? Linking policy network structure to policy outcomes: evidence from four Canadian policy sectors 1990-2000. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 35(2): 235-267.
- Howlett, M. and B. Cashore. 2009. The dependent variable problem in the study of policy change: understanding policy change as a methodological problem. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice* 11 (1): 33-4.
- Howlett, M. and M. Ramesh. 2002. The policy effects of internationalization: a subsystem adjustment analysis of policy change. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice* 4: 31-50.
- Howlett, M., Ramesh, M. and A. Perl. 2009. *Studying public policy – policy cycles & policy subsystems*. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford university press.
- Howlett, M. and J. Rayner. 2001. The business and government nexus: principal elements and dynamics of the Canadian Forest Policy Regime. In M. Howlett (ed). *Canadian Forest Policy: Adapting to change*. pp. 23 – 64. Toronto, Ontario. University of Toronto Press.
- Howlett, M. and J. Rayner. 1995. Do ideas matter? Policy network configurations and resistance to policy change in the Canadian forest sector. *Canadian Public Administration* 38 (3): 382-410.
- Kimmins, H.P. (Hamish). 1991. The future of forested landscapes of Canada. *The Forestry Chronicle* 67(1): 14-18.
- Kimmins, H.P. (Hamish). 1995. Sustainable development in Canadian forestry in the face of changing paradigms. *The Forestry Chronicle* 71(1): 33-40.
- Lemelin, R. H. and B. Nathan. 2010. The proposed Pimachiowin Aki World Heritage Site Project: management and protection of indigenous world heritage sites in a Canadian context. *Leisure* 34 (2): 169-187.
- Manitoba Conservation. 2011. Aboriginal relations branch – goals, objectives and initiatives. URL: www.gov.mb.ca/conservation/arb/goals/index.html#current
- McGregor, D. 2011. Aboriginal/non-Aboriginal relations and sustainable forest management in Canada: the influence of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. *Journal of Environmental Management* 92(2): 300-310.
- McGurk, B., Sinclair, A.J. and A. Diduck. 2006. An assessment of stakeholder advisory committees in forest management: case studies from Manitoba, Canada. *Society and Natural Resources* 19: 809-826.

- Natcher, D. C., Hickey, C. G., Nelson, M. and S. Davis. 2009. Implications of tenure insecurity for Aboriginal land use in Canada. *Human organization* 8 (3): 245- 257.
- O’Flaherty, R.M., Davidson-Hunt, I.J., and M. Manseau. 2008. Indigenous knowledge and values in planning for sustainable forestry: Pikangikum First Nation and the Whitefeather Forest Initiative. *Ecology and Society* 13(1): 6.
URL: <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol13/iss1/art6/>
- Pal, L.A. 1992. *Public policy analysis: in introduction, 2nd edition*. Toronto, Ontario: Nelson.
- Pal, L. A. 2006. *Beyond policy analysis public issue management in turbulent times*. Toronto, Ontario: Nelson, a division of Thomson Canada Limited.
- Parsons, R. and G. Prest. 2003. Aboriginal forestry in Canada. *The Forestry Chronicle* 79 (4): 779-784.
- Rayner, J. and M. Howlett. 2009. Implementing integrated land management in western Canada: policy reform and resilience of clientelism. *Journal of Natural Resources Policy Research* 1 (4): 321-334.
- Rayner, J., Howlett, M., Wilson, J., Cashore, B. and G. Hoberg. 2001. Privileging the sub-sector: critical sub-sectors and sectoral relationships in forest policy-making. *Forest Policy and Economics* 2: 319-332.
- Reed, M.G. and McIlveen, K. 2006. Toward a pluralistic civic science?: assessing Community Forestry. *Society and Natural Resources* 19:591-607.
- Ross, M.M. 1997. A history of forest legislation in Canada 1867-1996 – CIRL Occasional Paper #2. Canadian Institute of Resources Law, Faculty of Law, The University of Calgary. Calgary, Alberta
- Sherry, E., Halseth, R., Fondahl, G., Karjala, M., and B. Leon. 2005. Local-level criteria and indicators: an Aboriginal perspective on sustainable forest management. *Forestry Chronicle* 78 (5):513-539.
- Sinclair, J. A., 2002. Public consultation for sustainable development policy initiatives: Manitoba approaches. *Forest Policy and Economics* 2: 319-332.
- Sinclair, John A., and D. Smith. 1997. Policy Review The Model Forest Program in Canada: Building Consensus on Sustainable Forest Management? *Society and Natural Resources* 12(2): 121-138.
- Wellstead, A.M. Stedman, R.C. and J.R. Parkins. 2002. Understanding the concept of representation within the context of local forest management decision making. *Forest Policy and Economics* 5: 1-11.

Wyatt, S. 2007. First Nations, forest lands, and “aboriginal forestry” in Canada: from exclusion to comanagement and beyond. *Canadian Journal of Forest Resources* 38: 171-180.

6 Overall conclusions and reflections

6.1 Major conclusions

The broad goal of this research was to understand the evolution of forest governance in Manitoba. There were three research questions. The first was how have the values and ideas that support public forest policies changed in Manitoba? Secondly, what has changed with respect to public involvement in forest policy decision making, particularly with respect to Aboriginal people? Finally, what new arenas of public action are emerging in Manitoba's forest policy regime?

Addressing these three questions individually is difficult because they are highly interconnected. For example, regarding the second question, part of what has changed with respect to public involvement is embedded in the broader idea of SFM, which was revealed in the answer to the first question. Despite the interconnectedness among the questions, changes in values and ideas will be dealt with first. Next, I discuss how certain norms, practices and ideas were resistant to change, including practices and ideas regarding public involvement. Third, I present the final conclusions on patterns of policy change and expectations for the future.

6.1.1 Changing values in Manitoba's forest policy regime

Numerous changes were identified in the values and ideas in Manitoba's forest policy regime. These changes mainly existed in the form of recognition and consideration of additional values, such as environmental and ecological protection, and consideration of sociopolitical values including increased opportunities for PI and Aboriginal governance.

Associated with these sociopolitical values there was also increased recognition and consideration of TEK, co-management and revenue sharing. The changes did not necessarily involve replacing old values with new ones, but the addition of new values alongside existing ones. Existing values guiding Manitoba's forest policy regime included sustained yield harvesting, deriving economic benefits from harvesting trees, and long-term, area-based tenure agreements between government and industry actors. Furthermore, these two groups were the dominant actors in Manitoba's forest policy regime, another reflection of existing values. Although these were the two dominant actors, many more groups have become involved in Manitoba's forest policy regime. This change supports the need to clarify the set of actors in the policy network and the set in policy community, and various interconnections among the sets. In Manitoba's forest policy regime, the provincial government and the forest industry make up the forest policy network because their interests predominate and they are involved in decision making and policy development. Other actors in Manitoba's forest policy regime include Aboriginal people, stakeholders, federal government, ENGOs, NGOs, RMs, Manitoba Agriculture and private woodlot holders. These actors are involved largely through an advisory capacity. They form the policy community because they have a specific interest in some aspect of forest policies and they have connections with the policy network actors, but they do not have authority to make decisions and their interests are not predominant within the policy network.

6.1.2 Absence of change in Manitoba's forest policy regime

Consideration of multiple values and involvement of multiple actors were seen in non-forestry legislation, non-statutory forest policies and to some degree in forestry activities.

Furthermore, participants' perceptions of change corresponded with these changes. For example, most participants identified a shift from SY or sustainable fibre towards SFM. Many described forest policies as inclusive of multiple objectives and forest values (e.g., aesthetic, recreational, intrinsic and economic) or they recognized a need to balance ecosystem protection with forestry activities. However, these changes were not evident in forest legislation. Modifications to *The Forest Act* since the 1980s have been limited. However, updating the Act was identified as a policy objective in a recent forest policy document and some amendments were made in 2009. These changes included prohibiting logging in most of Manitoba's provincial parks and revising some of the key definitions. The lack of change perhaps says more than the changes themselves. *The Forest Act* still does not include any of the following terms: sustainable, sustainability, Aboriginal, First Nation, ecosystem, ecology or environment.

Despite the limited degree of change that occurred in *The Forest Act*, changes have been both identified and perceived. However, there is some discrepancy over how these changes have unfolded or the degree to which change has actually been manifest in Manitoba's forest policy regime. For example, increased recognition and consideration of PI opportunities were identified, however these opportunities were mainly opportunities to provide input at the operational level, not to share in policy decisions, decisions about allocating resources, decision-making processes or as opportunities that fostered power sharing. PI opportunities were also described as processes that were dominated by government and industry, impenetrable, controlled in a top-down manner, time consuming, complex and overly technical. Doubts were expressed as to whether these

opportunities changed management practices or resulted in better-managed or more sustainable forests.

Additionally, the degree of perceived change in operations varied. Some participants identified changes, while others indicated changes in policy objectives had not been implemented and still others indicated that forest management had not improved.

Participants viewed a lack of protected areas within FMLs, increased annual harvesting levels, and greater emphasis on long-term employment as indications that change had not actually occurred although policy objectives may have changed on paper.

The limits of change regarding an increased presence and role of Aboriginal actors were also recognized. Aboriginal inclusion in decision making was described as inadequate and even non-existent, policy development processes in cooperation with Aboriginal actors were described as absent and so was the inclusion of Aboriginal actors in forest legislation. Associated with the limits of Aboriginal involvement in Manitoba's forest policy regime was recognition that inequality existed regarding the distribution of power or authority over forest resources, and that government and industry actors were unwilling to forfeit or redistribute their own control in order to alter the existing power structure. Furthermore, there was a reluctance to recognize and incorporate TEK into science-based forest management, which was associated with a lack of dialogue between knowledge holders and epistemological differences between western science and TEK.

The lack of change or limits of change are explained by institutional stability. Forestry institutions in Manitoba exist in the form of constitutional jurisdiction and provincial legislation. Constitutional jurisdiction provides the province with authority over natural resources within provincial boundaries and legislation in the form of *The Forest Act* upholds the forest tenure structure and sustained yield harvesting principles. Furthermore, these institutions solidify the relationship between the provincial government and the forest industry.

6.1.3 Patterns of change and expectations for the future of Manitoba's forest policy regime

Change in Manitoba's forest policy regime has been described as slow and incremental and it is largely expected to continue this way. These two descriptors are often associated with normal patterns of policy change. Atypical or paradigmatic patterns of change are not anticipated in Manitoba's forest policy regime. That being said, it is possible for this pattern to occur. Paradigmatic change is often associated with significant tension or conflict. Manitoba's forest policy regime is described as small, cordial, integrated, and as having a lack of high profile disputes. However, economic constraints experienced by the forest industry in Manitoba in conjunction with increased pressure to manage and operate in accord with ecological, environmental and social values has decreased the security the forest industry has previously been accustomed to. The forest industry has expressed frustration with the provincial government over the lack of policy change regarding certification and for transferring to them many of the responsibilities for the involvement of Aboriginal actors. The potential for this frustration to escalate is real as sustainable management practices are expected to improve and become more widely accepted and

the level of involvement of Aboriginal actors in forest policy decision making and management is expected to increase. However, there is also potential for paradigmatic change to occur in a different way.

For example, paradigmatic change can happen when a number of incremental changes occur in the same policy direction. In Manitoba's forest policy regime incremental changes could be made towards increasing the role of Aboriginal actors in forest management, forest policy development and ownership. Wyatt (2008) provided five scenarios characterizing the role of Aboriginal people in forestry, which serve to describe the type of incremental steps that could occur. Incremental changes, represented by Wyatt's (2008) first four scenarios, could lead to the final stage, Aboriginal forestry. Aboriginal forestry is indicative of a new paradigm, relative to the exiting regime in Manitoba, because it is characterized by institutions established by First Nations according to First Nations' interests and values. In Aboriginal forestry, First Nations would hold the right and responsibility to make final decisions, and forest management would be guided by both TEK and western science. Although Wyatt (2008) concluded that non-Aboriginal stakeholders would likely reject this type of forestry system if it were established too abruptly, an incremental progression might allow for wider acceptance. Incremental steps would allow the status quo and norms to shift gradually, making the eventual shift to Aboriginal forestry more easily and widely accepted.

7 Appendix A – Interview guide

Q1a. Tell me about your Current Position

Q1b. How does your current position lead you to contribute to the forest sector?

Q1c. How does your current position lead you to contribute to forest policies?

Q1d. How is your organization involved in the forest sector?

Q2a. Tell me about the major characteristics of Manitoba's Forest Policy Regime

Q2b. Would you say that Manitoba's forests are generally public or private?

Q2c. Do other forms of tenure exist in Manitoba? (Note: other forms of tenure may refer to community, co-management, co-jurisdiction, etc.).

Q2d. How important or significant are these other forms of tenure?

Q2e. Tell me about protected areas in Manitoba with respect to the amount of protected areas that there are?

Q2f. What are the main ways public forest resources are allocated?

Q3a. Tell me about the major objectives of Manitoba's forest policies

Q3b. What major steps are being taken to achieve these objectives?

Q3c. Have these objectives changed in the last few decades? If yes, how have they changed and when?

Q3d. Have you observed any other significant changes in the forest sector?

Q3e. Were changes in forest policies incremental or were they abrupt?

Q3f. What provoked these changes?

Q3g. Are Manitoba's forest policies flexible with respect to changing values/changing environment?

Q4a. Tell me about the role of different actors in Manitoba's forest policy framework

Q4b. Who are the principal actors that participate in defining forest policies?

Q4c. Who are the public and private actors? (Provincial vs. federal government, NGOs, ENGOs, First Nations)

Q4d. Have these actors changed in the last few decades?

Q4e. What roles does each of these actors play?

Q4f. What are the relationships amongst these actors?

Q4g. What mechanisms allow these different groups of actors to coordinate their actions/efforts?

Q4h. What role do transnational organizations (e.g. certification schemes) play?

Q4i. How do Aboriginal Peoples participate? Who are the actors that participate?

Q4j. Are there opportunities for NGOs to participate in developing forest policies? If yes, do these opportunities have a significant influence on the main policy objectives?

Q5a. Tell me more about the role of Aboriginal Peoples in Manitoba's forest policy framework

Q5b. Is there sufficient opportunity for Aboriginal People to participate in the development of forest policies?

Q5c. Are there difficulties associated with the inclusion of Aboriginal Peoples in forest policy development if yes what are they?

Q5d. Is there a place for traditional knowledge in forest policies? If so what is it? If not, should there be and what could it be?

Q5e. Are there decision-making opportunities for Aboriginal Peoples to participate in debate on forest policies? If yes, do these opportunities have a significant influence on public forest policies (on major objectives or on the way forest policies are applied)?

Q6a. Tell me about the role of regional and local actors regarding forest policy and forest policy framework

Q6b. What role do local municipalities play with respect to forest management?

Q6c. Are they asked to participate in debate on the definition of forest policies?

Q6d. How about implementation?

Q6e. What roles do the regional administrative actors (regional ministries; forestry, wildlife, etc.) play in forest issues?

Q6f. Are forest policies adapted according to regional differences? If yes, in what way?

Q6g. Are there any networks of collaboration between actors at the regional level?

Q6h. Are there decision-making forums for local and regional actors?

Q6i. What roles do these networks and opportunities play or offer?

Q6j. Tell me about the relationship between regional actors and provincial decision-makers?

Q6k. Do networks for regional collaboration cross-over provincial borders?

Q7a. Tell me about your perceptions of what is done elsewhere

Q7b. Do Manitoba's forest policies differ from other Canadian provinces? If yes how? And why is it so?

Q7c. Have forest policies in other provinces inspired any of Manitoba's forest policies? If yes, how?

Q7d. Have other provinces been inspired by any of Manitoba's forest policies?

Q7e. What impact, if any, do certification organizations have on forest practices and policies?

Q7f. What role does the federal government play in relation to forest policies (Canadian Forest Service, etc.)?

Q7g. What role does the Canadian Council of Forest Ministers play?

Q8. Where do you see forest policies in 20 years?

Q9. Would you like to add anything else concerning any aspect of forest policies?

Q10. Who else should I speak with?

8 Appendix B – Introductory letter to participants

Date

Name, Title
Office Number
Address
City, Province
Postal Code

Subject: Request for your participation in a graduate research project concerning change in Manitoba’s forest policy regime.

Dear Participant:

You have been identified as a primary actor directly involved in Manitoba’s forest policy regime and I would like to learn more about your perceptions of change in this topic area. I am a graduate student at the University of Manitoba in the Department of Environment and Geography. The purpose of my project is to explain the evolution of Manitoba’s forest policy regime from a governance centered perspective and to identify emerging areas of forest management. My project is part of a larger comparative study with three other Canadian provinces, Québec, Ontario and New Brunswick.

I would like to have the opportunity to discuss your perceptions of change in Manitoba’s forest policy regime because I feel your perspective is an integral component of this research project. It would take about 60 minutes and everything you say will be treated as confidential. I cannot guarantee anonymity due to the nature of the objectives (to learn the perceptions of the primary actors involved in Manitoba’s forest policy regime), but I can assure you that your name and title will never be included in any reports or publications resulting from this work, nor will your name or title be attached to any specific comments that you provide. Your involvement in this project would be entirely voluntary and you may withdraw at any time, and/or refrain from answering questions without any prejudice or consequence. You may also find it assuring to know that my research has been approved by the University of Manitoba, Fort Garry Campus, Joint-Faculty Ethics Review Board.

Please consider this request, as your participation would aid in the development of a better understanding of change in forest governance and emerging areas of forest management. I will contact you by July 15th, 2008 to confirm a date for our meeting. If you would prefer to contact me sooner, I can be reached by:
Telephone at (XXX)XXX-XXXX or email at XXXXXX

Thank-you for your time and consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Jodi Griffith
Department of Environment and Geography, University of Manitoba

9 Appendix C – Interview consent letter

Participant Consent Form

Research Project: Transformation in Governance: The Evolution of Manitoba's Forest Policy Regime and Emerging Areas of Forest Management
Researcher: Jodi Griffith, University of Manitoba Graduate Student
Project Advisors: Dr. Rick Baydack, University of Manitoba, Dr. Alan Diduck and Dr. Jacques Tardif, University of Winnipeg
Sponsors: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council

This consent form, a copy of which will be left with you for your records and references, is only part of the process of informed consent. It should give you the basic idea of what the research is about and what your participation will involve. If you would like more detail about something mentioned here, or information not included here, you should feel free to ask. Please take the time to read this carefully and to understand any accompanying information.

Description and purpose of the research

The purpose of this research is to explain the evolution of Manitoba's forest policy regime from a governance centered perspective in order to identify emerging areas of forest management. I will gather data by interviewing participants who represent the primary groups of actors directly involved in Manitoba's forest policy regime. Complimentary data will be gathered by reviewing documents set out by these groups of actors. The data gathered will be compared and integrated to provide a well supported narrative of changes in Manitoba's forest policy regime. This project is part of a larger comparative study with three other Canadian provinces, Québec, Ontario and New Brunswick.

How will you be involved?

You will be involved as a research participant in an individual, one-on-one interview/discussion about your perceptions of change in Manitoba's forest policy regime. The length of the interview will be approximately 60 minutes.

How will I record what you say?

I will be taking notes with a pen and paper, while recording our interview with a hand held audio recorder (Optimus, voice activation, 2 speed). I would like to use both methods to ensure that I accurately record your responses, but if you would prefer I will not tape record the interview.

Risks, confidentiality and benefits to participants

As the purpose of this project is to gain a better understanding of change in Manitoba's forest policy regime from a governance-centered approach, there will be a relatively small number of interview participants (approximately 20-25), all of whom are key actors in Manitoba's forest sector (from government, industry and community organizations). Within this context this group may be identifiable to others in the forest sector and I am therefore unable to guarantee anonymity. This means there may be some risk associated with your participation in the project. However, the risk is slight as all information that you provide will remain confidential. Your name and position will not be revealed at any time and information you provide will be generalized as much as possible to increase anonymity. In addition, your name or job title will not be attached to any specific comments that you make.

Further, confidentiality will be maintained as interview tapes and notes will be transcribed and entered onto my computer hard disk. Backup copies will be stored and will be inaccessible to anyone other than myself and my primary advisors (Alan Diduck and Jacques Tardif). Raw data will be destroyed when they are no longer required, likely upon completion of any subsequent reports or publications.

By participating in this research you will be able to assist in developing a better understanding of change in Manitoba's forest policy regime, the forces that are driving change and how these forces will influence future change in forest governance.

Feedback

I will review the interpretations of your responses with you prior to the inclusion of these interpretations in my final report. I will go over my final report with you and any information not approved by you will be excluded from the final report. You will receive a copy of my final report.

Your signature on this form indicates that you have understood to your satisfaction the information regarding participation in the research project and agree to participate as a subject. In no way does this waive legal rights nor release the researchers, sponsors, or involved institutions from their legal and professional responsibilities. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time, and/or refrain from answering any questions you prefer to omit, without prejudice or consequence. Your continued participation should be as informed as your initial consent, so you should feel free to ask for clarification or new information throughout your participation.

Researcher: Jodi Griffith (email)
Researcher's Advisor: Dr. Alan Diduck (email)

This research has been approved by the Joint Faculty Research Ethics Board. If you have any concerns or complaints about this project you may contact either of the above-named persons or the Human Ethics Secretariat at (204)474-7122. A copy of this consent form has been given to you to keep for your records and reference.

Participant's Signature

Date

Researcher's Signature

Date

10 Appendix D – Researcher’s personal reflections on biases and thesis process

Courses and conferences that shaped me

There are numerous influences that shaped me, and therefore my research. Obviously I am unable to recollect or reflect on every experience and interaction that influenced me and created my biases. Nonetheless, I have been shaped and I do have biases. The focus of this reflection is courses and conferences that helped me recognize some of these biases. Remember – these thoughts are based on my interpretations of my education and experiences.

The most basic influence was my education in biology and forest ecology from where I have come to understand that everything exists in systems. The systems are made of components that interact and these interactions change the components or transform the systems to which those components belonged. Although I started out in natural sciences with a dream to sit in trees and watch animals, I realized that animals are only part of the system. Alongside blood sucking mites and parasitic worms, humans also play a significant role in the same system. They’ve been responsible for both destroying and protecting animal habitat in every part of the world. Humans make decisions and rules about animals - how they should be studied, how they should be protected, what their value is, particularly in relation to the values humans place on other components within the system. Through my education I realized that humans play a significant role within the systems in which animals live and so my interests turned to understanding the role of humans in these systems. I learned that humans made decisions about the natural world and the decisions were not always made in the best interest of the natural world. In fact they rarely were. They are mainly made based on human held values. I also learned that there were some groups of people, particularly some Aboriginal peoples, who had strong connections with the natural world. Many of these connections were destroyed through European colonization and later rights were allocated to these people recognizing some of the connections they had with the natural world. However, Aboriginal people did not inform these rights. The rights were awarded by people who did not have the same connections or have a full understanding of those connections. By the end of my

undergraduate degree I knew I had a very limited understanding of natural sciences and there was essentially an endless amount of information I could learn in any given field within a discipline like ecology or biology. I decided I wanted to learn more about humans in these systems and how their interactions change outcomes. An opportunity to learn more about the role of humans transpired. I was accepted to the Department of Environment and Geography graduate studies program at the University of Manitoba. Two professors, Jacques Tardif and Alan Diduck agreed to let me work on this project and two others, Stephan McLaughlin and Rick Baydack agreed to join my committee. Together all four would work together in an advisory capacity to guide me through this process and to review and evaluate my work.

Almost instantly I was overwhelmed! What did I know about governance? I'm the girl that wanted to sit in trees and watch animals. Through a social research methods course I learned that there were different epistemological and ontological philosophies that guided natural science and social science as well as data collection methods used in both of these fields. These differences explained rifts between students in different fields that I had recognized but not understood. I also related these philosophical differences to why a project with a social science basis appealed to me for my Masters work. I am continuously confronted with biases that I have from an education in natural sciences and even though I know so little about natural sciences I'm always shocked when I find out about accepted and expected ways of doing things within other disciplines.

Through other courses, readings and discussions, I focused on the complex nature of environmental resource management, how science has at times been an inadequate management tool with respect to ecological systems and how the interconnectedness between politics, economic interests, and science have hindered progress in this field. This type of progress would involve greater transparency, accountability and inclusiveness. I found this information fascinating and surprising. I guess most of all it taught me that I was not critical or skeptical enough – I took things at face value, I was naïve. I think I still am, but more cynical. I am continuously surprised by new information and by how biased I am.

There was also a focus in this class on research associated with Aboriginal communities and efforts being made to improve relations in research and resource management. Furthermore, there was recognition, consideration and genuine interest for understanding how Aboriginal peoples viewed the world and how this differed from the way relationships with people and the natural world were understood by scientists and resource managers and people like me. Again my narrow interpretation of all of this is that systems are made of components that affect other components and outcomes through actions. Furthermore, interactions need to be understood and respected. Disrespect of system components and interactions can lead to breakdowns in the system, which further affect all of the components and interactions and alter outcomes.

As a key component of learning about the role of Aboriginal people in research and resource management, I was also exposed to the term traditional ecological knowledge (TEK). During my entire undergrad of 140 credit hours I can only think of two courses that addressed TEK. I was also made aware that TEK taught in university courses is rarely done from the perspective of indigenous people. All of this awareness of inappropriate interactions with Aboriginal people raised concern about how I conduct my research. I have family members who are Aboriginal and I lived in northern Manitoba for a number of years as a child, and therefore it felt strange to all of a sudden be worried about how I interacted with Aboriginal people in my research. I guess it goes hand in hand with the fact that most of what I have learned about Aboriginal history I learned in university from non-Aboriginal people. I have learned about marginalization, unequal distribution of power, difficulties with cultural and spiritual preservation and loss of language, as well as recognition of Aboriginal and treaty rights, comprehensive land claims, TEK, consultation and revenue sharing.

I was also exposed to the issue of scientific misconduct. All of this information made me question how I had been influenced to think a certain way through my undergraduate degree. I felt irritated that I was unaware of this. I realize being naïve and not questioning the foundations of my education is partially my fault and responsibility. However, maybe

it is a fault of education systems. Maybe research methods courses or at least the philosophical underpinnings of natural science and social sciences and humanities should be a mandatory course or part of a degree. Perhaps it should be a requirement of all students to understand the differences. Then again maybe this information does exist and I just missed it.

The last thing I am going to mention about these classes is my introduction and experience with action research. A fellow student and I had the opportunity to teach our class about action research. We decided to teach them by actually attempting to conduct a mini action research project. Research participants, i.e., other classmates, were involved in the initial phase of the research, which meant that they were involved in shaping the research project. The issue we identified was that as graduate students we essentially felt like we were isolated and unaware of resources to help us through the process of graduate research. As a result of this exercise, we agreed to form a “grad club”. There were a number of us that met on a regular basis for close to a year. We would take turns discussing where we were at in our research and what kinds of troubles we were having. Students who were farther along would share their experience and advice. Although the research aspect of it was not continued, the exercise had an impact. A number of students I spoke with felt the group was beneficial. However, it unofficially disbanded after approximately a year. The experience introduced me to a qualitative research method, it gave me the opportunity to see that research could lead to positive outcomes and it also gave me a chance to see how a group of people could come together over a common interest or goal. Furthermore, it gave me an opportunity to be a part of these group interactions and to connect and create friendships with other graduate students. The group provided an awesome support network.

In addition to these courses, I was also influenced through conferences that gave me the opportunity to learn about a range of issues related to forestry and forest governance. I was particularly drawn to presentations and discussions on tenure reform, public involvement, Aboriginal forestry and associated considerations, such as Aboriginal and treaty rights, land claim settlements, TEK, revenue sharing, and unequal distribution of

power. I had the opportunity to be in a break out session with George Hoberg, Peggy Smith and Harry Nelson. Our group was to focus on a future scenario for Aboriginal involvement in forest tenure. I remember the comment being made that we needed to make suggestions that were realistic. I remember being surprised at this comment and thinking that if it was possible to identify or discuss ideas that were opposite of the status quo surely a break out session at a conference would be the forum to push the limits on ideas. I thought it should be possible to start with a scenario that is so far from the status quo and discuss what would need to change for these scenarios to occur. I guess this is partly why I thought another conference on scenario planning was an excellent opportunity. This time I was in a group with all Caucasian males many of whom were at least 50 years of age. Furthermore, the group mainly consisted of men from industry, government and a university professor. Our main task was to “suspend our disbelief” in order to discuss a number of different scenarios. It seemed like a difficult task for many of the participants. Again I had the same feeling – if we cannot think “outside the box” in this type of forum how could changes ever be made. I guess the thing is that everyone has their own interests and these may be difficult to protect in a group of people who interact regularly trying to pursue those interests. It is possible that if one was to let their guard down or think outside the box or acknowledge others’ interests they may be taken advantage of.

Thesis process

One of my biggest lessons about writing a thesis has to do with the way I work. I tend to want to learn it all and never feel like I know enough. I also do not want to exclude anything or overlook anything and I tend to think everything is important. I can also be indecisive. Therefore, what I really needed to do was make decisions and focus my work. I needed to focus my literature review by making criteria for the literature topics and the amount of literature pertaining to each topic. I still needed to be aware of other research I came across and perhaps keep track of that for review at a later time if necessary. Once I collected my data I needed to apply this approach to my data by deciding upon the most important topics and putting the rest aside. This would have allowed me to deal with a focused type and amount of literature and corresponding data. Writing would have been a

less daunting task because the information would have been limited and focused and easier to integrate. After forming a clear argument I could have added to it.

Another struggle I had was I found I was continuously trying to validate my analysis by adding numbers to it – which I found frustrating because I chose to use qualitative data collections methods. Another frustration was the software I chose to conduct my qualitative analysis. I think because I did not fully understand the ins and outs of N-Vivo I gave up using it because I expected it to do way more than what I could get it to do and at the same time it may not even be capable of doing what I had expected it to do.

Apparently my erroneous expectation is a common mistake. I was somewhat relieved when I came across this excerpt from Rubin and Rubin (2005, p. 243) on computer programs:

A search for counts and associations among concepts (something that the software facilitates and that takes little experience on the part of the researcher) might gradually replace the thoughtful analysis necessary to qualitative theory building. In the responsive interviewing model, analysis is not about how many times a concept or theme appears, but the strength of the evidence on which those themes and concepts depend and on the importance of the concepts and themes in building a theory. Computer programs are not set up to do these things, and you should not expect them to.

My final comments on my thesis process relate to the knowledge I have gained about public policy and governance. For the most part I had little understanding of these two areas when I began. Taking a historical view of Manitoba's forest policy regime allowed me to see that changes have occurred in the ways that forests are managed and the ways policies are made. Although I think there is still room for greater involvement and participation in forest management and policy development or at least debate about this, I can see that Manitoba's forest policy regime has progressed from government to governance at least to a degree. Would I say that these changes have been paradigmatic? No. I would say that some important changes have been made. Government and industry are aware of pressures to operate better in terms of environmental protection and social considerations. To some degree they have acted on these pressures and made improvements. However, participatory management and policy development processes as well as accountability and transparency surrounding these processes could still be

improved. The system is complex is my biggest conclusion I suppose. I do not feel that a degree in forest ecology, biology, and working on this project has provided me with enough information to be able to say conclusively that forests are managed well enough. I feel there is room for improvement on this front. However, I am more aware of the complex and interconnected constraints within which forest managers and policy decision makers operate.

11 Appendix E – Characterization of major forest eras

Decade	Forest policy development in Manitoba ¹	Provincial forest legislation in Canada ²	Evolution of Canadian resource and environmental policy ³	Historical pattern of the development of Canadian forestry ^{4*}	A history of Boreal forestry ^{5*}
Pre-1870	Unregulated exploitation (pre-1872)	Unregulated exploitation (ended in latter part of 19 th century)	The era of revenue generation (1800-80)		
1870	The regulation for profit and revenue enhancement era (1872 to 1906)	Regulation for revenue era (mid to late 19 th century) <i>Same as Howlett and Rayner (1995)</i>	<i>Government control over natural resources and stumpage fees</i>	Administrative paradigm <i>Laws, regulations and management objectives</i>	Administrative stage of forestry <i>Same as Kimmins (1991; 1995)</i>
1880	<i>Tenure, harvest licenses, stumpage fees</i>		The conservation era (1880 – 1950) <i>Concern over extraction rates and long-term security, tenure, parks and forest reserves</i>		
1890					
1900					
1910	The conservation era (1906 to 1952) <i>Large-scale forestry, incentive based tenure arrangements, forest protection through fire suppression, forest inventory and natural regeneration</i>	Conservation era (early to mid-20 th century) <i>Same as Howlett and Rayner (1995)</i>			Scientific forestry <i>Sustained yield timber production, utilitarian multiple use, site-specific (ecosystem based)</i>
1920					
1930					
1940					
1950	The timber management era (starting in 1952) <i>Government efforts to regulate timber supply, creation of management plans, shift from volume to area based tenure arrangements, artificial regeneration, recognition of</i>	Forest management era (mid-20 th century to late 1980s) <i>Same as Howlett and Rayner (1995)</i>	The management era (1950 to the present) <i>Secure resources, conservation, increased environmental activity and protection, government more involved in environmental regulation, complex environmental legislation and</i>	Ecological “scientific” paradigm <i>Recognition of ecological constraints, sustain multiple values</i>	
1960					
1970				Social paradigm <i>Increased social</i>	Modern Era <i>Biocentrism, growing demand for public</i>
1980					

	<i>additional forest resources</i>		<i>administration</i>	<i>pressure to protect nature, biodiversity, old growth forests, ecosystems, and aesthetic and spiritual forest values</i>	<i>participation and landscape design (manage forests over large spatial scales and long time frames)</i>
1990		<p>Sustainable forest management era</p> <p><i>Recognition of multiple forest values and functions (ecological and social), long-term sustainability of forest ecosystems, increased demand for inclusive participant in forest management and decision making processes</i></p>		<p>Emerging ecocentric paradigm</p> <p><i>Environmental protection provides the base value and as a cumulative secondary value all other values (social, cultural and ecological) must be considered in balanced</i></p>	
2000					
2010					

¹ Adapted from Howlett, Michael and Jeremy Rayner. 1995. Do ideas matter? Policy network configurations and resistance to policy change in the Canadian forest sector. Canadian Public Administration 38(3): 382-410

² Ross, Monique, M. 1997. A history of forest legislation in Canada 1867 – 1996. Canadian Institute of Resources Law. Calgary, Alberta.

³ Hessing, Melody, Howlett, Michael, and Tracy, Summerville. 2005. The institutional context: The Canadian Constitution, Aboriginal Rights and International Agreements Affecting Resources and the Environment. Chapter 3. *In* Canadian natural resource and environmental policy second edition. UBC Press. Vancouver, British Columbia. Canada. Pp. 53-100.

⁴ Kimmins, J.P. (Hamish). 1991. The future of the forested landscapes in Canada. *The Forestry Chronicle* 67 (1): 14-18 and Kimmins, J.P. (Hamish). 1995. Sustainable development in Canadian forestry in the face of changing paradigms. *The Forestry Chronicle* 71 (1): 33-40.

⁵ Burton, et al., 2003. The current state of boreal forestry and the drive for change. Chapter 1. *In Towards Sustainable Management of the Boreal Forest. Edited by P.J. Burton, C. Messier, D.W. Smith, and W.L. Adamowicz.* NRC Research Press, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada. Pp. 1-40.

* The timeline associated with information from Kimmins, 1991; 1995 and Burton et al., 2003 was not identified by these authors rather it was based on similarity of characteristics with the authors from ^{1, 2,} and ³.

12 Appendix F – Participants’ views of Manitoba forest policy objectives

Objectives identified by interview participants											
		Revenue Generation	Rural economic development	Job creation	SY *	SFM **	Environmentally friendly forestry activities	Forest & ecosystem protection	PI ***	Aboriginal involvement ****	Balance multiple values *****
Interview participants	A1					X					
	A2					X	X		X		X
	A3										
	C							X			X
	E1					X				X	X
	E2					X					X
	E3					X			X		
	F					X					
	G1				X	X		X			
	G2				X	X					
	G3	X			X			X	X	X	
	I1			X			X				
	I2					X	X	X			
	I3				X	X		X			X
	I4	X			X	X		X	X	X	
	I5			X			X				
	I6										
	I7				X						
	N1				X						X
	N2				X						X
	P1										
	P2	X	X			X					
	PG										X
	S1				X						
	S2										
	S3					X					
	V1	X	X								
	V2		X					X			X
VS				X			X		X		
Total		4	3	2	10	13	4	8	4	4	9

*SY = Sustained Yield. An additional objective included in this heading was maintaining a perpetual fibre supply

**SFM = Sustainable Forest Management. Additional objectives included in this heading were sustainable development, sustainability, or maintaining resources for future generations

***PI = Public Involvement. Consultation was also included with this heading

****This heading also included integrating First Nations and Aboriginal people into resource sharing, capacity building, and respecting traditional forest use

*****This heading also included balancing planning with environment (sustainable forest management), triple bottom line (economic, environmental, and social values), Two pillars; Sustained yield (ensure future wood supply) and accommodate other values, wise use of natural resources for the benefit of all Manitobans, and Ecosystem protection and (compatible) forestry activities; Aesthetic, recreational, intrinsic and economic values

13 References

Adamowicz, W.L. and P. J. Burton. 2003. Chapter 2. Sustainability and sustainable forest management *In* P.J. Burton, C. Messier, D.W. Smith and W.L. Adamowicz (eds.). Towards sustainable management of the Boreal Forest, pp. 41-64. NRC Research Press, Ottawa.

Bannatyne, B. B. and J. T. Teller. 1984. Geology of Manitoba Before the Ice Age. Chapter one *in* Natural Heritage of Manitoba Legacy of the Ice Age. J. T. Teller. Manitoba Museum of Man and Nature. Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Ballhorn, R. 2005. The role of government and policy in sustainable development. *International Journal of Sustainable Development Law and Policy (JSDLP)* 1(1): 19-27.

Baumgartner, F.R. and B.D. Jones. 1991. Agenda dynamics and policy subsystems. *Journal of Politics* 53 (4): 1044-1074

Beresford, H.E. 1953. Early Surveys in Manitoba. MHS Transactions Series 3, Number 9, 1952-53 season.

<http://www.mhs.mb.ca/searchresults.shtml?cx=010615179535509863828%3A7zow4hyr79w&cof=FORID%3A11&q=french+explorers+in+manitoba&sa=Search#936>.

Last accessed January 10, 2010.

Bryman, A., and J.J. Teevan. 2005. Social research methods: Canadian edition. Oxford University Press, Don Mills, Ontario.

Cashore, B. and M. Howlett. 2007. Punctuating which equilibrium? Understanding thermostatic policy dynamics in Pacific Northwest forestry. *American journal of political science* 51 (3): 532-551

Corkery, M. T. 1996. Geology and Landforms of Manitoba Chapter 2 *in* The Geography of Manitoba: Its land and its people. The University of Manitoba Press. Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Creswell, J.W. 2003. Research design qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches second edition. Sage publications Inc. Thousand Oaks, California.

Creswell, J.W. and D.L. Miller. 2000. Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into Practice* 39(3): 124-130.

Doern, B.G. 1993. From sectoral to macro green governance: the Canadian Department of the Environment as an aspiring central agency. *Governance: An international journal of policy and administration* 6(2):172- 193.

- Dube, Y.C. and F. Schmithusen. 2007. Cross-sectoral policy developments in forestry. Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 Rome, Italy.
- Friesen, Gerald. 1984. *The Canadian Prairies: a history*. University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario.
- Government of Manitoba - Manitoba Conservation. 2005. *Manitoba Conservation Annual Report 2004-2005*.
- Government of Manitoba (a). 2007. Demographics Ch. 1 *In* *Aboriginal Peoples in Manitoba 2000*. [online]. Access at <http://www.gov.mb.ca/ana/apm2000/1/b.html> Last accessed April 17, 2008.
- Government of Manitoba (b). 2007. *Aboriginal and Northern Profile*. [online]. Access at <http://www.gov.mb.ca/ana/community/profile.html> Last accessed April 17, 2008.
- Government of Manitoba – Manitoba Conservation Forestry Branch. 2006. *Five-Year Report on the Status of Forestry April 2001-March 2006*.
- Gulbrandsen, L.H. 2003. The evolving forest regime and domestic actors: strategic or normative adaptation. *Environmental politics* 12(2): 95-114.
- Hall, P.A. 1988. *Policy paradigms, social learning and the state Keynesianism across nations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hessing, M., Howlett, M., and T. Summerville. 2005. *The Institutional Context: The Canadian Constitution, Aboriginal Rights, and International Agreements Affecting Resources and the Environment Chapter 3 in Canadian Natural Resources and Environmental Policy Second Edition*. UBC Press, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.
- Hoberg, G. and E. Morawski. 1997. Policy change through sector intersection: forest and aboriginal policy in Clayoquot Sound. *Canadian Public Administration* 40(3): 387-414.
- Hogg, P. W. 2006. *Constitutional Law of Canada Student Edition 2006*. Thomson and Carswell. Scarborough, Ontario.
- Howlett, M. 2001. Chapter 1. Introduction: Policy regimes and policy changes in the Canadian forest sector. *In* M. Howlett (ed.). *Canadian Forest Policy Adapting to Change*, pp. 3-20. University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
- Howlett, M. 2002. Do networks matter? linking policy network structure to policy outcomes: evidence from four Canadian policy sectors 1990-2000. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 35(2): 235-267.

- Howlett, M. and B. Cashore. 2009. The dependent variable problem in the study of policy change: understanding policy change as a methodological problem. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice* 11 (1): 33-4.
- Howlett, M., Ramesh, M. and A. Perl. 2009. *Studying public policy – policy cycles & policy subsystems*. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford university press.
- Hjern, B. and D.O. Porter. 1981. Implementation structures: a new unit of administrative analysis. *Organization Studies* 2(3): 211-227.
- Hogg, P. W. 2007. *Constitutional Law of Canada* 5th edition. Thomson/Carswell.
- Hunter (Q.C.), J. J.L. 2009. *Disappointed Expectations: Why Delgamuukw Has Failed to Achieve Results on the Ground in Aboriginal Law Since Delgamuukw*. Morellato (Q.C.), Maria. Canada Law Book. Aurora, Ontario.
- Jackson, J. A. 1970. *The Centennial History of Manitoba*. The Canadian Publishers. Toronto, Ontario.
- Loughlin, J. 2004. The “transformation” of governance: new directions in policy and politics. *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 50 (1): 8-22.
- Luckert, M.K. and F.J. Salkie. 1998. Forestry in Canada: Transitions and emerging policy issues. *Canadian Public Policy* 24 (s.s. 2): S1-S10.
- Manitoba Conservation. 2011. Forestry Branch forest management. [online]. Access at http://www.gov.mb.ca/conservation/forest/manageme/fml_crown.html Last accessed on May 7, 2011.
- Manitoba Conservation. 2006. *Five-Year Report on the Status of Forestry April 2001 – March 2006*. Manitoba Conservation Forestry Branch. Winnipeg, Manitoba.
- Manitoba Conservation. 2001. *Five-Year Report on the Status of Forestry 1996-2001*.
- Milward. B.H. 1982. Interorganizational policy systems and research on public organizations. *Administration & Society* 13(4): 457-478.
- Milward. B.H. and K.G. Provan. 2000. Governing the hollow state. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 10(2): 359-379.
- Morton, W.L. 1967. *Manitoba: a history*. University of Toronto Press. Toronto. Ontario.
- Natural Resources Canada (NRCAN). 2011. *Canada’s forests - stats profile – key facts*. [online]. Access at <http://canadaforests.nrcan.gc.ca/statsprofile/keyfacts> Last accessed May 7, 2011.

- Nelson, J.G. 1991. Research in human ecology and planning: an interactive, adaptive approach. *The Canadian Geographer* 35(2): 114-117.
- Nicholson, B.A. 1996. Late Prehistoric and Protohistoric Settlement and Subsistence in Southern Manitoba, Chapter 5 *in* *The Geography of Manitoba*. Edited by J. Welsted, J. Everitt and C. Stadel. The University of Manitoba Press, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada. Pp. 65-78.
- Pal, L. A. 2006. Beyond policy analysis public issue management in turbulent times. Nelson, a division of Thomson Canada Limited. Toronto, Ontario.
- Pettipas, L.F.1984. The Paleo-Indians of Manitoba. Chapter 7 *in* *Natural Heritage of Manitoba Legacy of the Ice Age*. J. T. Teller. Manitoba Museum of Man and Nature. Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.
- Rametsteiner, E. and M. Simula. 2003. Forest certification – an instrument to promote sustainable forest management. *Journal of Environmental Management* 7: 87-98.
- Rayner, J., Howlett, M., Wilson, J., Cashore, B. and G. Hoberg. 2001. Privileging the sub-sector: critical sub-sectors and sectoral relationships in forest policy-making. *Forest Policy and Economics* 2: 319-332.
- Rhodes, R.A.W. 1996. The new governance: governing without government. *Political Studies* XLIV: 652-667.
- Robinson, J. 2004. Squaring the circle? Some thoughts on the ideas of sustainable development. *Ecological Economics* 48: 369-384.
- Rubin, H.J. and I.S. Rubin. 2005. *Qualitative interviewing the art of hearing data* second edition. Sage Publications Inc. Thousand Oaks, California.
- Skogstad, G. 2000. Globalization and public policy: situating Canadian Analyses. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 33(4): 805-828.
- Smith R. E., Velhius, H., Mills, G.F., Eilers, R.G., Fraser, W.R. and G.W. Lelyk. 1998. Terrestrial Ecozones, Ecoregions, and Ecodistricts, An Ecological Stratification of Manitoba's Natural Landscapes. Technical Bulletin 98-9E. Land and Resource Unit, Brandon Research Centre, Research Branch, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Winnipeg, Manitoba.
- Sneddon, C., Howarth, R. B., and R. B. Norgaard. 2006. Sustainable development in a post-Brundtland world. *Ecological Economics* 57; 253-268.
- Stevenson, M. G. and J. Webb. 2003. Just Another Stakeholder? First Nations and Sustainable Forest Management in Canada's boreal forest. Chapter 3 *in* *Towards*

Sustainable Management of the Boreal Forest. *Edited by* P.J. Burton, C. Messier, D.W. Smith and W.L. Adomowicz. NRC Research Press, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada. Pp. 65-112.

Stoker, G. 1998. Governance as theory: five propositions. UNESCO ISSJ 155: 17-28.

Teller, J. T. 1984. The Ice Age and Its Legacy. Chapter two *in* Natural Heritage of Manitoba Legacy of the Ice Age. J. T. Teller. Manitoba Museum of Man and Nature. Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Tellier, P.M. 1989. Public Service 2000: The renewal of the public service. Canadian public administration 33(2):123-132

Tembec, 2010. Tembec shuts down permanently its Pine Falls newsprint mill. [online]. Access at <http://www.tembec.com/public/Salle-de-presse/2010-09-02.html?Count=9&isRecent=fals>
Last accessed June 3, 2011.

Tolko Manitoba. 2009. Summary of Meeting – The Pas – Proposed Tolko annual operating plan 2010-2011. [online]. Access at <http://www.tolkomanitoba.com/AOP.htm>
Last accessed June 3, 2011.

United Nations. 1987. UN Documents Our Common Future, Chapter 2: Towards Sustainable Development.[online] Access at <http://www.un-documents.net/ocf-02.htm>
Last accessed May 2, 2011.

Van Kooten, C. G. and I. Vertinsky. 1999. Introduction: Framework for Forest policy Comparisons Chapter 1 in Forest Policy International Case Studies. Edited by B. Wilson, G.C. Van Kooten, I. Vertinsky and L. Arthur. CABI publishing. New York, New York.

Whitcomb, E. A. 1982. A Short History of Manitoba. Canada's Wings Inc. Stittsville, Ontario, Canada.

Wilson, C.A. 2000. Policy regimes and policy change. Journal of Public Policy 20(3): 247-274.