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The paper examines the relationship between rural development strategies and tourism in two Canadian communities from 1975 to 2000. Concentrating on these case studies, the paper utilises a political economy approach to consider the forces leading to tourism having been positioned as a saviour in local economic development, and makes links between this and overarching ideological changes within the globalising capitalist economy. As capital cements its latest form through the withdrawal of the state and the extension of the consumption, service-based economy, tourism is naturalised as an appropriate policy response to rural development problems. The response of local governing structures to this era of political and economic restructuring can be seen as a move towards establishing a new regime of accumulation based upon the service industry. It is argued that the actions of the local state cannot be considered without a reflection upon the broader political economy; tourism is presented as a policy option that is part of a more general response to the changing place of rural areas in the continental and global economy. The paper contributes to a growing literature addressing strategies of tourism promotion within the context of economic development as four dimensions are presented: rationale, responsibility, execution, and content.
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Introduction

Tourism is one facet of rural community development strategies gaining rapid support as a viable and attractive method for generating economic growth. Indeed, it has become a worldwide phenomenon that is growing exponentially and, in the words of Butler et al., ‘… has been hailed as a panacea for rural development for thirty years’ (1998: xi). Travel to rural areas, while an important component of tourism in the past, is enjoying remarkable growth with trends such as ecotourism and agri-tourism lighting the way for tourists (especially urban residents) to have a pristine and peaceful rural experience. Confronted with declining natural resource bases as well as economic restructuring, rural communities are embracing this interest. Tourism is ever more promoted as an effective tool for rural development in the face of the challenges wrought by economic globalisation and restructuring.

In light of the increasing credence given to tourism as a rural economic ‘propellant’, it is no surprise that academic attention in this area has also grown dramatically. As much research has shown, tourism is becoming a popular component of development strategies in rural areas (Blank, 1989; Butler et al., 1998; Lewis, 1998; Marcouiller, 1997; McKay, 1994; Mitchell, 1998; Reid et al.,
With this increased attention, however, has come a burgeoning awareness that tourism development in rural areas creates serious impacts and therefore must be considered carefully by policy makers (Kneafsey, 2001; Lewis, 1998; Reid et al., 2004). As Marcouiller describes:

In rural areas, tourism has become an important public policy issue because of limited development options, increased public expenditures for promotion, increased local pressures for resultant public services, increased conflict among user groups, and general concerns over societal costs and benefits of public support for tourism development. (Marcouiller, 1997: 337)

At a broader level, authors such as Harvey (1989, 2000), Marchak (1991), and Todd (1996) describe the solidification of the neoliberal ideology into the public discourse of economics, growth, and development. A particular image or definition of globalisation, couched in the rule of the market, is shown by these authors to be actively fostered in policy language and programmes dealing with the conundrum of generating economic development opportunities. This particular discourse has also come to dominate the arena of local economic development. As Benington and Geddes’ assessment (1992: 456) of local economic development strategies throughout the 1980s contends:

A feature of market-led neo-liberal economic strategy during the 1980s has been a shift away from policies of support for declining industries to explicit or hidden support for growth sectors. This has involved either the active promotion, or at least passive acceptance, of the shift away from manufacturing toward the service and consumption sectors. In relation to local economic development this orientation has been reflected in the restructuring of many local economies previously dependent on primary or manufacturing industries.

Hall and Jenkins (1995) are among those working to identify the implications inherent in this new hope placed in service and tourism as it reflects a difference in the overall expectations about state responsibility and helps the state move from its past role of protecting its citizens from the vagaries of capitalism (the welfare state) to providing opportunities for profit generation and economic development (the entrepreneurial state). Hopkins (1998) also identifies this trend in the Canadian context:

Post-industrial restructuring has compelled [sites] to exploit and promote local tourist attractions . . . in an attempt to minimise, halt or reverse economic decline induced by collapse or contraction in more conventional, manufacture-based sectors. In Canada, funding cuts, the lessening of the welfare state and the prevailing market-driven policy stance of the governing bodies have also encouraged local townships, counties and municipalities to market themselves to investors and consumers alike. (Hopkins, 1998: 66)

For those concerned with tourism, authors such as Marcouiller (1997; see also Joppe, 1996; Reid, 2003) argue that the economic growth focus of those who encourage tourism has placed insufficient emphasis upon determining whether
tourism strategies are feasible for the communities and areas in question. Marcouiller criticises the ‘non-integrative’ nature of most tourism planning in rural areas, which inevitably concentrates on marketing and promotion, as ‘overly myopic’, contending that the domination of business development and economic growth concerns will influence the goals of tourism development and planning to the exclusion of others (Marcouiller, 1997: 341).

The conflation of tourism and economic development in rural areas is also reflected in a growing body of international research. For instance, Hall and Jenkins (1998) delineate the forces at work to influence the formation of rural tourism and recreation policies, arguing that the social and economic goals of rural development have not been adequately integrated. Cawley et al. (2002) assessed the potential for tourism development, particularly niche marketing, in rural Ireland as part of a response to deeper changes in production patterns and economic development opportunities. Canan and Hennessy (1989) provide a critical assessment of tourism development in Moloka’i Hawaii, arguing that the language of tourism promotion has crowded out other considerations of other economic development opportunities in the area. Faulkner and Walmsley (1998) point out that tourism figured early in globalisation and restructuring in Australia and reflects changes wrought by the increasingly blurred distinction between economic, social, and cultural commodities. Kearsley (1998) investigated the changing context for tourism development in New Zealand and highlights the economic challenges facing that nation, from the beginning of economic restructuring in the 1970s to the removal of agricultural subsidies after which, he argues:

It seemed to many small communities that only tourism was left as a viable course of jobs and community income. Consequently, many farms attempted to set up tourist ventures, local authorities tried to encourage local festivals and events and many individuals attempted to set up small enterprises such as fishing, guiding or local tours. (Kearsley, 1998: 83)

Saeter’s (1998) work in Norway questioned not whether tourism was being used as part of rural development strategies, but if the enthusiasm expressed for it by local politicians and regional planners was warranted given the lack of a clear understanding of just what the benefits are. Hall’s (1991) edited volume of studies investigating the growth of tourism in Eastern Europe reflects the beginning of a surge of concern, balancing the promise with the threat of tourism for newly restructured and privatising economies. Finally, while not specifically attending to rural issues, Williams and Montanari (1995) make a direct connection between the crises brought on by economic restructuring and the growth of government interest in tourism and service-sector development in Europe.

Thus, tourism must be seen as a contested component of these greater forces of rural change. In the case studies presented below, an effort is made, not to evaluate the efficacy of these policies, but to analyse their underpinnings and to interrogate the ideological assumptions upon which they are based. It is argued that the connection between tourism and economic development is being encouraged by governments at all levels (primarily, in this case, the provincial and municipal) as well as media and industry. Moreover, it is being crafted in a particular way not necessarily concerned with meeting an existing demand but with creating events and attractions that may generate demand and thereby
stimulate economic growth. The same language that permeates the discourse around such broad ideas as economic policy and globalisation is being brought down to the local level, espoused by editors in the local media, industry, and politicians. The looming threat of competition, inefficiency and economic slow down are presented to communities as their most powerful members are convinced that tourism should comprise a significant part of their economic development strategy.

Therein lies the conundrum. If tourism is known to cause problems in rural communities, and yet it is still increasingly encouraged as a development strategy, what can be done? House (1997) makes the distinction between those who seek to reform the tourism industry in such as way as to mitigate its problems through management, and those who seek to restructure the industry by understanding and challenging the forces that construct it as an ideal development strategy. The research presented here falls into the second camp. Concentrating on two case studies, the paper outlines forces working to portray tourism as a saviour for local economic development and the rationalisations thereof. It seeks to make linkages between this characterisation of tourism and overarching changes within the global capitalist economy as influenced by neoliberal ideological assumptions about the role of the state in economic development. As global capital continues to cement its form through the withdrawal of the state and the extension of the consumption-oriented, consumer-based economy, tourism is naturalised as an appropriate policy response to rural development problems. Moreover, the position of most rural areas as peripheral to the growing global economy leads to their construction as leisure/consumption spaces for urban populations. Understanding how communities respond to these challenges, however, is not a simple task. The paper also considers how the biophysical endowments of a rural community, as well as its political-economic history, are important factors in determining how tourism is adapted into particular community development strategies.

The issues at stake are obvious: development policy makers in many Canadian rural communities and elsewhere are turning to tourism as a quick fix; a relatively benign way to generate growth and development in the face of restructuring. Given the increasing credence afforded to tourism within government and community planning, this situation demands investigation.

The paper is divided into five main sections. First, a brief review of the literature addressing both economic globalisation and late capitalism helps to contextualise the discussion of rural tourism development. Also included in this section is a consideration of the main tenets of regulation theory; a useful framework for beginning to understand this situation. Second, the methodological underpinnings of the study are highlighted to delineate the approach to the research and the case selection process. After a brief overview of the structures of government relationships in Canada, the next section outlines two in-depth case studies discussing the evolution of tourism planning and policy in Paris, Ontario and Grand Manan Island, New Brunswick, Canada, from 1975 to 2000. It is argued that the growing penetration of late-capitalist logic into the lexicon of rural growth strategies, as manifested in tourism development, is the result of a ‘trickle down’ of the neoliberal agenda through the various levels of government.
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This agenda works to frame questions of rural growth and development and, more importantly, how rural areas can respond.

In the fourth part of the paper, the promotion strategies undertaken in the cases are discussed and are presented as having four interrelated dimensions: rationale, responsibility, execution and content. These dimensions are compared and contrasted across the cases in an effort to contribute to our growing understanding of not just the role and importance of tourism promotion and supply development in rural communities but the ideological assumptions that fortify them. Further, the particular cases are compared to illustrate the different ways that this logic has been adapted in each so as to point to the importance of context-specific assessments of rural development in this era. The bio-physical base and the particular political economic history of the communities are put forward as factors shaping rural responses to changes under globalisation as well as what forms tourism takes as a strategy. Last, a concluding section aims to clarify how these findings can contribute to tourism studies as well as to point the way for new questions about the role of tourism in economic development and late capitalism in other areas.

The Policy-making Context: Framing Tourism as a Response to Political Economic Change

It should be noted that the connection between global shifts and rural change is not a new topic of investigation. Indeed, rural sociologists, political economists and geographers have long debated not just the impact of changes at the global level, particularly economic, upon rural areas, but also the extent to which social theory has been able to adequately capture and enhance our understanding of these changes (see, for instance, Goodwin et al., 1995; Hoggart & Paniagua, 2001; Marsden, 1999). Nonetheless, a consideration of economic growth strategies in rural areas in two Canadian provinces cannot be undertaken without an appreciation of Canada’s changing position in the global economy from the mid-1970s until the end of the research period.

The term ‘globalisation’ refers generally to the increasing interconnectedness of economic, political, social and cultural practices worldwide. As Giddens writes, however, the term globalisation is ‘much bandied about but as yet only poorly understood’ (1994: 4). Many works addressing the nature of this era of globalisation have traced the economic effects of the changes it has wrought. Put crudely, these economic effects include: reductions of trade barriers; shifts in production and distribution; an alteration of the division and structure of labour and the meaning of work; increased trade in finance; and a flexibility in consumption patterns and the orientation of production to the whims of consumer demand (Bienefeld et al., 1993; Drache & Gertler, 1991; Daniels & Lever, 1996; Korten, 1999; Lash & Urry, 1987, 1994; Winson & Leach, 2002). Ever capricious, capital (both industrial and financial) exerts pressure on public policy formation within nations and communities as they seek to create the conditions necessary to attract (or re-attract) it. While the growing economic connections understood as globalisation are not new, the recent, dramatic changes in technology, namely communication and transportation, are undoubtedly ushering in a
much more intensified phase of social, political and economic relations (Sassen, 1998, 2001).

In one of the most comprehensive investigations into the processes by which the ideological underpinnings of this current form of economic and corporate globalisation has taken hold in Canada, Marchak (1991; see also Bradford, 2004; Teeple, 2000), although writing at a time of great flux and social change, pinpoints succinctly the ideological forces working to create the current manifestation of globally integrated economies. She connects the decline in America’s post-World War II hegemonic position through events such as the OPEC oil embargo and environmental and social limits to the growth of industrialisation to the subsequent ‘threats’ to American economic dominance. This development, Marchak argues, was central to creating a space for the rise of the ‘new right’, a cadre of economists and business elite. Highlighting their success at understanding the opportunities presented by this situation, and being able to position themselves as leaders in pushing for a certain kind of economic and social change, the author traces their evolution.

It is possible to sketch the development of the neoliberal ideology from the 1970s as a political movement determined to attack the welfare state that had emerged from the rebuilding of the post-world war period (Marchak, 1991). The role of ideology in this process, she claims, cannot be underestimated as, ‘the messages of the new right became vital carriers for the restructuring of the 1970s and 1980s’ (Marchak, 1991: 10). Incorporated into these messages has been the development of a vocabulary and a discourse around which questions of economic change were increasingly situated:

In what appeared to be a sudden and spontaneous development, business leaders and politicians around the world began using a whole new vocabulary to explain the recession of the early 1980s and to promote a new agenda. They said that government had undercut healthy entrepreneurship through its interference in the free market. The new vocabulary included ‘privatisation’, ‘deregulation’, ‘downsizing’, ‘restraint’, and ‘special export zones’. ‘Free trade’ and ‘free enterprise’ took on a new urgency and a more extreme meaning. ‘Democracy’ lost its lustre, and became associated with complaints about excessive and unrealistic expectations.

(Marchak, 1991: 930)

Bradford (2004: 245) also identified the growing support for this ideology in Canada:

... the business community, through the research and mobilisation of the BCNI [Business Council on National Issues], actively supported the paradigm. Under its leadership, regional and sectoral tensions within Canadian business over macroeconomic policy were replaced by a unity of purpose defined by neoliberal restraint and liberalisation.

While the structure of the relationships between the various levels of government in Canada is discussed in more depth below, global economic relations and how they are played out in the history of Canadian development and international relationships is important for this consideration of its rural communities. In studies by political economists, attention was drawn to the fact that Canada’s
history of economic growth has been based upon the provision of natural resources or staples (generally semi-manufactured or raw), to foreign countries in return for more value-added (i.e. manufactured) products in an inherently unequal relationship (Drache & Gertler, 1991; Krahn & Lowe, 1988; Teeple, 2000; Williams, 1994). The dependence of Canada’s small communities upon natural resources (agriculture, forestry, fisheries, mining) left them vulnerable to change on both the supply and the demand side of the economic exchange relationship. Thus, the natural resources with which Canada enters into international trade agreements (particularly with the United States and Pacific Rim economies) places rural communities in a position of continual insecurity. Indeed, Canada’s position as primarily a reserve of natural resources for the American industrial engine encouraged a kind of development policy practised throughout the research period and left much of Canada with its resources extracted but also relatively ‘untouched’ in terms of industrial development. It was also vulnerable as it tried to generate employment in both non-industrial areas as well as those places, particularly in central Canada, where there had been a protected industrial development strategy until the onset of the Free Trade Agreement and subsequent trade relationships. When the recession hit the American economy in the early 1980s, Canada’s economy was altered dramatically.

Subsequently, the role of government policy, local or otherwise, in generating economic growth and development under these changing conditions is an important factor for any consideration of tourism development. As Benington and Geddes (1992: 455) point out, this context is ‘the battle of ideas within the wider socioeconomic and political environment within which local policy is formulated’. Governments may be involved in stimulating economic growth directly in terms of providing funds for service provision, or creating the infrastructure necessary for development, or, and as is the case most recently, they may be involved much more indirectly in their capacity to set the stage whereupon business activities, and, presumably, economic development, can take place. Whether and how the government acts, then, is subject to a myriad of factors and influences.

In an oft-quoted paper, Harvey (1989) marks the shift in state activity in the 1980s from managerialism to entrepreneurialism. Complete government disengagement is not yet politically acceptable as the state apparatus still has to provide public services, however minimal. The relationship between government, business and its citizens, then, is being recodified into a public-private partnership (Harvey, 1989) with many decisions being made at the local level. Wolfson and Frisken (2000), in their analysis of urban municipal government responses to global economic changes, make important points about the changing role of municipal governments. The actions of national governments within the web of the global political economy, the authors argue, are mediated through a changing role for municipal governments. The mobility of capital and resulting increased competition, as noted earlier, has led to more spatially (perhaps regionally) and less nationally focused efforts at attracting industries. Further, Wolman and Spitzley (1996) assess the ‘politics of local economic development’ and argue that there are four interrelated reasons that have been offered to explain the relative surge in economic development activity at the local level: the mobility of capital and resulting increased competition; slowed economic...
growth and even decline in some national economies since the 1970s; international economic restructuring and the decline of traditional employment opportunities; and cutbacks in government aid at upper levels. Each of these factors works alone or in concert to both create an atmosphere of uncertainty as well as to put pressure on local officials and policy makers to do something, even something symbolic, to address the situation. Wolfson and Frisken (2000) suggest that this has given municipal governments a new responsibility for attracting capital and investment as the nation state no longer is seen (or sees itself) as the strongest actor in this process. These authors, however, see the other side of the ‘rationale’ for this shift in responsibility as it manifests itself in terms of increased municipal responsibilities in the face of cuts in transfer payments and other funding support. This function is directly relevant to rural communities as they are deeply affected by these changes. Moreover, as the discussion of the cases below will reveal, the kind of connection developing between the changing role for the local state and the neoliberal free market ideology suggests that the market is not so free. Indeed, the state is involved at the local level, if in particular ways and to serve particular functions.

Reflecting the importance of the state in this role, there is a growing literature addressing the ways that rural community governments approach policy formation, not to mention efforts to link these discussions to broader considerations of the global political economy. For example, Barnes and Hayter (1992; see also Cox & Mair, 1988; Graham et al., 1998) who, in their analysis of a rural community in British Columbia, Canada, struggling to generate jobs and growth in response to corporate restructuring, provide an examination into the ways space and location can work to attract both tourism and high-end capital investment. Their work illustrates the importance of place and geography to the process of capital accumulation as it is created and recreated over time. Goodwin and Duncan (1986) use the term ‘servicing capital’ to describe the efforts of communities to attract industries through lowered taxes and other mechanisms that might make them more attractive, in the hope that, ‘footloose plants will locate in their particular area, that existing ones will expand, that new firms are generated, and that this will increase employment and regenerate the local economy’ (Goodwin & Duncan, 1986: 18–19).

Any understanding of the shifts in local government responsibility must be contextualised, and theorised, with an overall appreciation of how relationships between the levels of government are recreated over time. Insights from regulation theory can help us to investigate how the supply side of tourism has been influenced in this era; most notably how the language of tourism development has taken on the mantle of encouraging economic development in an attempt to re-establish a stable regime of accumulation. Regulation theory, particularly the work of Jessop (1997) and others, through concepts such as hegemonic projects and accumulation strategies, can help to provide an understanding of what is happening. While work in this field is arguably most often attributed to national considerations, primarily industrial growth, it is possible to extend the reach of the theory to understand attempts at tourism development in rural areas.

Regulation theory or the regulation school (Aglietta, 1979; Boyer, 1990; Lipietz, 1987) is an attempt to explain the creation and re-creation of the structures of capitalist economies over time. Lauria suggests that regulation theory
emerged from a critique of Marxist structuralism, asking, ‘if the logic of capital accumulation is so strewn with (strong) contradictions, how has it survived so long?’ (Lauria, 1997: 5). Part and parcel with considering regulation theory and its contribution to this research must be a discussion of its underlying assumptions regarding the current era of capitalist relations.

Regulation theorists consider not only the economic dimensions and forces of capitalism but also the social, cultural, and political aspects that are used by those in power as they construct their dominance in the capitalist system. As Lauria points out, ‘[r]egulation theory attempts to construct a historically and geographically grounded account of capitalism’s development’ (Lauria, 1997: 6). The notion of regimes of accumulation is used by regulation theorists to delineate the phases of stability and crisis of profit accumulation through which capitalism moves; the latter inevitably arising from the period of stability by virtue of the contradictions inherent in capitalism (e.g. wages versus purchasing power, creative destruction) and resulting in the efforts of capitalists (essentially transnational capital) to engender another period of stability. In particular, the regulation school has been concerned with investigating the ways in which capitalism has realigned and redefined itself after the economic crises of the 1970s. This transformation has been delineated as a movement of capital out of what is commonly understood as Fordism (a regime of accumulation as it was a stable period of relatively uninterrupted economic growth, within the West at least) through a period of great uncertainty and restructuring through to the current era of ‘post-Fordism’ or ‘neo-Fordism’. Notably, this includes a shift in government from a period of relatively centralised regulation and administrative control to a somewhat different, more governance-oriented role. While many have considered the production changes under the so-called post-Fordist shift, namely flexible specialisation and demand-oriented production systems (see, for instance, Lash & Urry, 1987, 1994), Macleod (1999) suggests that this post-Fordist era has been characterised as having a number of features relevant to the structure of government, including: an increased role for local and regional stakeholders in fostering economic development; an increase in the influence of local business elites upon public policy formulation and implementation; and a more ‘speculative’ political arena that manifests itself as a reimagining and commodification of place. These works help to form the conceptual foundations upon which the study highlighted below was built and are revisited in the concluding section.

Methodology

This paper is based upon doctoral research undertaken in two rural communities in Canada from 2001–2003. The overarching goal of the research was to examine the relationship between rural development strategies and tourism in policies created between the years 1975 and 2000. As the literature reviewed above makes clear, the mid-1970s was a time of rapid change both in the rural economies of North America but also in terms of the development of what can be understood as corporate or economic globalisation. The time period was thus chosen to reflect this era of dramatic change. As will become clear in the discussion of the research findings, the selection of the cases for analysis was also delib-
erate. One community, Grand Manan Island, is located in the province of New
Brunswick, on the economic and geographic periphery of Canada. The other
community, Paris, is located in what is commonly understood to be the economic
and political core of the nation: the southern region of the province of Ontario. As
is described in more detail below, the core–periphery relationship underscores
much of Canadian economic development opportunities and endeavours
(McCann, 1987); thus, an investigation of the role of tourism in the framing of
these opportunities required the selection of two very different cases. It should
be noted that, had a third or another case been selected, for example a community
from the Prairie region of Canada or the west coast, the analysis would look quite
different (see, e.g. Fennell & Weaver, 1997). The purpose of the research was to
compare the trends identified in these two vastly different communities and to
consider the role of social theory in explaining their similarities and differences.
The map of Canada (Figure 1) shows the location of the cases in relation to the rest
of the country.

Figure 1 Map of Canada
Using a case-study approach influenced by critical and constructivist paradigms, this primarily inductive analysis used local and provincial policy documents, in-depth qualitative interviews, participant observation and newspaper reports, as ways to illuminate both the trajectory of, and the justifications for, the use of tourism as a rural development tool in two communities. While the world can be known only as we construct it from the meanings that we give it, those meanings are affected by unequal power structures, as well as relationships of domination and oppression. Thus, the task of social critique is undertaken here as well as the goal of identifying opportunities for alternative paths that can transcend the powerful structures shaping social life.

The decision to use a case-study approach allowed for a focus on the ‘why’ and ‘how’ research questions (Yin, 2003) and for an analysis that, as Epstein (1967) has suggested, could focus on describing and critiquing social processes as they fit into the larger social world. In addition, the analysis was designed to answer a call from tourism researchers for this kind of approach (Hall & Jenkins, 1995). To garner a sense of the acceptance of tourism as a mechanism for rural growth and development, government policy documents (e.g. reports, minutes of council meetings) as well as local newspapers from 1975 to 2000 were analysed. To add depth to these sources, semi-structured qualitative interviews were conducted with community members involved in tourism or community economic development activities. In addition, participant observation was undertaken in each location on many occasions over the research period.

An underlying assumption of this research is that government activities and policies work to structure or set the parameters within which economic development options are framed at the local level. While this is not an evaluation of the success or failure of those policies, the work undertaken here adds to the growing effort to consider critically the forces influencing the framing of particular economic development policies (see, for instance, Benington & Geddes, 1992; Reese & Fasenfest, 2004; Wolman & Spitzley, 1996). In order to consider the trajectory of economic development and tourism in two Canadian rural communities, one must look also at the provincial level. This approach is supported by Papson, whose research on tourism policy in the provinces of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island in Canada led him to argue the need to consider provincial policies carefully:

While the federal government is important in providing a national strategy...it is too distant from local tourist areas to play a major role in tourism development. The provincial government is the most active body in tourism development. Its role cannot be underestimated in developing the tourist sector. (Papson, 1981: 224)

The next section introduces the case communities. Before this introduction can be made, however, a brief consideration of the larger context of intergovernmental relations in Canada can help set the stage for the rest of the analysis.

The Cases

Since Confederation in 1867, intergovernmental relationships within Canada have been the result of often tense struggles for independence and control of
social life from natural resources, health care and education, to economic development. While each of the 10 provinces and three territories must deal with the federal government, particularly in terms of financial support, each is relatively independent in most matters, for example, education and many aspects of economic development. However, the levels of economic development throughout the nation are vastly disparate. Among the reasons for this situation, as Stevenson (2004) describes, is the varying endowment and economic value of the natural resources across the country, as well as different economic structures, investment ties and relations with other nations, and industrial development opportunities. Moreover, these relationships have been subject to change over time, part of the context within which tourism development must be considered.

As Vojnovic and Poel (2000) identify, the 1990s brought about an era of fiscal downloading from the national to the provincial to the municipal governments throughout the country. The authors note that while economic pressures of this decade helped encourage these fiscal reforms, a new, entrepreneurial-led approach to generating economic growth and management was taking hold. The fiscal downloading from the federal government led to a fundamental shift in the relationship between the provinces and the local, municipal governments as the costs of and responsibility for service delivery were reallocated to the local arena (Vojnovic & Poel, 2000; see also Bradford, 2004; and Sancton, 2000). This is not to say that there have not been attempts at the federal level to generate opportunities for rural development in the face of restructuring nor that they have been without problems. The Canadian Rural Restructuring Foundation (1996) outlines the increased complexity, the tendency to specialise in one primary economic activity, growing economic instability and continued marginalisation of rural areas throughout the country. In a contribution to the Canadian Royal Commission on Renewing and Strengthening our Place in Canada (2003), Blake describes the history of rural development policy in Canada, beginning with the interventionist stance developed in the 1930s designed to address directly the question of regional disparity and rural poverty. It is useful to quote him at length as he considers the shifts into the more recent hands-off approach to governing:

The first rural and regional development strategies focused on increasing productivity in farming and fishing in an attempt to raise incomes and, hence, living standards in such areas. By the mid-1960s, the focus had shifted to encouraging the urban-industrial and manufacturing model in underdeveloped areas. More recently, the emphasis has shifted yet again to the development of local capacity through the ‘training’ of leaders and improving the social capital to enhance the social capacity of a region so that it can find its own solutions to its own problems. Rural development specialists and policy-makers are now all talking about ‘prosperity of place’.

Blake argues, however, that this new policy approach must be placed along a long and relatively unsuccessful series of attempts to address the conundrum of rural development. As is made clear in the discussion below, tourism fits well with this new approach to solving the problems of rural development.
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Paris, Ontario

The provincial policy context

Ontario might best be described as the centre of industrial power for the country. With nearly 42% of Canada’s industrial output and 38% of its population (Bone, 2002), Ontario is undoubtedly part of Canada’s core. When discussing the provincial context of Ontario, however, it is important to keep in mind the great diversity within the province. As the community of Paris is located in southern Ontario, much of the analysis presented here concentrates on this region, an area that houses the bulk of industrial production and 75% of the provincial population (Bone, 2002). The eastern and particularly northern parts of the province are more isolated and have less population and industrial production. The bio-physical base of southern Ontario, located in the region known as the Great Lakes-St Lawrence Lowlands, is blessed with some of the most fertile and accessible land in the country. Permanent settlement in this region began in the early 1800s and by the middle of that century, an industrial core was burgeoning in response to a series of government policies, like the National Policy of 1879, designed to protect an infant manufacturing base. As a result of these policies, Ontario is a very wealthy province in relation to the rest of the country. The vast majority of the population, about 6 million people, live in or near Toronto, in the so-called Golden Horseshoe region. For this consideration of Paris’s tourism development, this is significant as the community is within a two-hour drive of the largest population concentration in the country as well as being relatively close to the United States border. Figure 2 illustrates both the size and settlement concentration of Ontario.

Since the late 1970s, an opening up of what were otherwise relatively well protected manufacturing industries led to intense competition from American and international producers and pushed Ontario to undergo a period of severe economic restructuring. Trade liberalisation agreements and organisations like the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the North American Free Trade Agreement and the World Trade Organisation have challenged Ontario’s manufacturing base and forced it to redesign its relationship to the global economy. Attention is increasingly focused upon creating a place for the province in the service economy, of which tourism is a growing part.

An analysis of Ontario’s tourism and economic development policy materials from the mid-1970s to the early 1980s revealed a concern with monitoring the impacts of tourism development as well as increased efforts to quantify those impacts (primarily economic). For instance, reports measuring who was coming to the province and how much they were spending proliferated in this period. The period from 1975 to 1980 was one of growing awareness of tourism’s potential and includes a move by the government to make a concerted effort at measuring and reporting the impact of tourism on the provincial economy and, in particular, its potential role in alleviating regional disparities. The ability of tourism to affect many areas of departmental responsibility is reflected in the development of TORPS (Tourism and Outdoor Recreation Plan Study Committee), a multi-departmental research project established in this period to measure the impact of, and identify new opportunities for, tourism and recreation developments.
During the 1980s, however, tourism policy language took a different tone. Tourism was increasingly referred to as the ‘sunrise industry’ and its role in generating economic development opportunities in otherwise economically stagnant areas was touted. For instance, the 1984–85 Annual Report outlines the relationship between tourism and economic development in poorer regions:

The less developed regions of Ontario tend to benefit more from the employment and income generated by tourism expenditure than would be expected from their population size. The considerable local impact of tourism expenditure allows outlying regions to share in the growth and prosperity of the province in a way that other industrial expansions generally do not afford. (Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Recreation, 1985: 10)

In addition, the impacts of the burgeoning global economy are not lost on those concerned with engendering development in this period. Primarily concerned with competition and the need to develop ‘world class’ events and
facilities, a study released by the Ministry in June 1984 entitled *The Economic Impact of Tourism in Ontario and Regions* outlines the need to compete on the global tourism playing field and indicates that a certain kind of tourism, primarily large scale and private-sector based, is to be encouraged. Discussion of the $44 million Canada-Ontario Tourism Development Plan (under the federal-provincial Economic and Regional Development Agreement), for instance, and its role in stimulating the construction of large-scale tourism facilities, is couched in the tone of encouraging private-sector involvement in order to compete with other nations:

To expand its share of the competitive world tourism market, Ontario must lure international travellers with facilities and amenities that are second to none. But to build a world class tourism plant, more financial investment is required . . . The program components fit together in a comprehensive package of assistance to spur major private sector investment projects. (Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Recreation, 1984: 38–9)

At the local level, the 1982–83 report described the potential role for tourism in local economic development and particularly in those regions where development is most needed:

Tourism stimulates economic development, particularly in more remote regions which need to diversify their economic base. Unlike capital-intensive industries, tourism pays quick dividends because more of the products and services required are produced locally. This accelerated economic activity strengthens the municipal tax base, offsets municipal budget expenses and directly enhances the quality of life . . . *The upshot of these facts is that tourism should be a development priority at the municipal level.* (Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Recreation, 1985: 10; emphasis added)

At this time, a discernibly close relationship was being built between the provincial government and the tourism industry. For instance, the Annual Report of the Ministry for 1986–87, described having held 16 round-table meetings with members of the tourism industry in this period and highlights the development of the ‘Ontario Incredible’ campaign.

The role of tourism as an employment generator continues to deepen in the 1990s, as is indicated in the 1994 strategy report, specifically with regard to a certain type of potential employee:

Tourism has a unique role in the province’s employment picture. It is an industry that responds quickly to economic activity – as the economy improves, new jobs will be created in tourism. It also creates a large number of jobs for racial minorities, Aboriginal people, new Canadians and women. For many, tourism provides a training and development foundation that leads to more employment opportunities in other industries, as well as in tourism. (Ontario Minister’s Advisory Committee on Tourism, 1994: 18)

Thus, the rationale for encouraging tourism, from providing jobs to promoting diversity and protecting a community’s culture, became clear. As the same report pointed out:
Tourism has social importance as a vehicle for development of cross-cultural relations and personal growth. Working together with the province’s cultural industries, tourism can serve as a catalyst for the promotion of Ontario's history and its cultural and ethnic diversity. Tourism can also work to ensure the preservation of our cultural resources. (p. 21)

Connecting to wider economic instability and uncertainty, partnerships and 'self-reliance' were increasingly heralded in this period as the way to meet the challenges of these troubled economic times. As the report continues:

... as our economy continues to undergo a restructuring, there is a wider appreciation of the leisure sector’s contribution and potential for growth. It offers great opportunities for sustainable community-based development, which can strengthen local economies and foster healthier lifestyles across Ontario. Our province is defining its place in the new world economy and the leisure sector will play a key role. (p. 3; emphasis added)

By the end of the 1990s, tourism was positioned within the policy language to take on a primary role in the generation of growth in Ontario’s service economy. Indeed, it was repeatedly referred to as a ‘growth trigger’ and was increasingly viewed as a mechanism, from aiding those on the sidelines of full employment (new immigrants, youth, seniors, women, less educated workers) to alleviating economic disparities in underdeveloped regions and creating opportunities in the face of economic downturns and industrial restructuring. Towards 2000, the language around these particular opportunities afforded by tourism was notably more present.

To summarise, Ontario was faced with an economic crisis as restructuring began to take hold in the late 1970s. In particular, the southern region of the province, as the country’s industrial heartland, was threatened and economic downturn throughout the province followed. Discussions of this downturn permeated the policy language found in reports and the growing naturalisation of tourism as a credible response is marked. As Ontario realigned itself with capitalist growth in this latest stage, its government considered options within the service economy to stimulate economic growth. Alongside these options were the expectations, underwritten in neoliberal global trade agreements that the government would work to enable economic growth, not control or regulate it. The election, in the mid-1990s, of a Conservative provincial government committed to making Ontario ‘open for business’ then, can be understood in terms of its influence upon the kinds of tourism development opportunities that are encouraged. The language of public-private partnerships and the need to remove government regulations are logical steps within the overarching ideology of neoliberalism and independently stimulated economic growth, especially in periods of economic crisis. As is shown next through an analysis of one particular Ontario community, when presented with the conundrum of rural development, tourism was touted as meeting these criteria.

The community of Paris

Located in the heartland of Ontario and Canada’s economy, Paris has enjoyed a long history of industrially based economic growth and has a relatively large rural population of 9881 (Statistics Canada, 2001). In terms of tourism amenities,
Paris’s cobblestone architecture as well as its industrial (textile production) heritage have long been hailed both as a part of its historical legacy and a potentially major contributor to tourism. Figure 3 indicates its location in relation to Toronto and the rest of southwestern Ontario.

In a discussion of the early development of Paris (1831–1851), Wightman (1985) describes the process as unplanned but that the town founder, Hiram Capron, recognised the industrial and commercial potential of the site, with water power and critical road connections. Within the Canadian context, nation building, which began in the mid-1800s, usually incorporated railway development. Wightman (1985) captures what this meant for Paris and its location in southern Ontario, a soon to be manufacturing-based core for both provincial and national development:

Landowners and business people in Paris prepared for what they must have seen as ever-broadening opportunities. The anticipated arrival of the railways touched off a flurry of activity in the town that began the transition of the small commercial mill town to a secondary manufacturing centre. (Wightman, 1985: 26)

In a study of textile workers in Paris from 1880 to 1950, Parr (1990) describes Paris in this period as a knitted goods manufacturing centre where the majority
of the workers were female. Factory-based industry began in the mid-1860s in Paris and, Parr suggests, it ‘was most prosperous in the first three decades of [the 1900s]’; the author notes that by the Second World War Paris’s textile industry was moving through ‘hesitant maturity into decline’ (Parr, 1990: 4). Thus, periods of relative economic stability were enjoyed in Paris until larger shifts to manufacturing and a general economic restructuring began to have an effect upon the region. At this point, significant changes to Paris’s industrial base began to take place; most notably, an important legacy of Paris’s industrial past ended in 1982, when Penmans, the locally based textile manufacturer, moved out of the community after more than 100 years. As is shown below in the more specific discussion of Paris’ development strategies, a feeling of economic insecurity and the need to generate economic growth set the context within which tourism must be viewed.

In the period between 1975 and the early 1980s, before economic crisis and hardship had set in, tourism was, in the view of community leaders and newspaper editors, part of a more general approach to developing amenities in the community. For instance, the minutes of local council meetings held in this period contained infrequent mention of applications for funding for park development and other recreation facilities. In the local newspaper, The Paris Star, tourism was described as providing an impetus for downtown revitalisation, beautification and development and actual tourism developments were virtually non-existent. The newspaper editorials from this period concentrated on issues of beautification but also questioned the overall nature of growth and the need for controls. It should also be noted that in this period, the relationship between the local government in Paris and the Ontario provincial government appeared to be stable and supportive.

By the mid-1980s, the context of economic restructuring and uncertainty was beginning to frame the discussions of both community identity and its economic future – both in the local newspaper as well as at council. One indication that the community is beginning to consider how its identity might be presented to potential visitors was revealed on March 24 1987 when the minutes of council recorded a discussion about the development and placement of a sign welcoming tourists to Paris. The suggestion was made that the slogan for Paris might make reference to its unique cobblestone architecture instead of the phrase, ‘Prettiest Town in Canada’. This is important as it is the first overt reference to efforts to attract tourist interest and the issue was covered in The Paris Star as a story about members of three community and business groups who approached council and asked that it consider changing Paris’s slogan to ‘The Cobblestone Capital’ (11 April 1987). The group, including members of the Paris Business Improvement Association, Paris Heritage and the Paris Museum and Historical Society, argued that several other municipalities also claimed to be the prettiest town in Canada and so Paris’s collection of cobblestone architecture could give the town a new and unique identity.

In the late 1980s until 1999, when Paris was amalgamated politically with a number of nearby communities, the policy and newspaper language addressing tourism intensified both in frequency and kind, portraying it as a way to generate growth and in particular, stimulate downtown development in the face of economic downturn and lost government support. Economic conditions in Paris
in the early 1990s improved little and were a constant topic of reflection for the
Mayor and members of the council. Problematic economic conditions in the early
1990s were also frequently mentioned in The Star. For instance, on 16 January
1991, The Star’s headline reported, ‘Mayor warns we’re facing a tough year’ and
outlined the loss of companies and jobs in the community. In February of that
same year, the Mayor announced the creation of a trade show designed to bring
residents and industry together. Throughout this period, the openings and
 closings of new businesses and industries in Paris received front page coverage
with openings frequently including pictures of local dignitaries cutting ribbons
and welcoming new industrialists to the community. The mayoral address to the
newly elected council on 2 December 1991 captured the tone of this uncertainty:

We all know that the economy is poor at this time and there are many of our
residents and industries who are hurting. As Council, we must show lead-
ership and financial responsibility and join with our volunteers in helping
wherever we can.

Thus, economic recession and the increasing withdrawal of provincial and
federal government support created hard times for Paris. The local council
responded to these changes by creating a tourism and economic development
committee and hiring a tourism economic development coordinator. The coordi-
nator took a very prominent role in the community in the early 1990s, and was
supported by the local newspaper. On 6 May 1991, The Paris Star announced
the position on its front page and noted that the coordinator’s responsibilities
included ‘researching the best ways to promote tourism in Paris and high-
light[ing] Paris’ best features’. In her newspaper column ‘Around Town’, the
coordinator outlined her activities and public reaction, at least in the local paper,
were unwaveringly positive. For instance, The Star editorial on 31 July 1991 was
entitled ‘2 thumbs up’ and congratulated the town on hiring the tourism coordi-
nator. Other ‘Around Town’ articles focused on the heritage of the community,
bed and breakfast operations, community groups and craft fairs. A report on
preparations for 1992’s Heritage Weekend (a festival that would later be called
Springtime in Paris) published on 2 October, highlighted the tourism coordina-
tor’s view of Paris’s tourism potential: ‘people come to Paris because they like the
small town atmosphere and the great hospitality that they are shown and that’s
the real drawing card’.

Fiscal troubles continued, however, towards the middle of this period and the
tourism coordinator position was discontinued in 1993. Editorials and letters to
the editor revealed strident opposition to this decision and the language regard-
ing tourism took on a tone of economic growth generation. The relationship
between the provincial and local government became tense as the municipality
struggled to respond to the multiplicity of financial and political changes
wrought. The Paris government resisted but, as it became clear that these
changes were unavoidable, the language in both council minutes and the local
paper began to pitch self-reliance in an effort to meet the challenges presented by
political and economic restructuring. The following excerpt from an editorial on
12 May 1993 in The Paris Star illustrates the growing connection between tourism
and economic growth:
If there ever was a case of killing the goose that laid the golden eggs, it was the decision of Paris council to eliminate the town’s 2 year old tourism department and with it the service of tourism coordinator... Paris will save an estimated $45,000 a year in salary and the department budget when [her] contract ends in June. But in the long run, the town loses as it cuts off at the source the one industry – tourism – that is managing to survive, even thrive in this harsh economic climate... There are two points to be made here. Even in time of recession, you have to spend money to make money. While The Paris Star has argued consistently in favour of budget cuts for the elimination of unnecessary spending, it is obvious that tourism is and could continue to be a blossoming industry in Paris, one to boost the local economy. This is a job and a service that should have been saved.

Financial cuts intensified in the community under the newly elected provincial Conservative government. Announcements of cutbacks were constant. For instance, on 11 October 1995 The Star reported, ‘Road funds cut in half for 1995: a 50% reduction in funding to recent road reconstruction in the downtown core has left town officials scrambling to cover the remainder of the costs’ and on November 15 of that same year, there was an announcement that ‘Town cuts grant monies in effort to decrease spending’. Moreover, 17 January 1996’s front page read, ‘Officials continue soul searching’ as provincial funding to Paris was reduced by $320,000.

Alongside these cuts is increased attention to tourism in the local media. ‘Adventures-on-the-Grand’, a rafting and kayaking company, was one of the first ecotourism businesses in the area, and it received notable media attention. For instance, on 24 July 1996 an article on the second page of The Star covered the official opening of this new business, highlighted the owner’s vision of tourism in the community, and listed the local dignitaries who would raft along the river. In addition, an investigation of council minutes from this period revealed an increase in concern about economic development and the potential role for tourism. For example, council created an Economic Development and Tourism Action Committee (EDTAC) and hired a new economic development and tourism officer at the end of the decade, supported with frequent reference to government claw-backs and the need to generate economic growth independently. By 2000, Paris was clearly struggling to define itself in a virtual sea of small communities in the growing urban region of Toronto. Especially after amalgamation, those concerned with Paris’s future were focused on attracting business investment and economic development through tourism.

Attempts to generate economic development opportunities, and subsequently tourism, in Paris must be considered in light of its industrial past, the result of a mixture of its bio-physical endowments and its location in the industrial hub of the country. Not only has this past influenced the kinds of tourism activities that take place in the community, it also worked to shape the kinds of economic development options that are sought by those in power. Squire (1994) describes place making as a strategy that is embedded in the materiality of place. This notion sheds light on our understanding of Paris’s economic development strategy and its acceptance of tourism, as its material history helped define how it
sought to reconstruct itself in an effort to generate economic development through periods of economic crisis.

Thus, it is possible to make the connection between government cutbacks and the two-pronged blow dealt to this community. First, the thrust of economic restructuring presented the community with the problem of stimulating economic growth, while natural-resource extraction, as well as manufacturing opportunities were becoming less viable options. The withdrawal of government support limited the options that local policy makers could entertain to replace these industries. Second, the cutbacks from the provincial level essentially starved the municipal government, forcing it to consider more aggressive and less integrated economic development approaches in an effort to create funds to meet its short-term infrastructure and amenity needs. The lack of funds to support direct efforts to generate economic development opportunities led to a concentration on letting small businesses do it by themselves. Tourism became naturalised as a response in both government policy and media as it seemed to meet this objective well. However, the ‘hands off’ type of government involvement that this focus encourages is not supported by all. Interviews with key players in the tourism industry as well as economic and tourism development officers exposed a tension with regard to this neoliberal approach to stimulating economic development. As one local tourism-oriented business owner described, there is room for more government involvement in tourism:

I think that they don’t get too involved. They should be more involved...I don’t think there’s any help from the provincial or federal government. If you are self-employed, there’s no help for you. Maybe there’s a federal grant, you know, where you have to hire people from programmes or that kind of thing...I think that the municipal government needs to be more involved. They are the ones who are concerned most about the town and they still do nothing.

Moreover, the local tourism and economic development officer envisioned a strong role for the municipality, primarily in preparing to deal with the impacts of tourism development:

I think it’s kind of a funnel – down through the federal to the provincial and on to the municipal [government]. I see the provincial and federal government as providing kind of broad support for advertising the province and so on. But I think that the municipal government has the key role as facilitators and making sure that there is a product and visitor services. You can promote all you want but you’d better be ready for it and I think that this is the role for the municipality.

Thus, the relationship between tourism and economic development in Paris has been shaped by its changing association with the provincial government as well as larger economic and political shifts. The ‘official’ embrace of tourism can be understood as a reaction to the growing concern about the costs of government operation (both in terms of reducing its involvement and generating income on its behalf) and can be considered a contested strategy of rural development. The next section introduces a rather different case study and helps to add depth to our understanding of this relationship as it changes over time.
Grand Manan Island, New Brunswick

The provincial policy context

While southern Ontario is considered the industrial and population heartland of Canada, the province of New Brunswick is on the economic and geographic periphery. Located in the region of Atlantic Canada, New Brunswick’s biophysical endowments are influenced by the physiographic region of the Appalachian Uplands and although the middle of the province does have fertile land, a relatively stable growing season, and significant forested areas, the coastal areas are characterised by relatively poor soil and resources (Bone, 2002). The many small harbours, bays and inlets, however, have provided a legacy of fishing dating back to the 1400s. Early European settlement was generally not permanent as the region was utilised primarily for its fishing resources. With a population in 2001 of 717,710, (Statistics Canada, 2003), this province is markedly smaller than Ontario. A map of New Brunswick is seen in Figure 4.

As manufacturing in the region of southern Ontario was essentially protected by government policy, industrial development in Atlantic Canada enjoyed an early beginning but then faltered after Confederation in 1867 (Bone, 2002). Natural resources-based production, namely forestry, mining, fisheries and
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agriculture have historically provided the mainstays of the province’s economy and yet have been subject to instability and crisis. A legacy of unemployment, rural out-migration, and limited industrial development opportunities colour the history of the region (Acheson et al., 1985; Fairley et al., 1990). Many have argued that this legacy set the stage for a very different relationship with the federal government compared to Ontario. Further, transfers of wealth from the more developed parts of the country to the region (e.g. equalisation payments) as well as a series of attempts to coordinate and promote economic development opportunities (for example, the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency) were clear manifestations of both the goals of Confederation as well as the post-war tradition of interventionism and set up a relationship of dependency between the various levels of government (Acheson et al., 1985; Strain & Grant, 1999). There has long been an expectation of government involvement in development throughout the region.

It is against this backdrop that the rather radical shift to neoliberalism under the Conservative leadership of Premier McKenna in the late 1980s must be appreciated. Call centres and other technologically driven development schemes were constructed as the language of self-reliance and self-sufficiency began to permeate the discussions of development in the region and the province (Larner, 2002). Economic and social reforms were undertaken in an effort to enhance competitiveness and build an entrepreneurial spirit. Each of these factors has shaped the context within which tourism was being given increasing priority as a development strategy throughout the research period.

The relationship between tourism and economic development strategies began earlier and more discernibly in New Brunswick than in Ontario. Moreover, the bond between the provincial government and the tourism industry was much stronger. The creation of the Tourism Advisory Council, comprised of industry and government representatives in the mid-1970s, is one indication. For example, the main objective of the Council, as described in the 1977 Annual Tourism Report of the Department of Tourism (the first of its kind in the country), was finding an innovative way to inject tourism awareness into the public education system in order to increase understanding about its role in the economy. One of the mechanisms for enhancing this awareness was the introduction of tourism-related material in textbooks throughout the school system. (New Brunswick Department of Tourism, 1977: 20).

Awareness-raising with regard to the benefits of tourism was a consistent theme in the reports and connection was made to the municipal level. For instance, the 1980 report noted:

An in-province awareness program was initiated to inform the public of the importance of the tourist industry and to encourage residents to vacation within their own province. This included a media campaign, special radio and newspaper advertising, publication of an awareness brochure, a currency exchange program and assistance to municipalities sponsoring hospitality training seminars. (New Brunswick Department of Tourism, 1980: 7)

Further to this, in 1980, the province and industry’s tourism awareness campaign reached new horizons with the Mall Promotion Program entitled ‘Tourism is
Important to All of Us... Reach Out a Friendly Hand’. The programme involved uniformed tourism staff talking to visitors and New Brunswick residents in shopping centres about the value of tourism. By the mid-1980s, the relationship between government and the tourism industry had grown and attention turned to packaging the province into tourist-friendly, consumable experiences. For instance, a policy document released in 1989 regarding the province’s Scenic Roads Program revealed the need to capture the benefits of travelling motorists using incentive programmes to ‘provide appealing and marketable ways to attract tourists off the main routes and into the countryside’ (New Brunswick Department of Tourism, Recreation and Heritage, 1989: 2).

An assessment of annual reports released towards the end of the 1980s and at the beginning of the 1990s indicates a shift towards the cultivation of ‘adventure tourism’. The language used in the 1989–1990 Annual Report exhibited a more market-oriented, economics-driven approach both to tourism marketing and to describing the role of tourism in the economy. For instance, a summary of the report provided by the Deputy Minister, noted the following achievements:

... initiated a corporate image study which will give government direction in terms of creating a strong and positive image for New Brunswick to attract investment and tourists and to export its products and services to world markets. (New Brunswick Department of Tourism, Recreation and Heritage, 1990a: 9)

In 1993, the New Brunswick government went so far as to combine tourism and economic development within one department. This was an overt recognition of tourism’s potential contribution to employment and economic growth, a problem with which the region has been grappling since Confederation. It should be noted that it is also in this period that the province launched the first grading programme, the New Brunswick Tourism Grading Authority. As will become clear in the case community analysis of Grand Manan, this is a topic of much discussion and consternation. The purpose of this Grading Authority, as is noted in the 1990–91 report, is aimed at encouraging quality and uniformity of standards throughout the province, with efforts to identify and particularly classify the ‘best’ attractions, accommodations and even festivals in the province (New Brunswick Department of Tourism, Recreation and Heritage, 1990a: 9–12).

In addition, a new, three-year tourism strategy was embarked upon at this time, with a stated emphasis on ‘short activity-based vacation packages offering quality for affordable prices’ (1990a: 4). As a result, the entire province was mapped and labelled in terms of tourism packages. Hospitality training intensified and the former ‘Welcome Spoken Here’ training programme was changed to ‘Think Like the Customer’. There was a stated increase in corporate partnerships with companies such as Ford Canada, Nikon, Hyundai, and Tilley Endurables.

Into the mid-1990s, attention shifted to nature-based activities, so-called ‘soft’ tourism and, in particular, the creation of packaged experiences. Repeated reference in the departmental reports to tourism ‘products’ in a ‘catalogue’ illustrates the commodification process that accompanies tourism promotion, and New Brunswick’s rural experiences were no exception. Towards 2000, the relationship between tourism and rural economic development was consistently reinforced. For instance, in 1997, tourism was described in the Annual Report as one
of New Brunswick’s traditional industries and the creation of a programme called ‘Rural Experiences’ was highlighted. The double meaning of this programme was revealed, as ‘close to 1500 rural experience workers gained valuable experience working on numerous tourism developments throughout the province’ (New Brunswick Department of Economic Development and Tourism, 1997: 3). Overall, $4.7 million was committed to meeting the requirements of this programme, particularly for training and capital improvements. Job creation was the central focus; the following employment projects were listed (New Brunswick Department of Economic Development and Tourism, 1997: 9):

- coastal beach development;
- upgrading and enhancing campgrounds;
- upgrading and enhancing golf products;
- building snowmobile infrastructure;
- upgrading and enhancing B&Bs, inns, day adventure centres operations;
- tourism research; and
- ecotourism community projects.

Perhaps one of the most significant provincial government documents produced with reference to tourism and economic development in the research period was *Tourism Strategy: Toward the Year 2000*, published in 1990. The strategy for tourism development included the need to commodify the everyday life of New Brunswick’s residents:

New Brunswick’s great appeal lies in who and what we are as a people; our diverse culture and heritage; the province’s natural beauty; the way we live, work, express ourselves and spend our leisure time. Our challenge is to capture these elements of our lives, within the Maritime experience; and to communicate them, together with the allure of our landscape and seacoast, to the marketplace. (New Brunswick Department of Tourism, Recreation, 1990b: 9; emphasis added)

Thus, the trajectory of tourism development in New Brunswick followed a path similar to Ontario’s. However, its place on the periphery of the country and its various natural resource endowments, have shaped the consideration of tourism as a mechanism for stimulating a stagnating economy and/or crisis-prone economy. It is worth pointing out further that New Brunswick’s relatively light industrial past has always made it an attractive destination. However, reference to the utility of tourism as a stimulator of economic growth deepened in the policy language as the analysis moved to the present day. While early reports about the future of the tourism industry in the province reflected a concern to protect local communities and its people from too much development, this language disappeared in later years as consideration of its impacts was all but replaced by discussions of its benefits.

The growing portrayal of tourism as a ‘growth trigger’ and the need to prepare the ground for the ‘tourism plant’ to take root and flourish became increasingly evident by 2000. Moreover, the election of the McKenna government in 1987 and its neoliberal, ‘open for business’ approach to generating economic growth
allowed for an even deeper consideration of development opportunities within the private, predominantly service sector. Tourism fit the part well.

The community of Grand Manan Island

Grand Manan Island, in contrast to Paris, has a much smaller population of 2610 inhabitants (Statistics Canada, 2001). The island is 151 km² and consists of five relatively independent communities, especially before they were politically amalgamated into a single municipality in 1995. Located 35 km off the coast of New Brunswick (see Figure 5), the natural environment of Grand Manan as well as its seclusion from the mainland has created a small but longstanding, summer resident tourism industry. The difficulty inherent in simply getting to the island, especially in the past, worked to influence the kind of visitor it attracted. Until periodic improvements to the ferry were made, tourism on Grand Manan consisted of long stays (ranging from a week to the full summer) and a community of summer residents developed early in its settlement history. Vestiges of this community are still apparent on the island and residents made continual comparisons in interviews between this and the more recent ‘day-tripper’ tourists. Besides the natural attractions of the island and the appeal of the working fishery, the Grand Manan Museum (built in 1967) is the most prominent tourism attraction and, until the summer of 2002, housed its only tourist information site. Fishing and its attendant services is still the economic mainstay, as herring, lobster and increasingly aquaculture (primarily salmon farming) provide the main sources of income.

According to Scherman (1971), ‘Manan’ is a corruption of *man an ook* or *man an ook* meaning ‘island place’ or ‘the island’ from the Maliseet-Passamaquoddy-Penobscot Indians who visited the island from spring until autumn when the waters were navigable by canoe. The first permanent European settlement in the area occurred in 1784 when 50 United Empire Loyalist families settled on the island. Population on the island peaked at 2616 in the 1880s, a prosperous time.
due to the then plentiful fishery. Depletion of herring stocks, however, soon led to decline.

Romantic images of the island are plentiful and it has been the subject of numerous works of literature attempting to capture its mystery and natural appeal. For instance, the following quotation by Scherman gives a vivid picture of the island and its bounty:

Grand Manan is an awesome island, high-cliffed and thickly wooded . . . Though forbidding at a distance it seems, near at hand, a fine place to live. It is surrounded by the cold waters of the Labrador Current, beloved of herring, cod and lobster. Nourished by the fogs of the great bay, its meadows are bright with green grass and field flowers and wild strawberries . . . There are no slums or shantytowns, and its small settlements of clean frame houses are surrounded by garden flowers, many of which have escaped to line the roads and lanes. (Scherman, 1971: i–ii)

As the above quotation illustrates, the bounty-filled waters surrounding the island were deeply influential in both its settlement and economic development. Traders, fishers and explorers spent time on and off the island although the waters surrounding it were famously dangerous and have provided a legacy of shipwrecks and tales of brave rescues. The island did not attract much attention from governments until permanent settlement grew. In 1884, regular mail and passenger boats started operation and connected Grand Manan with the mainland. The issue of the ferry service, the islanders’ only consistent connection with the mainland, has a long history. A variety of ferries have been introduced over time; some were privately owned and, more recently, publicly through the provincial government.

Data analysis suggests that in the period from the mid-1970s to the early 1980s, tourism was viewed as part of island life for decades without much change. An analysis of the minutes of the local council, as well as newspapers from this period, indicates that while tourism was given much credence for its role in boosting an otherwise stagnating provincial economy, this was not the case on Grand Manan Island. However, consistent efforts at awareness-raising by the provincial government in terms of the positive benefits and successful growth of the industry were included regularly in the local paper, The St. Croix Courier. Moreover, an analysis of news reports reveals the trend that the months of May to September (tourism season) included a proliferation of tourism-related reports and stories. For instance, in May 5, 1976, the title of one article is ‘Busy selling NB’ and highlighted a travel trade effort where Tourism Ministry staff are headed to 21 cities throughout northeastern US and central Canada. Throughout this period, intermittent tourism updates from the provincial government, namely in the form of statistics regarding numbers of visitors and expenditures, were included in The Courier. While the primary champion for attending to tourism and its potential benefits, the local media clearly pointed the finger at the provincial government’s responsibility both for generating tourism opportunities and managing and protecting the area from intensive tourism growth. Like Paris in this period, mention of tourism in the minutes of council meetings was in regard to obtaining funding from the provincial government for building and maintaining parks and providing other leisure amenities.
One significant development in terms of tourism in the area in the 1970s was the creation by the New Brunswick government of a tourism strategy for the Fundy Isles, a region that includes Grand Manan Island. The provincial government hosted a number of meetings in communities to review the outcomes of the report that was to form the basis of the plan. An analysis of the report lends important insight in terms of understanding the rationale given for tourism promotion and development at this time. Funding for this plan came from the federal government, through the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and the Department of Tourism and under the Canada/New Brunswick Tourism Development Subsidiary Agreement. The tone is of preservation and control while encouraging development. The island was mentioned frequently and the specific objectives mentioned were: ‘to maintain low-key tourism development; [and] to ensure that tourism industry growth occurs at a rate that can be absorbed into the Island lifestyle’ (New Brunswick Department of Tourism, 1976: iv). The report described the attractions of Grand Manan in some detail and outlined the impact that intense tourism development might have upon the relatively secluded island. It is worth quoting the report at length as it suggested a measured and considered approach to tourism development on the island:

The chief attractions of Grand Manan are its natural beauty and the tranquil fishing lifestyle of its residents. Grand Manan, in its existing setting, offers a quality natural, interpretive experience which is difficult to duplicate anywhere else in North America. Grand Manan generates the longest lengths of stay of any area within the region, primarily due to the type of visitor who comes to the island. These tourists are often return visitors and usually have Grand Manan as a final destination. Short term visitation is discouraged by the isolation of the Island, long ferry line-ups and the high fare . . . [A]t the public meetings, the residents of Grand Manan rejected tourism development which does not conform to the existing way of life and lifestyle. Growth should occur only at a rate which ‘strangers from away’ can be absorbed into the existing way of life. (New Brunswick Department of Tourism, 1976: 89)

By the 1980s, however, increasing policy attention was given to tourism as well as its economic benefits, particularly from the provincial government’s perspective. Economic stimulation in an era of general decline in the region prepared the groundwork for what would become an atmosphere of reduced government funding and private-sector-led growth. For example, an article on the front page of *The Courier* on 15 June 1983 outlined a speech given by the federal finance minister at a meeting of investment dealers in which he stated that there was a need for cooperation between government and industry and that the ‘private sector is the main engine of growth and the government cannot give too big a push’. Economic slowdown and the election of the McKenna government at the provincial level, with its accompanying shift in focus from government-led growth to small business and entrepreneurially based development were frequent topics of discussion in council meetings and in newspapers. For instance, tourism and economics entered McKenna’s pre-election language as quoted in *The Courier* on 26 June 1985. The article described his views on moving to more packaged types of tourism attractions in order to encourage
lengthy stays instead of one-night stops. The following quotation from this article reflects the soon-to-be Premier’s views regarding the links between private industry, small businesses and tourism:

I’m a strong believer in private industry. And it will be small business that will put 25% of the province’s workers back to work. This small business can be home grown. We don’t need to bring in export industry, we can tap the natural talent and beauty of each community . . . [T]o help small tourist businesses, resources that are available through government for manufacturing should be available for the tourist industry.

It should be noted that, although tourism began to take on more of a central role in the focus of the provincial government’s local economic development policy, again supported generally by the local media, there was resistance to large developments perceived to have an effect on the region’s quality of life. For instance, in the mid-1980s, a proposal was made for a national marine park to be created in the area and an analysis of newspaper reports revealed a general concern about, and resistance to, this kind of development as well as the government’s ‘hard sell’ approach to the project.

From the early 1990s to 2000, there were two important developments on the island: a new, faster and larger ferry was built; and a discernible shift towards private-sector-led economic development strategies by the provincial government. The change in the ferry, with a more frequent schedule allowing for day trippers, had a dramatic effect not just on the number of tourists to the island but also on the kind of tourist. As one interview respondent, a long-time resident and former operator of a whale-watching operation, made clear:

When tourism started, it was a different era and a way of life. Not like the kinds of day-trippers that we have here now – different kinds of trips back then . . . You know, they were semi-residents and they would engage with the community and would take time to get to know us and to get to know them too. Now, these people just come in on the early boat, drive from one end of the island to the other end and then leave on the last ferry. They aren’t interested in Grand Mananers, they take a few pictures and leave . . . They get their sea voyage in and they don’t bother to meet anyone.

As noted earlier, at the provincial level, the Department of Tourism and Economic Development was created in 1993, reflecting the conflation of the two agendas. Outdoor adventure tourism, as manifested in the Day Adventure Programs, was popular in this period and the types of funding opportunities for members of local communities entertaining tourism operations reinforced these and other day-tripper activities. In addition, the creation of the Tourism Grading Authority led to a deepening of government involvement in controlling the nature and kind of tourism development on the island, although not necessarily providing more access to funding.

The government’s strategy and approach to tourism development on the island was not without resistance. The discomfort with the provincial government’s approach to tourism as a form of economic development is reflected in the following letter submitted to the island newsletter, The Island Times in the May issue of 1996:
...we have no local school board, no local hospital board, no local representative on the regional hospital board, no Customs office, no provincial environmental or planning activity and a single municipality whose taxpayers are responsible, among other things, for road and policing services because the province wanted to dump them...So, because of the narrow provincial government priority of tourism which is applied here, we will soon resemble nothing more than a seasonal, though somewhat cool, off-Bahamas island tourist destination, overrun by daily or weekly visitors, bussed, driven, housed and entertained by minimum-wage workers desperate for any employment. Indeed, because of encouragement, the number of whale watching boats in this part of the Bay of Fundy will soon equal the number of endangered creatures they sail to look at.

Interview data suggested that despite the provincial government’s increasing influence in promoting tourism on the island, not much credence was given to its ability to generate meaningful economic growth and development. Further, despite information about the role of tourism in stimulating economic growth, interview participants were virtually unable to distinguish what the role of tourism was in the Island’s economy. Discussion of the stress brought about by the growth in tourist travel to the island was common, as reflected in this quotation from an interview participant who was also a guide on a whale-watching boat:

It creates a completely different atmosphere on the island in the summer. It does cause stress on the island – traffic and people wandering all over the island. Tourists go through some kind of instant change when they step off the ferry – like they are free. We often leave our door open and tourists have been known to just walk in.

In addition, there was a much-discussed divergence between the kinds of tourism activities that were encouraged by the provincial government (for example, the outdoor adventures and up-scale accommodations) and the kinds of activities and experiences that most tourists to the island seemed to want, according to operators on the island. As one interview participant exclaimed when asked about the role of government in tourism on the island:

Government? It’s a pain in the butt. You know, sometimes I think they just sit in their cosy homes and dream up things that we should do without even coming here. The provincial government gives us so little in terms of funding and to belong to their groups, or get their signs, or get into their programmes, we have to comply with all of these crazy regulations and ‘modernisations’ that make no sense for the area...I think you are better off without them. It’s getting worse all the time. They want to categorise everything.

The owner of one of the first sets of tourist cottages on the Island reinforced the point about the provincial government’s involvement:

It’s a nuisance. You have to play their game – all these regulations...You know those Day Adventure Programs – you have to do so many things their way. It’s all costly and doesn’t make sense for what goes on here...
People choose not to advertise because they can’t afford all of the changes they have to make . . . Council has been no help to us. I’m not sure if it is supposed be.

In summary, the trajectory of policy language regarding tourism development on Grand Manan Island, as put forward primarily by the provincial government, is rather different from Paris. The role of the provincial government in engendering this and other forms of economic development, in turn, must be seen as influenced by its particular economic history and subsequent challenges with generating development. This reflects the extent to which the provincial government is more concerned with promotion and creating service-related economic opportunities than engaging community uniqueness or responding appropriately to existing demand. However, Grand Manan’s relatively isolated past influences its resistance to this top-down approach, despite a tradition of government involvement in the province and notwithstanding the neoliberal, hands-off flavour of that involvement. While this case can be considered as a strategy of economic development through commodification, in that it is a kind of ‘one-size-fits-all’ approach to tourism planning that captures and sells a way of life, it should be noted that the island is in the early stages of this process, perhaps ‘early commodification’ as described by Mitchell (1998).

This presentation of the primary findings from the case studies has created room for considering the different ways that communities respond to economic and political shifts and the role that tourism plays therein. Moreover, these efforts to encourage and promote tourism can be demarcated into four interrelated dimensions.

The next section introduces these dimensions as themes to compare the cases and build an enhanced understanding of the forces influencing the naturalisation of tourism as part of strategies for rural economic growth and development.

Discussion

It is useful to look at the material from the cases in such a way as to identify broad themes capturing the evolution of government policy and to allow for case comparison. First, there are two main realms of government interest regarding tourism that stem throughout the research period: monitoring tourism demand and promoting the development of supply. While monitoring tourism will be discussed briefly, as the primary focus of this paper is on the growing encouragement of tourism promotion in rural areas, a consideration of the following four key dimensions within the language of promotion provides the bulk of the analysis:

1. **Rationale**: why should tourism development be promoted?
2. **Responsibility**: who is (or should be) responsible for the promotion of tourism development?
3. **Execution**: how should tourism development be promoted?
4. **Content**: what kinds of activities and facilities should be promoted?

Using these key dimensions, an investigation of the cases is offered, first for the provinces and then the communities themselves. It must be noted that there is some difficulty inherent in separating out these dimensions, particularly the
political and the economic discussions of rationale and responsibility, as they become increasingly intertwined throughout the research period. In addition, while these factors are presented within the context of tourism, issues of rural development undoubtedly underscore the discussion.

The Provinces

Monitoring tourism demand

Both provinces undertook an extensive effort to connect tourism with the generation of jobs and economic growth as they endeavoured to quantify and publicise information about visitation and expenditures, highlighting the positive, primarily economic, benefits of tourism throughout the research period. The language of the ‘tourism plant’, introduced in the 1980s in both provinces, indicates an effort to extend to tourism the same legitimacy as other industries and thereby naturalise its role in economic development.

Rationale

In terms of economic development and the language describing it, the infiltration of the neoliberal ideology into policy language in both provinces has been noted. Both the Ontario and the New Brunswick governments underwent ideological shifts towards neoliberalism over the course of the research period. The language of tourism growth and development became couched in terms of restructurung, competition, global economic change and the need for new economic relationships. Moreover, the inevitability of these changes was never questioned, only the ability of the governments to respond to them. The election of conservative governments in both provinces helped ensure that this discourse was solidified.

Thus, the similarities regarding the evolution of tourism policy and activities in Ontario and New Brunswick, despite the minor chronological differences, are many, although outreach and awareness-raising about the benefits of tourism took a different tack. For instance, it is much less subtle in the New Brunswick case with efforts such as inserting information about the benefits of tourism into school curricula and hosting promotions of tourism at shopping malls. Both provinces, at least rhetorically, described the potential of tourism to ease regional disparities in areas with fewer industrial development opportunities. This happened at about the same time in Ontario and New Brunswick, primarily in the late 1970s and into the 1980s.

And yet, the language describing tourism development in New Brunswick, particularly in the late 1970s and early 1980s, was initially somewhat more cautious and involved a higher degree of public consultation than the Ontario case. Concerns about the nature of tourism development were evident in early government reports but were notably absent as time progressed. For the most part, this language was not present in the Ontario reports.

Initially, tourism was portrayed as a mechanism for alleviating regional disparities (through tertiary economic activities) and a way for communities without many other opportunities to survive. Nonetheless, the push to encourage local governments to utilise tourism as a mechanism for stimulating employment and growth in rural areas also occurred in both places and it became increasingly overt in Ontario towards the middle of the 1990s. For instance,
discussions of ‘convincing local councils’ and residents of rural communities as to the benefits of the jobs and amenities provided by tourism were more prevalent in Ontario. However, one possible explanation for this is that of New Brunswick’s more explicit effort to set the stage for this undertaking sooner.

Responsibility

In both provinces, the ideological shift entailed a dramatic pull back of government in a variety of ways, most importantly in terms of who was responsible for generating economic growth and development. As Savoie (2000: 19) notes, by the 1990s there was a:

widely held consensus that governments cannot create jobs – only the private sector can. The role of the public sector, in the eyes of many, ought to be limited to creating the proper policy and economic environment for the private sector to grow, prosper and produce jobs.

Thus, government was expected to set the stage for growth and then step back. Self-sufficiency and corporate partnerships were goals openly and repeatedly stated by both provincial governments, and tourism was held up as one way for communities to support themselves. New Brunswick was more direct in making these connections with the creation, in 1993, of the Department of Economic Development and Tourism and in 2000 with the submersion of both sections into Business New Brunswick. This suggests that the connection is, at least rhetorically, more apparent in New Brunswick.

In the New Brunswick case, even with the long history of government interventionism, the province’s approach to rural development became encapsulated in the movement of the state from a position of manager, responsible for creating jobs and growth, to one of facilitator and monitor, responsible for creating conditions under which business would flourish. In Ontario, the trends differed only in terms of the time periods and the length of the reign of neoliberal thinking as both eventually became ‘open for business’. It was not so much that tourism became a formally encouraged government policy as, with its small, independent business focus, tourism was considered to fit especially well within the language of self-sufficiency and a private-sector-led approach to development.

Both provinces undertook a dramatic process of political restructuring and many small municipalities were amalgamated at about the same time (as were Grand Manan and Paris) although amalgamation in New Brunswick occurred earlier. In addition, increasing responsibility for maintaining basic services to communities was shifted onto the municipal level and coupled with reduced financial support. This shift must be seen as creating a gap where municipal governments (rural and urban) became increasingly compelled to generate their own means of financial support and to stimulate economic development opportunities. A concentration upon encouraging small business activities, in an effort to spawn tax dollars for the community, grew.

Execution

Both governments, by 2000, were making consistent mention of having to decrease regulations upon small business activity for entrepreneurs. Connections between operators in the tourism industry and government deepened throughout the 1980s in both cases: New Brunswick set up its Tourism Advisory...
Council in the late 1970s while the Ontario government held roundtables with tourism businesses in 1986. Nevertheless, in both provinces, the necessity of ‘meeting the needs of the industry’, particularly in terms of loosening business regulations and generating awareness of tourism’s beneficial impacts, was a persistent theme in the policy language.

Likewise, New Brunswick’s provincial policy makers moved earlier to embrace tourism as a mechanism for generating growth, particularly in the relatively undeveloped rural regions of the province and this move led to a much faster and more intense effort at commodifying the experiences in the province. This is illustrated in the language describing tourist activities and experiences as ‘products’ and guidebooks as ‘catalogues’ evident as early as 1985. Thus, the methods of tourism development in New Brunswick were far more intensive and fast-paced than in Ontario.

Further to this, the role of government in the execution of tourism in these cases has not been a concern with the monitoring of the potentially negative impacts of tourist activities so much as to promote a particular kind of development. In his assessment of Canadian provincial tourism issues, Reid (1998) describes the relationship between the provinces and municipal governments, pointing out that provinces have traditionally played a role in tourism promotion and development. While he argues that there has been a marked change in attention given to rural tourism by mid-level (provincial) governments, there has been a general lack of policy when it comes to its implementation and evaluation. Connected to this, he argues, are further changes to the way that provinces support rural areas and tourism development more generally. Similarly, Ashworth (1993: 19) describes the failure of tourism and rural development policy makers in Europe to do little but manage the impacts and criticisms of the industry and to enhance the ‘image’ of tourism through promotion and public relations.

Content

Particularly revealing in the New Brunswick case is the use of specific kinds of rural tourism developments, both as an attraction for tourists and a stimulus for growth in those areas. The efforts to package the province into scenic driving routes and to provide ‘Day Adventure Centres’ and programmes towards the middle of the 1990s were hailed as revolutionary and innovative by policy makers. Moreover, programmes like ‘Hometown New Brunswick’ and the ‘Rural Experience Program’ were designed to get tourists ‘off the beaten path’ and to give underemployed rural workers job experience. While Ontario was later in the development of deliberate rural tourism promotion efforts, the growth of heritage and cultural tourism in that province may well put it on track to the same outcome.

In summary, the differences in the overall provincial approaches to promoting tourism development in rural areas are primarily a matter of degree and the end points are remarkably similar. The findings are in support of a much earlier work by Papson (1981) wherein the author determined that the primary objective of the departments dealing with tourism was to generate more economic benefits from tourism and that their methods included such strategies and approaches as marketing, routing and zoning, creating community events and organising the
history of tourist settings. The findings of this analysis suggest that this approach was also evident in both the New Brunswick and Ontario cases. It is clear, however, that more recent, ideological shifts in the way government acts to stimulate economic development opportunities have also worked to shape the context within which tourism policy is formulated.

One essential factor in assessing the differences in the speed and intensity with which the tourism option was embraced in the provinces is their position relative to the Canadian and continental political economy. New Brunswick is on the periphery of the country and has long struggled to find a path to development in place of large-scale industrially led growth. Its dependence upon natural resources has historically made it vulnerable to economic downturns and environmental degradation and yet its relative lack of industrial development gives it an unspoilt quality well suited to hosting tourism activities. Southern Ontario, on the other hand, is situated virtually in the heart of industrial Canada, and the continent. As its economic future was challenged, it investigated a multitude of opportunities. While some of these opportunities were still in the realm of industrial development and manufacturing, increasing attention was given to more service-based activities and tourism. Moreover, Ontario has the population, particularly in the southern region, to support many types of tourism activities.

The communities

The findings of both the Grand Manan and the Paris cases indicate that not only does the rhetoric of tourism’s potential intensify towards the end of the research period, but there are also changes in terms of actual activities. The way that these changes manifest themselves in each community, however, is multifaceted due to the particular character of rural communities and the extent to which their geography, resource base, economic development history and other factors influence which options for growth and development are perceived as possible and/or appropriate.

Monitoring tourism demand

Efforts to formally monitor tourism demand in the communities were minimal and changed only slightly through the research period. However, the most consistent mention of tourism statistics and its economic benefits accompanied tourism-related stories in both local papers. In these reports, tourism was almost never mentioned in any terms other than economic; and there was little effort to consider what is, or should be, the role of tourism in larger questions of community development. The efforts of the provinces, and even the federal government, to support and promote tourism were reported frequently in the media and are direct indicators of the deepening relationship between the government and the tourism industry in their collective bid to enhance awareness about tourism and its benefits.

Rationale

Cross-case analysis reveals a rather complex relationship between tourism and approaches to rural economic growth in the communities. That both areas experienced little change in the period leading up to the middle of the 1980s is made clear above. Indeed, with the exception of media attention, consideration of tourism development was rationalised in this period insofar as it provided an
avenue to capture provincial and federal government funds for recreation and leisure amenity developments. However, the local newspapers in both communities were regular boosters of tourism. Nearly every editorial addressing downtown development, economic growth or beautification included the word tourism. This is increasingly evident towards the end of the research period as the media reports contained frequent reference to the role of tourism in generating economic spin-offs and business development opportunities for the community and surrounding area. As noted above, however, interview data suggest that locals did not view this importance in the same way.

Responsibility

The sense of responsibility for tourism development in the communities was most clearly gleaned from local newspaper reports and they are important players in the move to naturalise tourism into the language of economic development. While The St Croix Courier, the local paper serving Grand Manan and the surrounding area, had a more cautious tone about tourism development in the initial years of the study period, the local papers in both communities were almost unwaveringly supportive. When it came to considering who holds the responsibility for tourism development, this same paper presented continuous editorials goading the provincial government, local councils and community members, to take action on the tourism front. This was not the case early on in The Paris Star; however, towards 2000 the editorial pages in both papers pointed fingers at local business people, pushing them to take up the charge and devise ways to attract more tourists in order to stimulate development opportunities in the face of economic crisis and cutbacks. Another essential similarity in regards to responsibility and the role of the media is that both papers’ editorials supported the government cutbacks in the mid-to-late 1990s, if lamenting their impacts. Both papers appeared to herald the ‘tough’ changes and the need to ‘rationalise’ production and become more ‘efficient’. Thus, the influence of local media in building these terms and ideas into the everyday language helped to support this shift and solidify the neoliberal ideology into the lexicon of rural development.

Execution

Grand Manan Island was virtually immune to provincial influence in tourism development until the ferry changed in 1990. Initial news reports and editorials reflected a suspicion of tourism projects, yet this critical voice all but disappeared as time went on and the island grew as a more mainstream destination. Although fishing and the quickly growing aquaculture industry remained the primary economic mainstays in the area, tourism, as discussed both in the media and at local council meetings, began, over time, to take on a role in stimulating business and economic development on the island. Day-tripper activities, undertaken by locals and non-local operators, proliferated and the presence of the provincial government in monitoring and controlling those developments is clear. For the case of Paris, the story took a different path. Initially, it was much like Grand Manan in that early reference to tourism took the form of obtaining access to funds for amenity development. After that time, however, tourism was mentioned repeatedly in the media but did not take hold in the community until its first attempt to have a tourism and economic development officer in 1991. At
this point, tourism was mentioned much more frequently in both council minutes and the local paper and a number of tourism-related activities began to spring up in the community (including a long-standing community festival and short-lived bus tours). Despite efforts by the province to enhance awareness about tourism and its potential bounty, few tourism-related efforts were undertaken in Paris until after political amalgamation.

It should be stressed that tourism changes, any changes, that take place in a community are always a two-way process. The kinds of tourism policies, projects and interventions developed by the provincial government are always mediated by the rural communities where they are adopted. A consideration of resistance to these changes in both communities, then, is important. In Grand Manan, the resistance came in the form of viewing the provincial government’s effort to control and corporatise the kinds of tourism on the island as an inappropriate intrusion. Some tourism operators responded by pulling out of the provincial tourism guide (catalogue) and have only maintained a connection with the government through licensing requirements. In Paris, initial resistance in this regard came in the early 1990s when the community and the local newspaper reacted negatively to the council’s decision to terminate the post of economic development and tourism officer. Since that point, however, because tourism had only directly been developed from a policy or government standpoint in any meaningful way after amalgamation, the primary mechanism of resistance came from the relative failure of attempts to push the recently amalgamated communities to coordinate in a county-wide tourism strategy.

Content

The kinds of tourism development encouraged through provincial and local government policies are unique to the communities. In Grand Manan, the tourist is invited to engage in ‘traditional’ community life; the very use values upon which the community is based. As Grand Manan is still a relatively vibrant fishing community, tourism is based upon this traditional and cultural heritage. Opportunities for outdoor activities such as whale watching, hiking and camping are growing steadily on the island, a reflection both of the kinds of activities that relate to the island’s natural assets as well as the kind of activities encouraged by the provincial government under the ‘Day Adventure’ and other soft adventure tourism programmes. In Paris, however, the economic and settlement history of the community does not so easily provide the basis for tourism; instead, a new set of activities in the form of festivals, arts and culture is being promoted. Much of the impetus for these developments is coming from local residents. This can be seen as a response to the diminishing industrial production and manufacturing opportunities and Paris’s emergence as a bedroom community for middle-class urban workers, some with an interest and ability in arts and culture. Thus, these differences can be connected to the development histories of the communities as well as considerations of their particular opportunities for future development.

Conclusions: The Industry of Last Resort

In the conclusion to his contribution to the Canadian Royal Commission introduced earlier in this paper, Blake (2003), although speaking directly about the
province of Newfoundland and Labrador and not the case communities studied here, makes the following comment about the positioning of tourism as a solution to that province’s rural ills:

Governments at all levels must work to limit the rush towards creating tourist attractions all over the province. While some areas will undoubtedly benefit from the tourist traffic, too much of the tourist business is geared towards low-paying and seasonal jobs, even if those jobs do keep some people employed at home rather than in low-paying jobs outside the province. In many ways, tourism has become like the fishery historically – the occupation or industry of last resort: when all else fails, turn to attracting tourists.

This paper has sought to illuminate the trajectory of the growing connection between tourism and rural economic development opportunities under changing socioeconomic conditions. The dimensions of that trajectory, particularly in the realm of tourism promotion, have been presented in order to add depth and a political economic context to our understanding of these cases and tourism more generally. As such, it has identified a need to reconceptualise not just the changing role of the state in rural development within the context of tourism development, but also the motivations for, and the mechanisms through which, these changes are taking place. Indeed, how has it come to pass that tourism is considered such a viable option for rural economic development and growth? When it is accepted as such a mechanism, how is it integrated into the community’s overall development options? Figure 6 juxtaposes shifts in economic development at the global level with changes at the local level.

The growth of tourism-oriented economic development policy language can be seen as following on shortly after broader changes, primarily the acceptance of neoliberal assumptions about the nature of economic growth and development opportunities. Moreover, the factors making tourism attractive as an option for development in rural communities are many and play roles of differing importance depending upon the context. First, the biophysical base of the area often both works to shape the kinds of development options available for the community as well as the kinds of tourism activities that might be undertaken (e.g. nature-based, industrial, heritage tourism). Second, the history of economic development in the community as it relates to the national, continental and global economy is important to consider for two reasons. In Canada, for instance, if the community is located on the periphery of the country, such as Grand Manan, then tourism is an option by virtue of its use of ‘unspoilt’ or relatively undeveloped status. This factor also engenders a willingness to entertain tourism as a development option, as the era of government pull-out has hit the peripheral regions harder than others. If, by contrast, the community is industrially based, like Paris, which is located in the country’s industrial and population heartland and has both enjoyed a history of successful industrialisation and a different relationship with various government levels, then the kinds of tourism experiences may be different and the ways in which the tourism project is undertaken will also differ.

Third, and related to the last point, the nature of capitalist growth must be considered as it is an ever-expanding process, moving through crises of accumu-
The neoliberal encouragement of the withdrawal of government service provision and the move of tourist development into previously under-exploited (or uncommodified) spaces must be seen as a two-pronged component of late capitalism. Moreover, the uneven nature of capitalist growth can point to the ways that rural spaces are able to be considered ‘play’ or leisure spaces given their relatively unsettled and unindustrialised status.

Fourth, the changing role of the state (both local and provincial) as influenced by late capitalism and the neoliberal ideology of corporate globalisation, is also an interrelated factor. This is not a straight, one-way process. Indeed, while neoliberal ideology and the language of the free market suggest that government activity is intrusive and inefficient, the cases studies presented above make it clear that, while qualitatively different, the state is still active in framing and making attractive certain development opportunities and not others. Further, the role of agency and politics also plays an important part as the attempts to withdraw from state involvement in development and tourism are mediated by the members of the community in question. This leads to the last factor, and one not discussed in much depth here. Social factors influencing local development strategies include such ‘external’ components as the growing demand for rural tourism, which stems from increasing disposable income and leisure time as well as a growing nostalgia for heritage and cultural experiences (Bunce, 1994; Mitchell, 1998).

**Figure 6** Trajectory of global economic change and rural tourism policy development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL</th>
<th>Mid-1970s-1980</th>
<th>1980s</th>
<th>1990s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic slowdowns, challenge to traditional economic bases</td>
<td>Regionally based development initiatives, government involvement</td>
<td>Locally driven economic development initiatives, government withdrawal, increased municipal responsibility for development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Tourism as amenity provision</em></td>
<td><em>Tourism as growth trigger for economic development</em></td>
<td><em>Tourism as increasingly significant component of rural economic development strategies</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLOBAL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beginning of new right/neoliberalism, energy crisis, crisis in Fordist accumulation strategy</td>
<td>Growth of neoliberal ideology, dismantling of welfare state, government as enabler for business</td>
<td>Solidification of neoliberal ideology, growth of post-Fordist accumulation strategy and service economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Tourism as mass holidays</em></td>
<td><em>Tourism as increasingly important component of growing service economy</em></td>
<td><em>Tourism as primary component of global economic activity (world’s largest industry)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Global economic restructuring / rural economic insecurity**
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All of these factors combine to influence all levels of policy decision making and work to form conceptions of community development opportunities. Questions of, and assumptions about, the rationale, responsibility, execution, and content of tourism promotion and rural development policy affect which development options are naturalised and made legitimate. Given the nuances of the findings presented, this study is certainly not leaning towards a conclusion that all tourism development in rural areas should be discontinued. Yet, one can hardly keep from asking how we might reconcile the infusion of tourism into the discourse of rural economic development given the economic, social, political and environmental impacts that are becoming widely evident. As pressure mounts to maintain economic stability in rural communities, the ways in which tourism development is planned will become ever more important. If communities feel pressure to compete with one another and to find ways to generate economic development in the short term, the kinds of tourism planning activities undertaken will be unlikely to engage the non-business community in planning, nor will they look beyond short-term economic goals.

Thus, the danger is that capitalism and market-led approaches will be concerned with little more than short-term gain and generating quick-fix, service-oriented profit accumulation strategies. Profit-driven tourism development changes the community experience as well as community life from being based upon use values to exchange values. This change has implications for how those who live in the community relate to it. The provision of services and amenities become better tailored to assumptions about the needs of those who may visit than the needs of those who live there. Further, nowhere in this relationship is it written that there must be a community-controlled approach or even that members of rural areas must be involved in the tourism planning and development process. Indeed, in the short-term logic of capitalism and profit seekers, this would be a very cumbersome undertaking and a hindrance to economic growth and development. This is the part of the logic of current approaches to tourism development that must be challenged.

Another significant danger, and one not dealt with extensively here, is the degree to which the tourism market can even absorb so many rural destinations. The current ‘cookie-cutter’ approach of the provincial governments studied here illustrates an uncritical assessment not just of community uniqueness but also the vagaries of the tourist market itself. Is it feasible that many rural communities will be able to sustain themselves with a tourism product in competition with their neighbours? Moreover, researchers and policy makers need to consider carefully what kind of development is being created through tourism.

The production of the current regime of accumulation, otherwise known as restructuring, is evident in the discussion by Marchak (1991) and others outlined at the beginning of the paper as they describe the crisis of industrial or manufacturing-based capitalism to increase profits, as well as the periods of great shifts and changes that we are still experiencing as we move into the service and even the so-called knowledge-based economy. Part of this economic transformation, particularly in the West, is a movement to leisure-based activities and nostalgia for the pre-industrial or even the industrial past (Britton, 1991; MacCannell, 1989; Urry, 1990). All of these factors will continue to coalesce to create the push for tourism development in rural areas.
Jessop’s notions of hegemonic projects and accumulation strategies (1997) identify the ways in which the needs of local industry and even international capital are made legitimate at the local level as they work politically to create the conditions necessary to keep maximising profits. Bridger and Harp (1990) and others identify the shift in communities from use value to exchange value – or commodification – the very mechanism used to generate profit from the selling of rural experiences to tourists. This shift can be seen as increasing within rural areas as tourism is being legitimised as a practical development mechanism and thus positioned as a viable option for keeping communities alive.

In rural areas where dramatic changes in land use and economic development are pervasive, efforts to create and legitimate a new regime of accumulation in which owners of capital can continue to expand their profits are complex and varying. However, the constant search for new markets and ways of producing goods in order to maximise profits and accumulate capital demands flexibility difficult to reconcile with a desire to maintain a stable, rural community life.

Regulation theory and radical political economy perspectives help to illuminate the relationships between trends in tourism development at the local level and the broader neoliberal forces under globalisation, as periods of stability and crisis are experienced and consumer culture deepens. Case studies are useful in that they help flesh out the unique ways this occurs in communities as well as in identifying opportunities for alternative approaches to resist and counter the framing of tourism within an economic development imperative. Efforts must be made to help rural communities (and other areas caught in this imperative) to design a tourism strategy that is part of a larger, long-term effort for community sustainability. While much touted and criticised, a community-based approach to tourism development may be one step in putting the needs of community members ahead of tourist needs (Blackstock, 2005; Bramwell & Sharman, 1999; Reid et al., 2004).

As with most studies of this sort, the particularities of the cases make it difficult to extend to generalities. Future research must be undertaken in regard to understanding how this neoliberal imperative of economic development is manifested and maintained in rural and urban communities elsewhere as well as the implications of this shift. Illuminating the assumptions underscoring this growing support for tourism is one step in creating tourism projects that are built on a wide range of development imperatives that meet the needs of the community in question. Given the overwhelming support of tourism development projects in both the developed and underdeveloped world, and in light of the growing evidence of negative economic, social and environmental impacts, the task is urgent.
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