

## Review Article

### Note bibliographique

## Alternative Styles in the Study of Canadian Politics\*

ALAN C. CAIRNS *University of British Columbia*

### The dominance of *The Government of Canada*

Canadian political science lacks a tradition of long review articles. Seminal works receive too many eulogies and too few critiques, as the ties of friendship and familiarity characteristic of a small academic community inhibit criticisms. Monopolies of interpretation flourish, sustained by the absence of alternative analyses, a problem long evident in the texts on Canadian government and politics. The academic issue raised by the long dominance of *The Government of Canada*,<sup>1</sup> first published in 1947, was not the adequacy or orientation of what was a considerable work of scholarship by any standards, but simply that disciplines are poorly served by monopolies. This dominance has been finally undermined by the welcome appearance of two new texts, *The Structure of Canadian Government* by James R. Mallory,<sup>2</sup> and *The Canadian Political System: Environment, Structure and Process*, written by two political scientists at Carleton University, Richard J. Van Loon and Michael S. Whittington.<sup>3</sup>

Mallory's work provides students and professors with an alternative text employing the same institutional-historical approach as *The Government of Canada*,<sup>4</sup> while Van Loon and Whittington, although paying re-

spect to "Dawson's classic," employ such modern tools as a process approach and systems analysis, thus identifying themselves as spokesmen for the new political science which "has claimed its birthright as one of the social sciences and has begun to put government within the context of its social environment."<sup>5</sup> Thanks to their effort, the choice of a text is now the conscious choice between two contrasting styles of political science in Canada.

The effect of markets on scholarship and publication is often overlooked by academics. Two decades ago Keirstead and Watkins lamented the relatively small domestic market for political-science texts, as being too small "to furnish a particularly promising field of local publishing enterprise," while there were too few faculty and graduate students "to produce a considerable body of publishable writings."<sup>6</sup> This situation changed with the explosive growth of university education in the sixties, which increased the demand for texts and the number of faculty capable of writing them. Publishers became more aggressive and more competitive. The resulting frantic search for publishable material gave a boost to the reprint industry as previous works were republished, books of readings flourished, and various specialized monographs, designed as supplementary texts, appeared in response to an expanding market. The beneficent effects of this publication explosion are now evident in the availability of textbook choice in the field of Canadian politics.

ernor-General, cabinet government and parliamentary sovereignty suitably modified by the federal structure adopted by the framers of the British North America Act in 1867." *Review, American Political Science Review*, LXVI (1972), 1067.

<sup>5</sup>Van Loon and Whittington, preface.

<sup>6</sup>Burton S. Keirstead and Frederick M. Watkins, "Political Science in Canada," in UNESCO, *Contemporary Political Science: A Survey of Methods, Research and Training* (Paris, 1950), 174.

\*Helpful comments on this article have been received from Ed Black, David Elkins, George Feaver, Iza Laponce, Jean Laponce, Jack Millar, Ian Slater, Marian Slater, Donald Smiley, and Vladek Stankiewicz.

<sup>1</sup>R. MacGregor Dawson (Toronto, 1947). All references in this article are to the fifth edition published in 1970 and revised by Norman Ward, hereafter cited as Dawson and Ward.

<sup>2</sup>(Toronto, 1971), hereafter cited as Mallory.

<sup>3</sup>(Toronto, 1971), hereafter cited as Van Loon and Whittington.

<sup>4</sup>Douglas Verney's summary is apt: "Professor Mallory does not attempt to break new ground comparatively or conceptually: like Dawson he takes as his starting point the Anglo-Canadian tradition of Monarch, Gov-

Texts are frequently held in low esteem as inferior products of second-rate minds, as examples of academic parasitism in which the few acquire wealth by plundering the work of others. This negative attitude may be appropriate in the United States where the flood of American-government texts adds little to our understanding, but in Canada where our lives have not been complicated by an excess of texts this is not the case. The continuing absence of secondary literature in key areas both thwarts and complicates the writing of a good comprehensive text, for, unlike the article or monograph where the author can remain within his own areas of special competence and interest, the text puts his weaknesses on display. The contemporary debate within political science over issues of scope and method adds another element of difficulty by generating uncertainty about the kind of text that is most appropriate. When the country under analysis is beset with profound political controversy over fundamentals, including its very survival, an additional complication is readily apparent. In these inauspicious circumstances the appearance of new texts is an occasion for rejoicing.

This was certainly the response in the mid-forties when four broad-ranging scholarly texts appeared: H.McD. Clokie, *Canadian Government and Politics*,<sup>7</sup> J.A. Corry, *Democratic Government and Politics*,<sup>8</sup> R.M. Dawson, *The Government of Canada*, and A. Brady, *Democracy in the Dominions: A Comparative Study in Institutions*.<sup>9</sup> Given the scanty literature on which they could build, and the high quality they attained, these volumes were distinguished intellectual achievements. Their clear identity as works of political science revealed that behind the political economy label, and within the joint university departments then common, political science and economics were separating from each other. Of additional significance was the fact that they were the work of Canadian scholars located in Canadian universities, and as the best of the previous overviews had been written by foreigners such as Siegfried and Bryce, or by transplanted Englishmen such as Goldwin Smith, their publication was a major contribution to the development of political science in Canada.

For students of Canadian politics *The Government of Canada* had a special significance. Its appearance, stated Arnold Heeney, was "an event of more than ordinary importance in the study of Canadian government. For the first time a serious attempt has been made by a competent authority to examine critically

... the whole complicated mechanism by which Canada is governed."<sup>10</sup> The works of Brady and Corry included much material on Canada, but they were explicitly comparative and thus did not constitute alternative texts in Canadian politics. Clokie's *Canadian Government and Politics*, published three years earlier than Dawson's book, was much less thorough in its description of institutions, although it was more informative about Canadian society and had a simple unpretentious style. It was also less formidable in size and detail than Dawson's work and thus had certain advantages as an introductory text. However, it was only revised once, in 1950, and did not long remain a serious rival to *The Government of Canada*.

In the struggle for survival Dawson's text had many advantages, being impeccably produced by the University of Toronto Press, and kept up to date by four revisions in 1954, 1957, 1963, and 1970. After Dawson's death in 1958 future revisions were entrusted to Norman Ward, who had studied under Dawson. Ward ably handled the succession crisis, having a warm respect for his one-time mentor, and defining the task of political science in much the same way. In its later editions, as in its original format, *The Government of Canada* remained a classic illustration of a historical-institutional approach.

Market factors probably helped its survival. It is likely that until the late fifties the market was inherently monopolistic, large enough to comfortably support one text but too small to support more than one. In these circumstances any rival text employing the same approach faced very stiff competition. A different kind of text using one of the newly emerging approaches to the study of politics was always a possibility; however until recently such an undertaking was severely hindered by the absence of the secondary material required to sustain a novel perspective. With the aid of these factors Dawson's text dominated the textbook field for a quarter of a century.

Nevertheless, the passage of time inevitably worked against *The Government of Canada*.<sup>11</sup> At a very elementary level a feeling developed that it was unseemly for one text to survive so long with no competition. Its continued dominance, regardless of its qualities, came to be viewed as a reproach by succeeding generations anxious to establish

<sup>10</sup>Review, *Canadian Historical Review*, 29 (1948), 69.

<sup>11</sup>Many of the comments in this and the following paragraph are echoed in John Meisel's review of the fourth edition in *Journal of Commonwealth Political Studies*, III (1965), 155-6.

<sup>7</sup>Toronto, 1944.

<sup>8</sup>Toronto, 1946.

<sup>9</sup>Toronto, 1947.

their own identities as political scientists. Dawson's book inevitably bore the imprint of its time and of his personality. He was a staunch nationalist whose analysis was comfortably located in the then-popular colony-to-nation syndrome. The postwar nationalism of English Canada was reflected in his focus on and support for the central government, and his lack of interest in French Canada. These, and various other subtle emphases of time, place, and person were resistant to modification in later editions. As the depression and the Second World War receded into history, the text changed less than the political system it described.

Not only did Canada change – so did political science. The growing political science literature of recent years meant that Dawson's successors faced a less formidable task of authorship than he had encountered in the forties. Much of this literature reflected new perspectives in focus, style, and methodology which, under the general rubric of the behavioural revolution, led some critics to view Dawson's work as a brilliant anachronism.<sup>12</sup> A historical-institutional approach came to represent the past from whose thralldom it was the duty of later generations to escape.

The emergence of a partially hostile academic environment created problems for Ward. The original format of the book was such that accommodation to an alternative

<sup>12</sup>Douglas Verney stated in 1964 that even when first written "Dawson's book ... was a pre-war style text for a post-war world, and despite the revised editions of 1954 and 1957 it remained a monumental tribute to an earlier era." Review, "Government without Politics," *Canadian Forum*, 44 (1964), 18.

In his 1965 review of the fourth edition John Meisel anticipated "a great flowering of Canadian political science and with it, a great proliferation and improvement in the available text books." He asserted that "it is almost certain that this very fine book is the last of its kind to emerge from the typewriters of Canadian scholars." He somewhat prematurely concluded, "while we recognise and even welcome its passing, we nevertheless marvel at the greatness of its achievement." *Journal of Commonwealth Political Studies*, III (1965), 156.

In the early fifties there was a similar reaction in the United States to the dominance of F.A. Ogg and P.O. Ray, *Introduction to American Government* (1st ed., New York, 1922), with its "seemingly excessive emphasis on formalisms and detail." George Carey, "Introductory Textbooks to American Government," *The Political Science Reviewer*, 1 (1971), 155.

brand of political science would have gone far beyond the bounds of a normal revision. In any case Ward was sympathetic to Dawson's approach, and agreeably deferred to the publishers and the Dawson family by keeping the "original form and character of the book"<sup>13</sup> in the fourth edition. Although the fifth edition was more extensively revised, it embodies the same approach to political science as the first edition published a quarter of a century ago.

Although texts are written by individuals, their synthesizing nature makes them, more than most academic works, collective achievements. They bring together previous research and, if well received, may impart directions to future research. Due to their crucial teaching function thousands of students will learn about Canadian politics from their pages. These considerations make the comparison of texts a matter of practical importance as well as a convenient way to raise questions of a broad disciplinary nature.<sup>14</sup>

#### Central government focus

Although the texts differ in various ways, they are similar in their focus on the central government and their exclusion of provincial (and municipal) government and politics. The provinces are noted when they supply an interesting precedent, provide an intriguing comparison, or are necessary to a discussion of federalism, but not otherwise. Although Dawson was a "Nova Scotian of Nova Scotians,"<sup>15</sup> he was also, like most

<sup>13</sup>Dawson and Ward, viii.

<sup>14</sup>Two recent attempts to examine the state and nature of American political science through an examination of introductory texts are Alan C. Isaak, "The Grassroots of a Discipline: A Review of Some Introductory Texts in Political Science," *American Political Science Review*, LXVI (1972), 1336–40; and Carey, "Introductory Textbooks."

A revealing indication of cultural differences in attitudes to texts is evident in R.H. Pear's review article, "The Great American Textbook," *Parliamentary Affairs*, XVII (1964), which notes the proselytizing purposes of American texts in contrast to the British approach. "A speaker who talks about the 'British way of Life' will, if he is not careful, raise a giggle before he has gone very far," 220.

<sup>15</sup>G.E. Wilson, "Robert MacGregor Dawson, 1895–1958," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, xxv (1959), 210. He wrote the *Report of the Nova Scotia Royal Commission on Provincial Development and Rehabilitation*, two vols. (Halifax, N.S.,

English-Canadian social scientists of his era, a nationalist and centralist. The first edition of *The Government of Canada* did not cover "except incidentally, anything more than the Canadian federal or central government and its relations with the provinces."<sup>16</sup> By the fifth edition, Ward, after noting the varying views of the Canadian constitution, "frankly admitted ... a 'one nation' and centralist view of the constitution" in his text.<sup>17</sup> Mallory stated that the "main weight of the discussion will be on the institutions of central government," because of his own lack of knowledge and the absence of secondary literature. In any case, the differences in government machinery "between the provinces and Ottawa are not great. Within limits, what is true of the central government is also true of any given provincial government."<sup>18</sup> Van Loon and Whittington attributed their central-government focus to limitations of space, absence of knowledge, the difficulty of generalization (because, in partial contrast to Mallory's assertion, "provincial and municipal governments are such diverse institutions,"), and to the prevailing tendency of Canadian political scientists to focus on national politics, which made it difficult to recruit other scholars into provincial studies.<sup>19</sup>

Explanations are not the same as justifications. The exclusion of provincial (and municipal) levels of government from three textbooks which display different approaches and whose authors belong to different generations is a serious shortcoming which not only reduces their utility as texts, but reveals a basic weakness of Canadian political science. A centralist bias has been characteristic of Anglophone historians and political scientists who for most of the last 40 years not only focused on the central government, but sided with it, displaying all the symptoms of the biographer's disease – becoming a protagonist for their subject.<sup>20</sup> The right denigrated

1944), and he also had extensive prairie experience as head of the University of Saskatchewan political science department from 1928 to 1937.

<sup>16</sup>Dawson and Ward, v. The failure to cover provincial or local government was described as an "important shortcoming" in William B. Munro's review of the first edition: *American Political Science Review*, 42 (1948), 583.

<sup>17</sup>Dawson and Ward, 58.

<sup>18</sup>Mallory, 29. There are, however, "extremely wide variations in the character of the politics of different provinces ...," 31.

<sup>19</sup>Van Loon and Whittington, 493–4.

<sup>20</sup>See Alan C. Cairns, "The Study of the Provinces: A Review Article," *B.C. Studies*, no. 14 (Summer, 1972), 73–6, for a discussion of this centralist bias.

regionalism as a barrier to national unity, while the left castigated it as an ephemeral form of false consciousness which regrettably delayed the emergence of the class politics necessary for a British-type party system to emerge on Canadian soil. Sir John A. Macdonald and the League for Social Reconstruction both believed that federalism would prove to be a temporary arrangement destined for the museum as provincial identities faded under the experience of common membership in the same political system and/or the nationalizing hammer blows of industrialism.<sup>21</sup> The central government, nation-building focus of Canadian scholarship needs to be supplemented by a recognition and analysis of the process of province building which has been such a significant part of Canadian history.<sup>22</sup>

A central-government focus exaggerates Canadian unity and uniformity by overlooking those diversities demarcated by provincial boundaries. All three texts, for example, pay minimal attention to the regional/provincial diversities of political culture and political practice in English Canada.<sup>23</sup> Furthermore, such a focus underestimates the significance of minor parties, which have been more successful at the provincial level.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>21</sup>P.E. Trudeau, "The Practice and Theory of Federalism," *Social Purpose for Canada*, ed. Michael Oliver (Toronto, 1961) is the classic indictment of the former ccf left for its centralist antipathy to federalism. Various contemporary Canadian left-wing thinkers, by contrast, display positive support for various forms of decentralization. See Bruce Hodgins, "Nationalism, Decentralism and the Left," *Canadian Forum* (April, 1972); Kari Levitt, "Towards Decolonization: Canada and Quebec," *Canadian Forum* (March, 1972); and Charles Taylor, *The Pattern of Politics* (Toronto, 1970), 116–23.

<sup>22</sup>*Canadian Provincial Politics: The Party System of the Ten Provinces*, ed. Martin Robin (Scarborough, 1972) helps to fill one important gap in provincial studies.

<sup>23</sup>John Wilson makes this point with respect to Van Loon and Whittington. Review, *Canadian Public Administration*, 15 (1972), 400.

<sup>24</sup>A weakness partially overcome by the fact that none of the three texts completely maintains its national focus in discussion of the parties. This relative willingness to depart from a restrictive central-government focus probably reflects four factors: (1) the pronounced interest of political scientists in third parties, which have been stronger at the provincial level; (2) the generally good literature on third parties in the provinces; (3) recognition, or assumption of important links

For the British Columbian whose provincial politics have been dominated by the CCF/NDP and Social Credit for two decades the equation of political leadership with Liberal and Conservative prime ministers at the national level has elements of unreality. Texts that provide space to R.B. Bennett, and none to W.A.C. Bennett (who is mentioned only once in the three volumes)<sup>25</sup> do not come to grips with the political world of those of us who are both British Columbians and Canadians. The Newfoundlander who notes that Joey Smallwood is not mentioned may be equally bemused by the differences between post-confederation politics as he knows it and as these texts describe it.

Far more serious than the vague unease precipitated in Newfoundlanders and British Columbians is the inevitable playing down of the French fact that results from an Ottawa focus. The major attraction of Confederation for French Canadians in 1867 was the security and the outlet for collective self-expression provided by the provincial government of Quebec.<sup>26</sup> To ignore Quebec is to ignore the centre of French-Canadian political attention. According to Van Loon and Whittington, using the results of John Meisel's 1965 National Political Survey, only 24 per cent of French Canadians think Ottawa "handles the most important problems," compared to 57 per cent of English Canadians. Thus provincial political office is much more attractive in Quebec than elsewhere, and for many French-Canadian politicians constitutes "the summit of their ambitions."<sup>27</sup>

These texts, written for English Canadians by English Canadians, differ in a striking way from the Sabourin text for French-Canadian students, which devotes approximately one-quarter of its pages to provincial, basically

between parties at the two levels; (4) recognition that federal provincial conflict cannot be understood without including provincial parties.

<sup>25</sup>Van Loon and Whittington, 271.

<sup>26</sup>Three articles by Jean-Charles Bonenfant describe French-Canadian attitudes. "Les Canadiens français et la naissance de la Confédération," Canadian Historical Association, *Report* (1952); "L'Idée que les Canadiens français de 1864 pouvaient avoir du fédéralisme," *Culture*, 25 (1964), and *The French Canadians and the Birth of Confederation* (Ottawa, 1966).

<sup>27</sup>Van Loon and Whittington, 280. On p. 85 the phrase "most important *political* problems" (underlining added) is used with the same percentages, 57 and 24. It is not clear from the text which wording is correct, or whether both are.

Quebec, politics.<sup>28</sup> The fact that only four of the hundreds of footnotes contained in the three English texts refer to French-language sources<sup>29</sup> provides supplementary confirmation of their Anglophone nature.

English-speaking political scientists apparently have the same difficulty as English-speaking politicians in straddling, or encompassing, the ethnic duality of Canada.<sup>30</sup> It is "indeed remarkable," as Smiley noted in 1967, how little attention the previous generation of political scientists had paid to "political relations between English- and French-speaking Canadians and ... the politics of Quebec."<sup>31</sup> While both Mallory and Van Loon and Whittington provide helpful information and interpretation of the French or Quebec fact in Canada,<sup>32</sup> their texts, in spite of the events of the past decade, contain only a slightly less English-Canadian version than *The Government of Canada*<sup>33</sup> originally written a quarter of a century earlier.

<sup>28</sup>*Le Système politique du Canada: institutions fédérales et québécoises*, ed. Louis Sabourin (Ottawa, 1968). Jean-Charles Bonenfant, *Les Institutions politiques canadiennes* (Québec, 1954), an older elementary French text, contains one chapter on provincial legislatures, one on the Legislative Council in Quebec, and one on municipal institutions.

<sup>29</sup>Van Loon and Whittington, 243, 253, 356; Mallory, 302.

<sup>30</sup>The present generation of Anglophone academics inherits a lengthy tradition well described by Mallory. For most of the first 100 years of Canadian history "even the most liberal" English-speaking Canadians, he wrote, "... regarded French Canada as little more than a transitory source of trouble and discomfort which, in the long run, would somehow be solved by the ultimate penetration of the forces of 'progress' into Quebec. Meanwhile it was best to let sleeping dogs lie." Mallory, 395.

<sup>31</sup>Donald V. Smiley, "Contributions to Canadian Political Science since the Second World War," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, xxxiii (1967), 573.

<sup>32</sup>Mallory, for example, has an excellent concluding section on the ethnic political crisis of the past decade, 393-404, and on "The Public Service in a Bicultural Community," 175-9. Van Loon and Whittington include a helpful discussion of the French-English cleavage, 47-64.

<sup>33</sup>In his preface to the fourth edition in 1963 Ward noted that a reading of "almost the whole of the earlier text" would have failed to provide understanding of the French-speaking third of the country and the political importance of the French fact. It was "an



The decision to write a text is based on assumptions about the audience to whom it is addressed. It would be a useful experiment if the authors of future texts faced the prospect of simultaneous publication of their work in both languages. What kind of text could portray Canadian political reality simultaneously to the students of English Canada and the predominantly separatist youth of Quebec?<sup>34</sup> The challenge of such a task would almost certainly evoke increased respect for the virtues and difficulties of brokerage politics, and would render visible the ethnic/cultural assumptions behind much contemporary academic analysis and description in Canada.<sup>35</sup>

Changes in the working nature of the federal system constitute additional reasons for including the provinces in future texts that profess to be comprehensive. Separate treatment of the central government was plausible when classical federalism prevailed; however, the era in which each government went "its own way in the enjoyment of its own powers under the check of a watchful electorate with a minimum of either association or collision"<sup>36</sup> is over. It has been succeeded by a situation in which the two levels are locked in an interdependence which elicits both cooperative activities and violent conflicts. The two levels of government have become more intermeshed at the same time as the provincial and municipal governments have grown greatly in importance. Both trends surely underline the folly of excluding the provinces from an analysis of Canadian politics. Even if the explanation of central-government be-

English-Canadian version of Canadian government, and while I cannot pretend to have made it any less so, I have where possible amended the text to include references to the rest of us," vii–viii.

<sup>34</sup>See Jacques Lazure, *La Jeunesse du Québec en révolution: essai d'interprétation* (Montreal, 1971), esp. chap. II.

<sup>35</sup>When authors "forget" their ethnic background, they run the risk of being taken to task by ethnic patriots. Maurice Lamontagne, author of *Le Fédéralisme canadien* (Québec, 1954), a book which did not dwell on the particularism of Quebec, was criticized by Michel Brunet in the following revealing manner: "Le plus grave reproche qu'un critique canadien-français puisse adresser à M. Lamontagne c'est d'avoir systématiquement oublié qu'il est un Canadien français du Québec." *Canadiens et Canadiens* (Montreal, 1954), 162.

<sup>36</sup>J.A. Corry, "Constitutional Trends and Federalism," in A.R.M. Lower, et al., *Evolving Canadian Federalism* (Durham, N.C., 1958), 95.

haviour is the prime concern it is no longer realistic to devote more space to the Senate and the governor general than to the impact of the provinces on federal decision-making, for, as Richard Simeon notes, "the federal and provincial governments compete to gain credit, status, and importance, and to avoid discredit and blame."<sup>37</sup> With rare exceptions, the anticipated reaction of the prime minister of Quebec is a more important factor in the decisions of the federal cabinet than that of the governor general, and yet tradition induces the institutionally oriented political scientist to pay more attention to possible, but unlikely, conflicts between the prime minister and the governor general than to chronic conflicts with the provinces which at times threaten to tear the system apart. While Van Loon and Whittington helpfully refer on several occasions to intergovernmental conflict and collaboration,<sup>38</sup> and include a useful chapter on interest groups, they do not treat the provincial governments as the biggest interest groups of all, endowed with legality and institutionalized access to Ottawa. In the development of the Canada and Quebec pension plans, for example, the federal government paid much more attention to the provinces, especially Quebec, than to the powerful insurance lobbies whose extensive campaign had little effect.<sup>39</sup> It is necessary, therefore, to go beyond the standard section on intergovernmental collaboration<sup>40</sup> if the provinces are to receive the prominence their importance justifies.

A recent observation by John Meisel merits attention: "The vast majority of studies of Canadian politics have focused on problems which seem to appear in only one jurisdiction, and they have therefore tended to neglect the degree to which much of Canada's life is influenced by the interplay of forces manifesting themselves at two or more levels of government."<sup>41</sup>

The most common method for simultaneously dealing with both levels of government has been to study linking mechanisms, or specific foci, or instruments of federal-provincial interaction. The old coercive measures

<sup>37</sup>*Federal-Provincial Diplomacy: The Making of Recent Policy in Canada* (Toronto, 1972), 185, italics in original. See also Van Loon and Whittington, 166.

<sup>38</sup>Van Loon and Whittington, 166–7, 391–2, 407.

<sup>39</sup>Simeon, *Federal-Provincial Diplomacy*, 269.

<sup>40</sup>Mallory, 386–93; Van Loon and Whittington, 222–8. In Dawson and Ward this focus is mainly found in the chapter on dominion-provincial financial relations.

<sup>41</sup>Simeon, *Federal-Provincial Diplomacy*, vii.

of disallowance, reservation, and refusal of assent have been examined by various scholars, and the position of lieutenant governor has been given detailed scrutiny by Saywell. Federal-provincial administrative collaboration has been examined, notably by Corry, Smiley, and Veilleux, while the link of money in the form of conditional and equalization grants has elicited a number of useful studies. The Senate, originally viewed as a protector of the provinces, has received several book-length examinations, although the more potent role of the federal cabinet in this regard has been more noted than examined. The role of parties as linking institutions has been partially illuminated by Paltiel, Black, and others, and various hypotheses exist about how the voter plays his role in two discrete political arenas. The major formal instruments of constitutional adaptability (judicial review and constitutional amendment), have managed to muster a respectable literature by Canadian standards, while the federal-provincial complications of treaty-making and treaty-implementing have been extensively discussed. Finally, Simeon has recently dissected federal-provincial policy-making at the summit.<sup>42</sup>

While all of the above studies are useful, they do not go far enough in developing frameworks which allow us to look at the total Canadian political system from the provincial perspectives of Quebec City, Edmonton, and Halifax, as well as, and concurrent with, the national Ottawa perspective. In short, the provinces should not be appendages hustled on and off the stage before an uncomprehending audience, but should be star performers in their own right. We require a framework coextensive with the single Canadian political system and its two major levels of government jointly responsible for administering the same people in the same land area – 11 political arenas with overlapping electorates, all subject to dimly understood forces of change which over time cause the two jurisdictional levels to expand and contract relative to each other. This is a difficult academic task, partly because of our strong tendency to think separately of each level of government (a tendency fostered by the available literature), rather than of the single

<sup>42</sup>The literature pertaining to the authors and subjects cited in this paragraph is listed in the excellent federalism bibliography in *Canadian Federalism: Myth or Reality*, ed. J. Peter Meekison (2nd ed., Toronto, 1971), with the exception of Gérard Veilleux, *Les relations intergouvernementales au Canada, 1867–1967: les mécanismes de coopération* (Montréal, 1971), and Simeon, *Federal-Provincial Diplomacy*.

political system of which they are component parts. The development of a comprehensive framework will have to be a work of creative synthesis that will lead us out of the conceptual jails we have unwittingly developed.<sup>43</sup> At the moment such a work is particularly hampered by the absence of an adequate literature dealing with the provincial level. If governments at the municipal level are included, the difficulty of the task is further increased. However the logic that requires inclusion of the provinces is equally compelling for the governments that exist under their jurisdiction.

#### Lack of interest in output

A second weakness of postwar Canadian political science revealed by these texts is a lack of concern with what government does.<sup>44</sup> Two of the texts take the reader through an extended historical and institutional analysis of the federal government, but provide neither description, explanation, nor evaluation of the extraordinary proliferation of government policies and programs since Confederation. Van Loon and Whittington are equally remiss. In the opening pages of their book they provide an Eastonian diagram of the political system with outputs prominently displayed. They then guide the reader through a long section largely dealing with the policy process, but fail to discuss the outputs which the process generates.

All three texts make general references to the growth of government, the expansion of service functions, the increasingly technical and complex nature of modern legislation, the strains thus placed on the federal system, the resulting shift of power from legislatures to cabinets and from cabinets to bureaucracies, and the problems of public control thereby created. Delegated legislation, administrative and judicial tribunals, the by-

<sup>43</sup>One of the most successful syntheses in the existing literature is James R. Mallory's case study *Social Credit and the Federal Power in Canada* (Toronto, 1954).

<sup>44</sup>See *The Structures of Policy-Making in Canada*, ed. G. Bruce Doern and Peter Aucoin (Toronto, 1971), introduction. This failing is not confined to Canada. For a general discussion, which notes the recent emergence of a strong interest in policy and output studies by political scientists, see H. Hugh Hecló, "Review Article: Policy Analysis," *British Journal of Political Science*, 2 (1972). There is some evidence of a growing Canadian interest in output, particularly by political scientists at the University of Toronto who have produced several important policy studies in recent years.

passing of the courts, and the threats to the rule of law are all discussed in relation to the evolving tasks of the modern state. A particular disciplinary bias of political scientists is evident in the tendency to view the growth of government in terms of its impact on the shifting relations among the institutions of government itself and on certain fundamental norms such as the rule of law and the accountability of elected office holders.

Smiley suggests that the postwar generation of Canadian political scientists has been less interested in public policies than has its predecessors.<sup>45</sup> If the proviso is added that many of the scholars who matured in the interwar years continued to publish in the postwar period, his suggestion of a generation difference seems valid. Brady, for example, had a deep and abiding interest in collectivism which is reflected in several of his works.<sup>46</sup> Henry Angus had a strong interest in foreign policy toward Asia, and in domestic policy toward Orientals.<sup>47</sup> J.A. Corry's combination of legal training and liberalism gave him a continuing interest in the growth of government,<sup>48</sup> the relations of government and business,<sup>49</sup> and the impact of growth on valued political norms.<sup>50</sup> R.A. MacKay, usually identified with his well-known study of the Senate,<sup>51</sup> also edited and contributed to an important book on Newfoundland which had as its fundamental theme an analysis of the capacity of its government to provide a reasonable standard of public services for a

population whose expectations increasingly reflected North American consumer values.<sup>52</sup> Finally, the Rowell-Sirois report, with its supporting studies, was a response to the collective failure of Canadian governments to solve depression problems. Curiously, this magnificent state paper, to which political scientists made important contributions, had almost no direct effect on the research focus of the next generation of political scientists.

Although a residual concern for political economy lingered on at the University of Toronto, where an interest in public policy also found scattered support, little interest in outputs survived in the postwar years, and in the 1969 book of readings, *Business and Government in Canada*, edited by Jack McLeod and K.J. Rea<sup>53</sup> only two articles, one originally published in 1950, were written by Canadian political scientists. The bibliographies at the end of each section make it clear that the continuation of the political-economy tradition has received little support from political scientists. The one flourishing exception to the general lack of concern with output has been the field of Canadian foreign policy. Stimulated by the Canadian Institute of International Affairs and blessed by its existence as a distinct subfield of international relations, it has received a continuous stream of comment and analysis.

A focus on inputs is natural to scholars in democratic polities who are concerned with the manner in which the people control and influence their rulers. Logically, however, the power of the people cannot be assessed if outputs are excluded from analysis. We should "begin to view politics through the eyes of the consumer."<sup>54</sup> What impact does the Leviathan of modern government have on Canadians? Has the welfare state increased our welfare? What has been the effect of the century-long activity of the Indian Affairs Branch on the "Indian problem"? Has the tax system reduced or fostered inequalities? Which government policies achieve the presumed goals behind their selection and implementation? The evolving role of government makes Lasswell's famous dictum – Politics: who gets what, when, how – increasingly relevant.

Unfortunately, in Canada we have had no continuing equivalent to the British Fabian

<sup>45</sup>"Contributions," 569.

<sup>46</sup>"The State and Economic Life," *Canada*, ed. George W. Brown (Toronto, 1950); "The Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, II (1936); "Economic Activity of the State in the British Dominions," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, V (1939); and his major work *Democracy in the Dominions*.

<sup>47</sup>See *Canadian Issues: Essays in Honour of Henry F. Angus*, ed. Robert M. Clark (Toronto, 1961), for a bibliography of the writings of Angus.

<sup>48</sup>*The Growth of Government Activities since Confederation* (Ottawa, 1939); "Changes in the Functions of Government," *Canadian Historical Association, Report* (1945).

<sup>49</sup>"The Fusion of Government and Business," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, II (1936).

<sup>50</sup>"The Prospects for the Rule of Law," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, XXI (1955); and more recently *The Changing Conditions of Politics* (Toronto, 1963).

<sup>51</sup>*The Unreformed Senate of Canada* (London, 1926; rev. ed., Toronto, 1963).

<sup>52</sup>*Newfoundland: Economic, Diplomatic and Strategic Studies* (Toronto, 1946).

<sup>53</sup>Toronto, 1969.

<sup>54</sup>Kenneth M. Dolbeare, "Public Policy Analysis and the Coming Struggle for the Soul of the Postbehavioral Revolution," *Power and Community: Dissenting Essays in Political Science*, ed. Philip Green and Sanford Levinson (New York, 1970), 93.



society and its left-wing analysis;<sup>55</sup> nor have we had a school of social administration capable of producing such university-based academics as Richard M. Titmuss<sup>56</sup> to provide us with a running commentary on developing social policy and on the performance of the political/economic system measured against the ideal of equality. The faculties of social welfare in Canada seem to have made almost no academic contribution to our understanding of the evolution of the welfare state.<sup>57</sup> We have also lacked reasoned defences of the limited state that display the sophistication of Friedrich von Hayek's *The Constitution of Liberty*.<sup>58</sup> The absence of these schools of analysis reveals our success at eschewing evaluative considerations to the detriment of our understanding.

Why has government grown so dramatic-

<sup>55</sup>A temporary exception was the depression-born League for Social Reconstruction. See Michiel Horn, "The League for Social Reconstruction and the development of a Canadian socialism, 1932-1936," *Journal of Canadian Studies*, vii (1972), and his unpublished PhD thesis "The League for Social Reconstruction: Socialism and Nationalism in Canada, 1931-1945," University of Toronto, 1969. A number of academic groups, largely Toronto-based, have made various attempts to fill the gap, particularly the University League for Social Reform and the more radical breakaway group SPEC (Studies in the Political Economy of Canada) whose first publication edited by Gary Teeple has just appeared, *Capitalism and the National Question in Canada* (Toronto, 1972). There has also been a noticeable growth in radical periodicals in recent years to supplement the venerable *Canadian Forum*, particularly *Our Generation* (commenced 1961 with the title of *Our Generation against Nuclear War*), *Canadian Dimension* (commenced 1963), and *Last Post* (commenced 1969). The rise and fall of radical French-Canadian periodicals is outside the scope of a footnote.

<sup>56</sup>*Income Distribution and Social Change* (London, 1962); *Essays on 'The Welfare State'* (2nd ed., London, 1963); *Commitment to Welfare* (New York, 1968); *The Gift Relationship: from Human Blood to Social Policy* (London, 1970).

<sup>57</sup>For one exception see Richard B. Splane, *Social Welfare in Ontario 1791-1893: A Study of Public Welfare Administration* (Toronto, 1965).

<sup>58</sup>(Chicago, 1960). However, we have had a strong attack on Hayek's limited state by Christian Bay, now of the University of Toronto. See his "Hayek's Liberalism: The Constitution of Perpetual Privilege," *The Political Science Reviewer*, 1 (1971).

ally?<sup>59</sup> The three texts explain its growth in terms of interdependence, urbanism, industrialism, and the insecurities of a free-enterprise economy, but they do not get behind these generalities. We need, as T.K. Olson recently argued, "studies of the *politics* of basic policy areas of this country, including agriculture, economic disparity, resource development, pollution, education, transportation and communication, health, and taxes."<sup>60</sup> Contemporary government, state Dawson and Ward, "is becoming yearly more assertive ... and it is quite prepared to direct and drive people into righteousness."<sup>61</sup> Some future text might discuss the extent to which it has succeeded.

### Institutional analysis

R.M. Dawson did not defend his institutional approach in 1947. He was not troubled by doubts about its appropriateness, and he was little influenced by the disciplinary pluralism of his colleagues in the University of Toronto department of political economy. His approach to the study of Canadian politics shows little trace of the sociological perspective of A. Brady, the Marxist theorizing of C.B. Macpherson, or the influential political-economy focus of Innis and his supporters.

A quarter of a century later Ward and Mallory were both self-conscious and aggressive about their institutional orientation, with Ward vigorously defending it against the charge of obsolescence which he detected in various reviews of the fourth edition, while readily admitting that it needed supplementing by the behavioural and other approaches. He insisted, however, "that other approaches cannot ignore the institutional, and indeed I cannot conceive how one could understand the government of Canada without having at least some understanding of its main institutions: a belief supported by the reading, for this edition, of a variety of works by authors who appear to have attempted that daring feat."<sup>62</sup>

Mallory was equally explicit in defending his own book "about the machinery of government in Canada." He recognized that an improved understanding of political behaviour through the study of elections,

<sup>59</sup>Richard M. Bird, *The Growth of Government Spending in Canada*, Canadian Tax Papers, no. 51 (Toronto, 1970) is an indispensable basic source in this field of research in Canada.

<sup>60</sup>Review of Charles E. Lindblom, *The Policy-Making Process* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1968), *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, iv (1971), 295.

<sup>61</sup>Dawson and Ward, 265.

<sup>62</sup>*Ibid.*, xi-xii.

opinions, and pressure groups was "a necessary and important exercise." However, he continued: "I believe that politics is not only about voters but about politicians, and politicians spend most of their time operating within the framework of the constitution ... It remains important to explain, or at least describe, how they function in their natural habitat, which is Parliament, the Cabinet, and the institutions related to them."<sup>63</sup> Accordingly, he concentrated on the constitution, which provided "the framework of rules" for political activity.<sup>64</sup>

The two traditional texts recognize that institutions cannot be taken at face value. They both share "the traditional British attitude to written constitutions" identified by Professor A.H. Birch: "that if they appear to conflict with the demands of common sense too much attention should not be paid to them."<sup>65</sup> Dawson and Ward make a special point of contrasting the autocratic role of the governor general, indicated by a literal reading of the BNA Act, and the realities of the working system of responsible government.<sup>66</sup> Arnold Heeney's review of the first edition specifically congratulated Dawson for dealing with the "machinery of government in action," observing that the book had an "atmosphere of 'actuality' which has been notably absent from the product of most other Canadian writers in this field."<sup>67</sup>

In addition to, and partly in conflict with, the Rankean desire to describe things the way they really are, there are other considerations that determine the selection and use of material. For example, both institutional texts enjoy the exploration of obscure nooks and crannies of government. Mallory delights in illuminating various esoteric aspects of the constitution. He devotes nearly three pages to Section 26 of the BNA Act, a provision never used, which allows the appointment of additional senators.<sup>68</sup> Dawson and Ward provide a detailed discussion of the rituals attending the

opening of Parliament, as does Mallory.<sup>69</sup> Both texts devote complete chapters to the governor general, and both assert that his reserve powers are important and usable, with Mallory going into considerable detail. The question of the governor general's right to refuse a request for dissolution is carefully considered, the issue being viewed as complex, endowed with a tangled history, possessed of moral aspects, and of more than antiquarian interest.<sup>70</sup>

Both texts are interested in institutions *per se*. A traditional institution or constitutional provision is often described at a length disproportionate to its present, or even its previous, contribution to the functioning of the political system; furthermore, the criteria for allocating space to particular institutions are not clear. One suspects that custom plays an important part, so that traditional, visible institutions, about which much information and analysis has accumulated, are likely to be accorded more space than their importance merits. A related tendency is to come to the defence of institutional arrangements and formal powers frequently regarded as obsolete. Both find important reasons for continued federal-government possession of the disallowance power which has not been used since 1943,<sup>71</sup> and both staunchly support the constitutional monarchy against its detractors. Dawson and Ward attack the view that it is "a useless survival which through inertia or kindness of heart has been allowed to linger on. It is no atrophied organ of the body politic, but an important part with useful and even vital duties to perform. Cabinet government, in short, presupposes some central, impartial figure at its head which at certain times and for certain purposes supplements and aids the other more active and partisan agencies of government."<sup>72</sup>

Both texts allocate a complete chapter to

<sup>63</sup>Mallory, xi.

<sup>64</sup>*Ibid.*, xi.

<sup>65</sup>*Ibid.*, 359. The Canadian constitution, Mallory observes, "is a product of negotiation and bargaining, of a feeling that practical operation is more important than the letter of the law, and that the spirit supersedes the letter of the agreement." Thus "our constitutional law [is] harder to discover and apply than the American, for it shares the ambiguities of the British constitution," 2.

<sup>66</sup>Dawson and Ward, 58–60.

<sup>67</sup>Review, *Canadian Historical Review*, 29 (1948), 69. See however n. 96 below for the criticism of Jennings.

<sup>68</sup>Mallory, 225–8.

<sup>69</sup>Dawson and Ward, 344–8; Mallory, 219–22.

<sup>70</sup>Mallory, 17–18, 48–54. For the discretionary role of the governor general in selecting a prime minister, see Mallory, 45–8, 71–5, and Dawson and Ward, 153–4. The general reserve power of the governor general to deal with serious threats to the constitution is discussed in Dawson and Ward, 161–3.

<sup>71</sup>Mallory, 328; Dawson and Ward, 216–17.

<sup>72</sup>Dawson and Ward, 153. See also 157–8, and in general chap. 8. See, however, 279, for circumstances in which the position of the governor general might disappear. Although Mallory defends the monarchy, he notes that its impact is divisive as well as unifying, and that republican sentiments are powerful in Quebec, 40–1, 399.

the Senate, although that body elicits only minimum praise from Dawson and Ward who express the "gravest doubts" that its cost produces an adequate return, "unless it is looked upon simply as a pension scheme for retired commoners."<sup>73</sup> The most they look for is a slight increase in the Senate's usefulness if it reinvigorates itself, some evidence of which has appeared in recent years.<sup>74</sup> Mallory, however, defends its utility, sympathetically discusses the possibility of its reform, and concludes his chapter by asserting that "the Senate is a real and an important part of the machinery of the constitution."<sup>75</sup>

Given their willingness to praise, or at least to minimize criticism of the less-obviously useful institutions, it is not surprising that extensive space is given to description and positive evaluation of the cabinet and the House of Commons. To Dawson and Ward the cabinet is the "centre of gravity" of the Canadian political system, if any such centre exists,<sup>76</sup> and for Mallory "a well-organized cabinet system ... can, in spite of the necessary compromises and public debates of a healthy democracy, challenge the most formidable totalitarian régimes in sheer efficiency."<sup>77</sup>

Van Loon and Whittington's rejection of the traditional institutional approach is illustrated by the fact that their chapter headings do not divide up the Canadian political system in terms of institutions; indeed they contrast their approach to the *Canada Year Book* which "tends to give a picture biased in favour of many of the myths of the parliamentary system, of a literal interpretation of the constitution, and of the written rules of administrative behaviour," claiming that their book "if anything, leans in the opposite direction."<sup>78</sup> They point out that since "Dawson's classic" of 1947, "the focus of political science has changed in many ways. Primarily, this change has meant a shift in the emphasis of political studies from the form and development of political institutions to the functional relationship of those institutions to society." Given this disciplinary development their purpose was to complement Dawson's work by examining "many of the same things from the newer perspectives that have been developed in the discipline."<sup>79</sup> They are not interested in institutions as such, although they are interested in

the contribution of institutions to the functioning of the Canadian political system; thus they frequently explain behaviour by reference to institutional constraints and incentives. The most convincing explanation they cite for the persistence of third parties in the Canadian setting is an institutional one, namely the tendency of the party discipline required by the parliamentary system to force protest outside the old parties (in contrast to the United States). They note an additional incentive to third parties, also a product of institutions, the possibility of winning provincial power allowed by the federal system.<sup>80</sup> The institution of the single-member-plurality electoral system is advanced as an explanation of certain features of the party system which appear dysfunctional, and they suggest that the tactics of interest groups in Canada and the United States are affected "by structural features of the two political systems."<sup>81</sup>

They display little interest, however, in what they view as peripheral offices and institutions. The governor general and the Senate, extensively treated in the other two texts, are given only cursory attention. In contrast to the extended complex discussion by Mallory, and to a lesser extent by Dawson and Ward, of the capacity of the governor general to refuse a request for dissolution, they dispose of the issue in a paragraph which asserts that "King's victory [in the 1926 election] finally established the principle that the Prime Minister has the right to control the timing of elections, and incidentally removed any illusions about the real power of a Governor General."<sup>82</sup> Their treatment of the Senate is also brief, although it does not differ much in tenor from the other two texts,<sup>83</sup> and they accord it a posi-

<sup>80</sup>*Ibid.*, 279. Mallory, 202, also employs institutional differences to explain Canadian third parties.

<sup>81</sup>Van Loon and Whittington, 293–5, 313–14. For addition speculation on the effect of "government structure on group activity," see 316–17.

<sup>82</sup>Van Loon and Whittington, 288. See also 130–1 re the figurehead status of the governor general. John Wilson suggests that their inadequate treatment of "the reserve power of the crown" may reflect the weakness of "a narrow application of the system approach [which] probably cannot cope with the idea of an ultimate reserve power on the part of the head of state, for it appears to put his function outside the system." Review, *Canadian Public Administration*, 15 (1972), 398.

<sup>83</sup>They are wrong, however, in their statement that the Senate cannot amend money bills and does not attempt to do so, 481. For

<sup>73</sup>Dawson and Ward, 300.

<sup>74</sup>*Ibid.*, 279, 303.

<sup>75</sup>Mallory, 234–41.

<sup>76</sup>Dawson and Ward, 168.

<sup>77</sup>Mallory, 109.

<sup>78</sup>Van Loon and Whittington, 412n.

<sup>79</sup>*Ibid.*, preface.

tive, if minor place in the political system.<sup>84</sup> In an interesting inversion of the argument that the Senate is a bastion for capitalist interests, they suggest that the upper chamber's availability as a retirement haven for former cabinet ministers reduces the necessity of ministerial pandering to the private sector in the hope of future preferment.<sup>85</sup>

The difference in Van Loon and Whittington's evaluations of institutions becomes especially pronounced in their discussion of Parliament. While they occasionally make statements about the positive role of Parliament,<sup>86</sup> their general attitude is one of recurrent debunking. A statement by Dawson and Ward about the contribution of the House of Commons in keeping the cabinet in touch with public opinion is described as "an example of the type of mythology which surrounds the House of Commons,"<sup>87</sup> while the "real sources of power and decision making" in Canada are said to be "far removed from the world of legislatures and Governors General."<sup>88</sup> The granting of an important input role to legislators is described as "one of the more cherished and inaccurate myths of Canadian, and indeed of all democratic, politics."<sup>89</sup> Again, "the concept of parliamentary supremacy is a myth – an outmoded belief that in our system of government ultimate political power should reside in the elected representatives of the people."<sup>90</sup> The decline of legislatures has apparently produced the paradoxical situation in which members of parliament, full-time politicians, are the victims of myths if they have a sense of efficacy. Curiously however, ordinary citizens with a sense of efficacy are implicitly viewed as good citizens, and those who lack such a sense are to be pitied.<sup>91</sup>

the correct position see Dawson and Ward, 295–6.

<sup>84</sup>Van Loon and Whittington, 480–3.

<sup>85</sup>*Ibid.*, 354, 482.

<sup>86</sup>*Ibid.*, 464–5.

<sup>87</sup>*Ibid.*, 369n.

<sup>88</sup>*Ibid.*, 107.

<sup>89</sup>*Ibid.*, 369; see also 495.

<sup>90</sup>*Ibid.*, 447.

<sup>91</sup>*Ibid.*, 89–92. Elsewhere, however, we are told that increasing government complexity produces "a decline in the ability of the individual to understand current political issues," 331. This is followed by a discussion of the dangers of citizens combining feelings of efficacy with ignorance, 332–3.

Is the stress of contemporary political science, particularly in the United States, on measuring feelings of citizen efficacy related to American populist values? Does (should) the concept of the good citizen have the same

The debate over the usefulness of institutional studies does not admit of an easy answer. It is evident that they can manifest a sterile formalism if they take constitutional charters and organizational forms at face value. The human-relations-school of industrial sociology long ago noted the contrast between actual behaviour and the behaviour assumed by organization charts. This understanding has become a commonplace of the social sciences. In addition to observing the distinction between formal and informal organization, there is the more difficult task of analysing the reciprocal manner in which the formal rules and the behaviour affect each other. Analysis is further complicated by the fact that institutions adopted as means to protect or foster certain values become valued themselves. Parliamentary government is an obvious illustration.

It is not possible to focus on society rather than on institutions, for no societies exist without institutions. We cannot ignore institutions because of an interest in the real world of behaviour.<sup>92</sup> Particular institutional

meaning in different political systems? Does parliamentary government make a difference to the model of good citizen behaviour? Perhaps the appropriate feeling is not efficacy, which for an individual is probably a delusion anyway, but a resigned willingness to do one's duty as a citizen even if satisfying results are unlikely to be forthcoming.

<sup>92</sup>Representative examples of Canadian political-science literature examining the impact of institutions on behaviour include the following: W.R. Lederman, "Some Forms and Limitations of Co-Operative Federalism," *Canadian Bar Review*, XLV (1967) discusses the significance of the BNA Act for cooperative federalism, and refutes the suggestion that the constitutional text is a meaningless facade. S.M. Lipset, "Democracy in Alberta," *Canadian Forum*, xxxiv (1954–5), 175–7, 196–8, suggests that the rise of third parties is a result of the restraints of party discipline in a parliamentary system which does not allow the regional political diversities of a federal society to express themselves effectively within the major parties. Allan Kornberg, "Caucus and Cohesion in Canadian Parliamentary Parties," *American Political Science Review*, LX (1966) establishes the thesis "that the presence of a British Parliamentary system is of crucial importance in making Canadian parliamentary parties more cohesive than American Congressional parties," 91.

Three articles discuss the impact of the electoral system on the party system in Canada. Alan C. Cairns, "The Electoral Sys-

arrangements embody assumptions about the good political community, and when functioning successfully they contribute to its realization. Accordingly, much political activity is directed to building, maintaining, or destroying institutions. Mallory's remarks on the constitution are apposite: "The formal structure of the constitution is important, otherwise so much energy would not have been expended in drafting it and arguing about it ever since. Men act within the framework of formal rules, and act as if they are important. The formal structure of the constitution shapes and limits the rules by which the political actors play."<sup>93</sup>

The difficult decision is not whether institutions merit attention, but to the study of which ones should scarce resources be allocated. This decision is influenced by our definition of political science. It is suggested below<sup>94</sup> that part of the differences in the appraisal of parliamentary institutions reflects opposed definitions of the task of political science in the minds of the authors of the three texts.

### The environment

While Dawson and Ward assert that the environment is one of the two basic forces shaping government<sup>95</sup> (the other being he-

tem and the Party System in Canada, 1921–1965," *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 1 (1968); J.A.A. Lovink, "On Analysing the Impact of the Electoral System on the Party System in Canada," and reply by Cairns, both in *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, III (1970).

J.E. Hodgetts recently denied that the institutional approach was passé: "I would contend that we are only at the beginning of a lengthy programme in which, casting aside the antiquarian interests we have shared with the historian but using their findings, we move forward to contemporary critical assessments of our institutions." "Canadian Political Science: A Hybrid with a Future?" *Scholarship in Canada, 1967: Achievement and Outlook*, ed. R.H. Hubbard (Toronto, 1968), 103.

Even Van Loon and Whittington are moved to lament in their postscript that the behavioural revolution, by reducing the attention paid to the constitution and the formal structures of government, has had the effect that our knowledge "in this area is quickly becoming dated. What was once a strength in Canadian political science may soon become a weakness," 493.

<sup>93</sup>Mallory, 326n.

<sup>94</sup>See below, p. 122–4.

<sup>95</sup>Dawson and Ward, 3.

redity), this understanding has little effect on their text. Neither of the institutionally focused texts systematically examines the impact of Canadian society, or the broader environment in which it is set, on the political system.<sup>96</sup> The overwhelming focus of both texts is on the institutions themselves, their interrelations, and their historical development. Beyond a passing reference, neither text discusses the class system<sup>97</sup> and its political importance, while interest groups, which form an obvious link with the environment and which receive chapter-length treatment in Van Loon and Whittington, are also ignored. Neither socialization, nor political culture, both given lengthy treatment by Van Loon and Whittington, are explicitly discussed,<sup>98</sup> while all three texts are weak in discussion of those who do not belong to founding races. They are mentioned as a side issue by Van Loon and Whittington,<sup>99</sup> only once by Mallory,<sup>100</sup> and not at all by

<sup>96</sup>In a review of the first edition of Dawson, Ivor Jennings stated: "It is I think significant that some of the best books on government were written by foreigners – Bryce on the United States and Lowell and Ogg on the United Kingdom. Bryce above all showed the intimate relations between government and its social context but we had not learned the lesson ... The political scientist must take the whole of knowledge for his province. I would therefore suggest that a book on the Government of Canada should tell us a little about the people of Canada, their social relationships, economic organization, history, and geographical influences. Is Canada a string of beads strung on railroads? Does it contain five or six economic areas artificially separated from the similar areas across the line? Who are these French Canadians and where and how do they live? Is there anything left of the United Empire Loyalist tradition? Why do the Maritimes complain of Confederation? There must be a hundred such questions." Review, *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, XIV (1948), 392–3.

"Dawson's idea of the boundaries of the Canadian political system," observed Smiley, "was drawn at parties and did not include voters, interest groups, agencies of political socialization, and what in general today would be called 'political culture.'" "Contributions," 570.

<sup>97</sup>Dawson and Ward, 414; Mallory, 203–4.

<sup>98</sup>Mallory's discussion of political parties, however (194–204), makes various observations about society and culture that partially exempt his work from the above observation.

<sup>99</sup>Van Loon and Whittington, 47, 253–4, 262–3, 348.

<sup>100</sup>Mallory, 305, in a quote from Frank Scott.



Dawson and Ward. This lack of attention is less surprising however when it is noted that English Canada itself is not discussed in any of the three texts. The accounts of Mallory and of Dawson and Ward display pride in the British political heritage, but they do not analyse the Anglophone community of Canada. Aside from the unavoidable intrusion of the French–English cleavage, none of the three texts undertakes a serious discussion of the ethnic distribution of privilege in the Canadian vertical mosaic described by John Porter, thus revealing a myopia characteristic of Canadian political science.<sup>101</sup>

The environment of political activity is not entirely overlooked in the two institutional texts. Both relate the choice of federalism to regional particularisms,<sup>102</sup> and they explain the federal nature of the Canadian cabinet as a response to sectionalism.<sup>103</sup> In two areas, “The Public Service in a Bicultural Community” and “A Nation Disunited,”<sup>104</sup> the interaction between institutions and society is effectively examined by Mallory, who is more prone than Dawson and Ward to note and discuss the impingement of society on the working of the insti-

tutions to which his attention is directed.<sup>105</sup> He also effectively notes the impact of economic interests on the process of judicial review, and astutely discusses the influence of the anticollectivist ideas of the legal profession on judges recruited from the practising law fraternity. More generally, there is in his work a sensitive perception of the interaction between law and opinion as befits a student of Dicey. While there are additional references in both institutional texts to the environment of political activity,<sup>106</sup> no specific place is reserved for its discussion, and various politically relevant environmental factors are excluded. The general restriction of focus to institutions may be partially justified by a division of labour which leaves the unexamined areas to others, but presumably it also rests on a judgment that institutions can be understood with only minimal reference to the environmental context in which they operate.

In stable societies where the political system can be taken for granted and where the environment is broadly supportive the possibility of effectively studying institutions in isolation is much increased. A restricted focus upon institutions makes much more sense in the United Kingdom than in the post-independence Congo. It is also especially appropriate for the analysis of tightly circumscribed roles where discretion is limited, precedent has high value, and idiosyncratic behaviour is unlikely, such as the role of the speaker or the governor general.<sup>107</sup>

In times of turmoil, when the political system itself is in trouble, the exclusion of the environment is less defensible. In Canada, the French–English crisis of the sixties, the growth of support for separatism, the extensive criticisms of traditional institutions, the attack on the constitution, and the open talk of the possible breakup of the country reveal the precariousness of the political system, reminding us of the societal and environmental forces that batter political systems in times of stress, and sustain them in times of quietude.<sup>108</sup>

<sup>101</sup>Joel Smith and Allan Kornberg, “Some Considerations bearing upon Comparative Research in Canada and the United States,” *Sociology*, 33 (1969) is a valuable comparison of the different political role of ethnicity in Canada and the United States. They note that, with the exception of its French–English aspects, ethnic politics has been much less visible in Canada. Possibly for this reason it has been little examined. The absence of attention to ethnic issues may reflect the WASP composition of the Canadian social-science community, and/or the late development of sociology as a discipline, and of “race relations” as an important subdiscipline.

Helpful comments on the present state of ethnic studies which, partly under government sponsorship, are experiencing a mild boom are contained in Andrew Gregorovich, *Canadian Ethnic Groups Bibliography* (Toronto, 1972), preface. *Canadian Ethnic Studies* (1969–) a bulletin published by The Research Centre for Canadian Ethnic Studies of the University of Calgary is an important new source of information. T. Peterson’s “Ethnic and Class Politics in Manitoba,” *Canadian Provincial Politics*, ed. Martin Robin (Scarborough, 1972), is a valuable recent study stressing ethnic factors.

<sup>102</sup>Mallory, 28–29; Dawson and Ward, 26.

<sup>103</sup>Dawson and Ward, 179–85; Mallory, 82–4, 96–7. See also Van Loon and Whittington, 346–50.

<sup>104</sup>Mallory, 175–9, 393–404.

<sup>105</sup>See his excellent discussion of judicial review, 335–55, and his chapter on the courts.

<sup>106</sup>For good examples see Mallory, 40, 196, 211–12, 305, 321, and Dawson and Ward, 72–3.

<sup>107</sup>Fred I. Greenstein, “The Impact of Personality on Politics: An Attempt to Clear Away Underbrush,” *American Political Science Review*, LXI (1967), is useful in identifying situations where political behavior is predictable for institutional or other reasons, versus those in which personality variables may be important.

<sup>108</sup>Even in times of crisis, however, institu-

Thus, the strong interest which Van Loon and Whittington display in the environment is a salutary supplement to the other texts. They view this interest as one of the prime differentiating features of their work, which is a response to the stress of contemporary political science on the functional relationship of institutions to society.<sup>109</sup> They also state: "the functions of a political system are environmentally determined. Conversely, the function of the political system is to allocate resources found in the environment among the members of the society who are also a part of the environment. Thus, not only are the functions of a political system environmentally determined, but the performance of those functions involves producing change in the environment."<sup>110</sup>

Part I of their book, about one-sixth of the whole, is an analysis of "The Environment." Among other things, they discuss the political implications of geography, the economy, and the class system. There is much that is useful in this section, particularly a helpful discussion of the French-English cleavage.<sup>111</sup> Even so, I think that they fail to describe "The environmental determinants of political behaviour in Canada."<sup>112</sup> Their failure, I would suggest, was inevitable, for they apparently lacked any theoretically grounded criteria for deciding which environmental factors to include, or even a realistic simplifying theme capable of imposing order on chaos. Given their assertion that "the environment of the political system includes all matter, living or non living, which is not itself a part of the system,"<sup>113</sup> they faced a very real danger of drowning in an ocean of environmental facts. This danger was only avoided by an inarticulate major premise which led them to stress the conflict side of Canadian politics, the lamentably inept performance of the political system, and the negative impact of the environment in which it existed. In short, they combined a systems approach, frequently described as conservative, with

tions continue to have an important effect. Simeon shows that the search for a new constitution, one response to the recent French-English crisis of federalism, was much affected by the fact that the official searchers were representatives of governments who met in the particular institutional context of the federal-provincial conference (*Federal-Provincial Diplomacy*). Crises call institutions into action, and the particular institutions available affect the way the crisis is handled.

<sup>109</sup>Van Loon and Whittington, preface.

<sup>110</sup>*Ibid.*, 9-10.

<sup>112</sup>*Ibid.*, 65.

<sup>111</sup>*Ibid.*, 47-64.

<sup>113</sup>*Ibid.*, 9.

an almost totally negative appraisal of the Canadian political system.

Virtually their entire discussion of the environment focuses on cleavages, tensions, demands, crises, etc. The section opens with the stock market crash of 1929, followed by the depression, drought, a generally pessimistic appraisal of Canada's geographic situation and of her position in the international economy, the fundamentally harmful effect of contiguity to the neighbouring American monolith, the tensions caused by the move from a rural-agricultural to an urban-industrial society, the severe climate, the expense and problems related to the size and distance of the country, regional disparities, class cleavages, and French-English tensions. The result, I believe, is a serious distortion, almost a caricature, of the environment and, by implication, of the political system it is supposed to explain. The crucial importance of economic abundance, the product of a favourable physical environment, and a highly efficient economic system, is ignored.<sup>114</sup> Their approach, instead, directs their attention to the poor which, partially using Economic Council of Canada data,<sup>115</sup> they tentatively put at 40 per cent of the Canadian population. This 40 per cent figure, which is repeatedly used,<sup>116</sup> helps to sustain the pessimistic appraisal of the performance of the political system held by the authors.

It is not surprising, given their pessimism, that Van Loon and Whittington repeat the conventional wisdom that "no nation is easy to govern, but the problems produced by deep regional and economic cleavages exacerbated by deep ethnic cleavages ensure that the Canadian political system, more than most others, is under constant pressure. The process of making authoritative allocations in Canada is indeed a difficult one."<sup>117</sup>

The time has come to provide a decent burial of the widespread myth that Canada is an especially difficult country to govern, a cliché of Canadian politics given new life by the pessimism of the past decade. Frank

<sup>114</sup>See David M. Potter, *People of Plenty: Economic Abundance and the American Character* (Chicago, 1954).

<sup>115</sup>*Fifth Annual Review: The Challenge of Growth and Change* (Ottawa, 1968), chap. 6.

<sup>116</sup>The first use of this percentage refers to "fully 40 per cent of Canadians" as "below at least a 'discomfort' line." Van Loon and Whittington, 42. The 40 per cent figure is subsequently used in various contexts for the poor, the unorganized, the inarticulate, the non-participants, and those with a "subject" orientation, 44, 72, 93, 321, 364.

<sup>117</sup>*Ibid.*, 64

MacKinnon is correct in observing that "almost all recent books on Canada are fashionably morbid, despite the fact that, by world standards, Canadians do not know what real political trouble is."<sup>118</sup> Which countries in Africa, Asia, Europe, or South America have been easier to govern? With the leaders of which Persian Gulf sheikhdom, African one-party state, South American dictatorship, or Communist regime of Eastern Europe should the battered federal cabinet ministers trade places to find the solace which is deprived them in Canada? An effective analysis should explain the fortunate circumstances which make Canada one (or even two) of the least difficult countries to govern on this planet.

The effective interpretation of political systems requires the inclusion of environmental matters. The cogency of this general proposition is both enhanced and made more visible at times when there are serious institutional crises. Unfortunately, the response of Van Loon and Whittington to environmental factors is a form of indiscriminate overkill with its curious inability to observe the comparatively favourable environmental context in which Canadian politics, even in a time of domestic crisis, is played out.

### History

The Canadian political system, like any other, is a result of previous political decisions, historical events, antecedent social forces, etc. It cannot be understood without resort to history.

Mallory's thinking has a pervasive historical dimension. Indeed, his text is steeped in history, as especially befits the study of a country which has experienced only incremental change for nearly two centuries.<sup>119</sup> Confederation, for example, the crucial event in Canadian history, was not a revolutionary break with the past, but had decisive elements of continuity with "an elaborate system of government which had grown up for over a century in the provinces of British North America."<sup>120</sup> The prime focus of his study is an "old constitution" which

reflects the "pre-democratic age" of its emergence.<sup>121</sup> Most institutions of government have deep historic roots, making the "constitutional framework ... an embodiment of the contribution which the past makes to the present."<sup>122</sup> In this kind of political system, history is viewed by Mallory as a repository of rich experience, not to be lightly disregarded by those seeking comprehension of the present; consequently he scans the past for precedents to illuminate the working rules of the contemporary constitution.

The Dawson and Ward analysis is similarly attuned to history. "The character of a government," they state in the very first sentence of their book, "like that of an individual, is shaped by the two primary forces of heredity and environment; and the study of a government, again like that of an individual, must perforce devote some attention to parentage and the special associations which have had direct contact with each particular institution."<sup>123</sup>

The first three chapters on "constitutional development" take the reader from Virginia, the "first permanent English settlement on the Atlantic seaboard" in 1607<sup>124</sup> up to the present international position of an autonomous Canada. The remaining institutionally focused chapters frequently resort to historical description and explanation. The chapter "Dominion-provincial financial relations," which contains an extensive historical analysis, commences with the assertion that "the present cannot be understood without some knowledge of Canada's financial history."<sup>125</sup> Other chapters also include a strong historical orientation, especially chapter 7, "The development of the constitution," so that references to Beamish Murdoch, *Epitome of the Laws of Nova Scotia* (Halifax, 1832), and T.C. Haliburton, *An Historical and Statistical Account of Nova Scotia* (Halifax, 1829),<sup>126</sup> seem perfectly natural.

Dawson belonged to that group of Canadian social scientists whose "first, instinctive approach to any question is historical."<sup>127</sup> Indeed, Donald Creighton suggests that Dawson "might quite reasonably be described as a Canadian constitutional historian,"<sup>128</sup> his historical approach partly

<sup>118</sup>Review of *The Canadian Political System in Canadian Journal of Political Science*, v (1972), 320.

<sup>119</sup>A. Brady asserts that from the constitutional act of 1791 to the present "the continuity in development ... has been virtually uninterrupted." "Canada and the Model of Westminster," *The Transfer of Institutions*, ed. William B. Hamilton (Durham, N.C., 1964), 79–80.

<sup>120</sup>Mallory, 2.

<sup>121</sup>*Ibid.*, 108

<sup>122</sup>*Ibid.*, xi.

<sup>123</sup>Dawson and Ward, 3.

<sup>124</sup>*Ibid.*, 4.

<sup>125</sup>*Ibid.*, 99.

<sup>126</sup>*Ibid.*, 61n.

<sup>127</sup>Donald Creighton, *Towards the Discovery of Canada* (Toronto, 1972), 50.

<sup>128</sup>*Ibid.*, 50.

reflected his great satisfaction with the evolution of Canada from colony to nation,<sup>129</sup> a theme which helped to make history an organizing principle. The historical orientation which runs through the work of Mallory and Ward places them squarely beside Dawson in the historical school of Canadian political science.<sup>130</sup>

The attitude of Van Loon and Whittington to history is less easily discerned. They refer positively to a historical approach on several occasions, including the assertion that "the work of the political scientist and that of the historian overlap and complement each other."<sup>131</sup> Further, they frequently resort to historical explanations to good advantage.<sup>132</sup> Elsewhere, however, they leave the impression that they are uncomfortable with history, and do not place a high value on chronology as a helpful principle of organization, or on time as an important variable. Their analyses of regional disparities<sup>133</sup> and

class cleavages<sup>134</sup> are very strongly oriented to the present with a consequent weakening of their argument, while their chapter "Political Participation: Input Behaviour" is almost completely ahistorical. The restricted time horizon in their discussion of Canada's global position<sup>135</sup> produces odd statements such as the assertion that geography has "led naturally to our looking to our nearest neighbour to take the bulk of our exports and supply most of our imports," a thesis supported by the 1969 figures in which "72.6% of Canada's imports came from the United States, and 70.7% of her exports went there."<sup>136</sup> However, although the statistics are correct for the years cited, the markedly different percentages for earlier years indicate the weakness of a geographical explanation.<sup>137</sup>

In sum, Van Loon and Whittington reveal ambivalent attitudes to the use of history. This ambivalence may explain the fact that their use of historical data seems out of place on occasion or seems to reflect a perfunctory interest rather than a real belief in the significance of historical factors in explanation.<sup>138</sup> It may be that their personal definition of political science is in a state of flux, and they are caught between the old and the new, or they may have preferred a contemporary analysis of the relationships between institutions and society, but lacked the data to employ it consistently. Or, perhaps their model had difficulty accommodating historical data which they could not honestly exclude.

In a form of guilt by association the reaction against institutional approaches in contemporary political science has come to include a reaction against the historical perspective with which they were often coupled. As a result, as has often been noted, behaviouralism was endowed with an ahistorical orientation, a bias exacerbated by its use of quantitative approaches and survey research which contribute to present-mindedness.

The laudable attempt of Van Loon and Whittington to relate the political system to its environment foundered, I believe, on

<sup>129</sup>G.E. Wilson, "Robert MacGregor Dawson," 211. In his review of the first edition Frank Scott suggested that the book displayed "traces of a colonial concern about the marvellous disappearance of colonialism." *International Journal*, III (1948), 167.

<sup>130</sup>A bibliography of Dawson's publications is appended to G.E. Wilson's obituary notice "Robert MacGregor Dawson," 212-13. Ward's historical orientation is evident in his books *The Canadian House of Commons: Representation* (Toronto, 1950), and *The Public Purse: A Study in Canadian Democracy* (Toronto, 1962). Mallory's historical orientation is evident in his *Social Credit and the Federal Power*.

<sup>131</sup>Van Loon and Whittington, 492. For references to the ubiquity of political-system change over time, and recognition of the danger of "drawing a static mechanical picture" see 6, 491.

<sup>132</sup>The inadequate economic position of French Canadians is explained by a historical interpretation, 54-5. They provide a historical description of French-English crises in Canada, 55-63, present a standard treatment of the historical background to confederation, 167-72, include a detailed chronological treatment of the impact of the Judicial Committee on Canadian federalism, 181-92, and of federal-provincial finances from 1867 (largely derived from the Rowell Sirois report), 192-205. Their treatment of parties has a large historical component because the structural features of the parties and their bases of support have been much influenced by history, 254. Accordingly, chapter 11 deals with parties from a historical perspective.

<sup>133</sup>*Ibid.*, 32-8.

<sup>134</sup>*Ibid.*, 38-47.

<sup>135</sup>*Ibid.*, 20-30.

<sup>136</sup>*Ibid.*, 21. In a footnote on the same page they note changes in trade patterns back to 1964.

<sup>137</sup>Import-export data for previous years, indicating a much less heavy dependence on the United States, is contained in *Canada One Hundred 1867-1967* (Ottawa, 1967), 260-1.

<sup>138</sup>See also John Wilson's comments, Review, *Canadian Public Administration* 15 (1972), 399.





The language of Canadian parliamentary government is British, not American.<sup>143</sup> To write of votes of want of confidence, and of prime ministers rather than presidents, of fusion of powers rather than separation of powers, is to focus on attributes of the Canadian political system not found in the United States, while to focus on the governor general is to draw attention to comparisons with and contrasts to the British monarchy. The Senate and the House of Lords, the Canadian cabinet and House of Commons and their British counterparts, are equally and almost unavoidably paired.<sup>144</sup>

*Influences on Canadian Government* (Toronto, 1929), chap. III, "City Government in Canada."

The kinds of comparisons and contrasts employed by French-Canadian scholars merit investigation. The recent publication of Jacques Benjamin, *Les Camerounais occidentaux: La minorité dans un Etat bicommunautaire* (Montreal, 1972) is a discussion of an African example of federalism to which the author was attracted "instinctivement" as a Quebecois (p.1). See also his article "La minorité en Etat bicommunautaire: quatre études de cas," *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, IV (1971) comparing Cameroon, Mauritius, Cyprus, and Lebanon. Several of the recent publications of Jacques Yvan Morin have drawn on federal examples little used by Anglophone scholars, from which he derives conclusions hostile to the existing Canadian federal system. For one of many possible examples see "Le Québec et l'Arbitrage Constitutionnel: De Charybde en Scylla," *Canadian Bar Review*, XLV (1967). Jacques Brossard, *La Cour Suprême et la Constitution* (Montreal, 1968) includes a variety of comparative examples, such as Italy, Turkey, Venezuela, and Germany unlikely to be included in Anglophone comparative studies of institutions. The brilliant comparative study of R.L. Watts, *New Federations: Experiments in the Commonwealth* (London, 1966), confines itself, as its title indicates, to the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth has been of negligible interest to French-Canadian scholars.

<sup>143</sup>It is not French either. The language of parliamentary government links Canada to Britain, and thus stresses the British nature of the Canadian polity, as the French fact has had a less visible impact on the form of Canadian government institutions.

<sup>144</sup>The focus on parliamentary government also leads to comparisons with the other political systems of the Empire-Commonwealth endowed with similar British institutions. Mallory's chapter on the "formal executive," for example, not only has many com-

To dwell on the triumph of responsible government is to study the successful struggle of the British North American colonists to make the best of the British political tradition a crucial part of the Canadian tradition.<sup>145</sup> The next step forward, Confederation, revealed a desire for a "constitution similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom." The statute implementing this desire was, and remains, an act of the British Parliament, the final interpretation of which was undertaken by British judges until the abolition of appeals in 1949. The majority of the Fathers, especially in English Canada, had a profound respect for British political institutions with which they had had prior experience, and which they deliberately perpetuated in the wider union to be created by Confederation.<sup>146</sup> Confederation was a conscious effort to salvage a separate non-revolutionary British nation on the North American continent in the face of justified

comparisons with the United Kingdom, but also draws on Australian and South African experience. See also Brady, *Democracy in the Dominions*, and Eugene A. Forsey, *The Royal Power of Dissolution of Parliament in the British Commonwealth* (Toronto, 1968), for two important comparative studies in this vein.

<sup>145</sup>The significance of responsible government is eloquently described by Brady. "The consequences of the triumph of responsible government are many, but one commands particular attention. Canadians could henceforth feel confident that the essential fabric of the British constitution was their own acquisition, secured through their persistent advocacy, fitted to their peculiar circumstances, and fostered as the substance and symbol of their political identity in North America." "Canada and the Model of Westminster," 67-8.

<sup>146</sup>See Dawson and Ward, 36. The Canadian leaders, according to Brady, sought "not merely the external forms of the British system, but what they interpreted as its inner and pervasive spirit: the sense of continuity, the capacity for slow and secure change, and the protection of minority rights and social diversities. To these qualities Macdonald and Cartier in particular were as devoted as any nineteenth century British Whigs," "Canada and the Model of Westminster," 69. See also Maurice Careless, "Mid-Victorian Liberalism in Central Canadian Newspapers, 1850-67," *Canadian Historical Review*, XXXI (1950), for the overwhelming dominance of British models in discussions of political and other subjects in the Toronto press in the pre-confederation period.

fears of American expansion.<sup>147</sup> Even the parties that emerged to work the political system created by Confederation used the British names of Liberal and Conservative. Aided by this identity of names, the British party system became the ideal of many academic theorists,<sup>148</sup> the goal to which the Canadian party system should and would tend.

The scant attention of Van Loon and Whittington to the institutions of parliamentary government reduces the frequency of British references and comparisons in their text. Their limited interest in the past, when British models and influence were greater, has the same effect of minimizing the Britishness of Canada. For example, their totally contemporary references to Canadian defence and foreign policy<sup>149</sup> ignore the British heritage and European pull which have been so influential in these areas. Instead, possibly due to limitations of space, they concentrate on the American impact on Canadian foreign and defence policies, leaving the student unaware of the longer historical period in which British influence was much greater than American.

The divergent Canadian and American histories have, of course, produced different relations with the outside world which explain why Canada, with less than 8 per cent of the population of the United States, had more men killed in action in the First World War,<sup>150</sup> and entered the Second World War two years before her southern neighbour.

<sup>147</sup>Mallory, 332–3; Van Loon and Whittington, 167–8; Dawson and Ward, 37.

<sup>148</sup>In which ways would academic evaluations of the Canadian party system have been different if the two major parties had been called Republican and Democratic? Curiously, the Canadian party closest to its British counterpart, the CCF, did not assume a British name. The significance of labels and the comparisons they elicit or inhibit is a little examined area. See, however, J.A. Laponce, "Canadian Party Labels: An Essay in Semantics and Anthropology," *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 11 (1969).

<sup>149</sup>Van Loon and Whittington, 21–3.

<sup>150</sup>Kenneth McNaught, *The Pelican History of Canada* (Harmondsworth, England, 1969), 213, asserts that more than 60,000 Canadians were killed in action, "some 12,000 more than those similarly lost by the United States." Unfortunately, completely precise comparisons cannot be made with confidence as different sources quote different figures, especially of American military fatalities. However, all sources agree that the Canadian war dead were proportionately much greater than American.

The continuing link with Britain gave Canada an enduring Atlantic orientation when the United States, with its partial rejection of Europe, was developing Pacific interests.<sup>151</sup>

It should be noted, however, that a political science that concentrates on the historical development of institutions may easily exaggerate Canadian uniqueness on the North American continent. Unless supplemented by a sociological focus on the environment it will pay inadequate attention to the North American, new world context in which Canadian history has been played out.<sup>152</sup> Dawson and Ward, for example, note that "the temper of Canadian politics is distinctively North American,"<sup>153</sup> but they do not elaborate how or why. The temptation offered by this statement to make American comparisons is generally resisted. Their discussion of parties, where one might anticipate an environmental focus which would facilitate American comparisons, does not exploit the literature or practice of American parties.<sup>154</sup> While Mallory

<sup>151</sup>Most of the Pacific links of Canada are legacies of Empire. With the recent exception of strong trade links with Japan, they have been with the old white dominions of Australia and New Zealand and the new Commonwealth countries of Asia. John W. Holmes, *The Better Part of Valour: Essays on Canadian Diplomacy* (Toronto, 1970), 161–2.

<sup>152</sup>Munro, *American Influences on Canadian Government*, is an early indication of the usefulness of looking at the North American environment and the specific impact of American models on the practice of Canadian politics.

<sup>153</sup>Dawson and Ward, 344. This was added by Ward in the fourth edition.

<sup>154</sup>For exceptions see Dawson and Ward, 431, 436–7, 452–3, 466–7, 476. Several observers have made similar criticisms. In his review of the first edition of *The Government of Canada*, W.B. Munro suggested that more contrasts and comparisons with the American party system would have been helpful. "The similarities are greater than most students of comparative government realize." *American Political Science Review*, 42 (1948), 583. In his own chapter "Party Organization and Practical Politics" written in 1929 Munro had effectively called attention to American influences on the Canadian party system, and the similarities of practice born of the similar problems they both faced. *American Influences on Canadian Government*.

In his extensive review of the first edition F.W. Gibson observed that "Professor Daw-

is somewhat more prone to make American comparisons, the latter cannot be considered a notable feature of any of the three texts.<sup>155</sup>

Similarly, a historical emphasis on the peacefully evolving links with Great Britain, on the British nature of parliamentary government, and on the conscious anti-Americanism behind key historical choices such as Confederation may overlook not only the North American environment but also the innumerable and growing ways in which the presence of the American government makes itself felt. To note only one aspect of this presence, in 1968 there were no less than 12,900 official Canadian visits to Washington, plus many other contacts by telephone, correspondence, and at international conferences.<sup>156</sup> Only Van Loon and Whittington give any recognition to the pervasive impact of the American government on federal (and provincial) policy-making. It is ignored in the other texts which observe the triumph of national independence as Empire trans-

son concentrates on an intensive analysis of the machinery of government and avoids much discussion of the ultimate purposes for which the machinery is designed or of the distinctively Canadian social context within which it operates." The parties, he continued, "function within a specific social context the character of which is largely determined by the dynamic pattern of conflict and community of interest among its component groups ... It is this social context that gives meaning to an analysis of political parties ..." Professor Dawson "does not illuminate fully the character of the dominant groups in the community, or the nature of their quarrels, or the methods employed by the party leaders to resolve them." *Queen's Quarterly*, 57 (1950-1), 480, 492-3.

Ward himself noted in his preface to the fourth edition that part of Dawson's "chapters on political parties paid more attention to the democratic facades which the parties present than seemed realistic in the light of the parties' actual roles in Canadian society," viii.

<sup>155</sup>Mallory, in a much shorter section on parties than that of Dawson and Ward, has about the same number of references to American practices: 194, 196, 197, 201, 202, 204, 206; see also 282. Van Loon and Whittington, in a considerably longer section than Mallory, employ a roughly equal number of American references, contrasts, and comparisons: 231, 239, 240, 275, 283-4. Van Loon and Whittington are more prone to refer to American writers, Mallory and Dawson and Ward to American practices.

<sup>156</sup>Peter C. Dobell, *Canada's Search for New Roles* (Toronto, 1972), 81-2.

formed itself into Commonwealth, but fail to discuss the threats to Canada which derive from the increasing pressure of the most powerful political system in the world on its northern neighbour.

Canada must be studied as a partially dependent political system whose range of manoeuvre has been limited, initially by her status as a colony and now by her position in the orbit of a superpower.<sup>157</sup> Whether dependent status was or is good or bad, voluntary or involuntary, does not affect the objective consideration that the Canadian political system cannot be understood without analysing the historically changing nature of its dependence upon more powerful external political systems, previously Great Britain and now the United States.<sup>158</sup> Cana-

<sup>157</sup>The Canadian situation is simply the indigenous variant of the "worldwide blurring of the boundaries between national and international systems" which requires the development of linkage theory to examine the resultant interdependence. See James N. Rosenau, "Introduction: Political Science in a Shrinking World," *Linkage Politics: Essays on the Convergence of National and International Systems*, ed. James N. Rosenau (New York, 1969), and other essays in the same volume.

Part of the difficulty in generating an effective academic response to this interdependence resides in a division of labour with little overlapping of interest or research between students of domestic and international politics.

Stephen Clarkson's reminder of the almost total social-science neglect of Canadian-American relations indicates how much remains to be done, "Lament for a non-subject: reflections on teaching Canadian-American relations," *International Journal*, xxvii (1972).

<sup>158</sup>The evolution of the Canadian position in the North Atlantic triangle has multiple strands. John Meisel has recently suggested that the much-touted Liberal pride and arrogance may partly reflect the educational links with the United Kingdom of those leading public servants, academics, and Liberal politicians who were influential in the period 1935-53 when the Liberal "style" congealed, and who were imbued with a complacent elitism by their sojourn. He goes on to suggest: "The elites may be more receptive to British and French traditions and trends, whereas the mass public may respond much more strongly to United States influences." "Howe, Hubris and '72: An Essay on Political Elitism," in John Meisel, *Working Papers on Canadian Politics* (enlarged edn., Montreal/London, 1973), 236-7, 245.

dian relations with the latter, as Stephen Clarkson observes, defy "the normal categories of international relations analysis" due to the ease with which provincial governments and federal departments "relate with the political, bureaucratic, and economic institutions in the United States on a direct bilateral basis."<sup>159</sup> Further indication of the special and complex nature of the Canadian-American relationship is provided by the fact that the voters in Vancouver-Burrard "operate within at least three major political systems: the Canadian provincial and federal systems and the American system."<sup>160</sup>

### Parliamentary government and the role of the politician

The three texts react differently to the development of big government and its impact on the parliamentary system. Mallory and Dawson and Ward note it with alarm and view it as a challenge to constitutional government.<sup>161</sup> They do not respond to the rising power of the bureaucracy by crowding the politician off the pages of their book, but rather keep him, curiously it might seem, prominently featured at the centre of the stage in the familiar institutions of the cabinet and the House of Commons, which receive extended treatment and positive evaluations.

In terms of simple photographic description of the working of the political system there is something incongruous in the continuing prominence accorded to politicians and the institutions under their direct control. The explanation is surely that Mallory and Dawson and Ward are engaged in more than mirror-like description. They are also presenting a normative model of political behaviour to which they are deeply committed, that of the British system of responsible parliamentary government. Running through both texts there is a constant fluctuation between ideal and reality, the manifestation of an unavoidable tension between prescription and description.

This tension is not always easy to identify because parliamentary government exists both as a working reality, and as an ideal to which we are committed by history. The relation between ideal and reality is complex and, not surprisingly, often confused. The most obvious confusion is to assume that the ideal

accurately portrays reality, and to describe the actual functioning system in terms which pertain only to the ideal. This idealizing is aided by the fact that the activities of Parliament and its members enjoy maximum visibility, while the activities of the bureaucrats to whom the power has allegedly fled are partially hidden from our eyes by the conventions of bureaucratic secrecy. A different confusion is to assume that the ideal is only, or primarily, a veil which hides reality, and which we should tear down to better understand the political system. The nature of this error is apparent on those occasions when we see clearly the deficiencies which attend the working system of parliamentary government. In these circumstances the typical reaction is not one of indifference; rather we intervene and attempt to shore up the system by introducing changes to alleviate the problems we have discovered. In other words, we react as doctors confronting a challenging disease rather than as cameras which observe without emotion.

The attention which Dawson and Ward and Mallory give to parliamentary institutions reflects an allegiance to parliamentary government, and an antipathy to the trends which threaten its functioning. Dawson and Ward do not blanch when they describe the House of Commons as "the people's forum and the highest political tribunal."<sup>162</sup> Mallory is equally positive, asserting that the House of Commons "by common consent, is the central nucleus of representative demo-

<sup>162</sup>Dawson and Ward, 304. Elsewhere they describe the House of Commons as "the great democratic agency in the government of Canada: the 'grand inquest of the nation'; the organized medium through which the public will finds expression and exercises its ultimate political power. It forms the indispensable part of the legislature; and it is the body to which at all times the executive must turn for justification and approval," 304. Further, in the past decade it "has enormously improved its ordering of its own internal workings ... and ... has grown in stature," 364. In spite of changes which have increased the cabinet's power, "the House of Commons does control the cabinet – rarely by defeating it, often by criticizing it, still more often by the cabinet anticipating criticism before subjecting itself and its acts to the House, and always by the latent capacity of the House to revolt against its leaders," 366; see also 379. Dawson, as J.H. Aitchison observed, "remained always a staunch and enthusiastic admirer of the British parliamentary system." *The Political Process in Canada: Essays in Honour of R. MacGregor Dawson*, ed. J.H. Aitchison (Toronto, 1963), vi.

<sup>159</sup>Clarkson, "Lament for a non-subject," 270.

<sup>160</sup>J.A. Laponce, *People vs Politics* (Toronto, 1969), 164.

<sup>161</sup>Mallory, 110, 116, 137–49; Dawson and Ward, 231–2, 235–7, 269–70, 272–5.

cracy – where the government must confront in debate the people's chosen representatives."<sup>163</sup> If a somewhat imperfect analogy may be used, it seems that the ideal of parliamentary government plays the same role in these texts as the American creed, or the American constitution, does for some American texts. It establishes a norm against which existing performances may be measured, and toward which change should be directed.

To analyse this complicated interaction between ideal and real aspects of the political system the institutional authors naturally turn to the politician as a helpful informant. Their research approach indicates agreement with David Butler's thesis that "many of the most significant observations about political behaviour are to be found among the *obiter dicta* or the formal writings of statesmen and demagogues."<sup>164</sup> Politicians, as Mallory pointedly observed, "achieve positions of power or influence by processes obscure even to the sociologist."<sup>165</sup> Accordingly Hansard, political biographies, and autobiographies are extensively canvassed for the insights of politicians. However, even with the aid of biographies and personal papers, the secrecy of the deliberations of cabinet and of high officials ensures that "we can never know very much about how decisions at the summit are taken under the Canadian system of government,"<sup>166</sup> a government which like others is a mystery whose innermost recesses are shielded from our view. Research into it is a somewhat intuitive and personal activity which involves immersion in the writings of those politicians who have participated in the mystery. Research is not the application of a scheme, but an exploration.

Van Loon and Whittington are little troubled by the alleged shrinking significance of the politician and of the institutions in which he is the chief actor. Shrinking significance elicits shrinking coverage. The rise of the bureaucracy to a dominant position is unemotionally noted, and the politician occupies a much less prominent place in their text, either as important actor or as source of information. Politics, they assert, "is *not* the activities of a few people in Ottawa or provincial capitals. It is an extremely complex process set in an extremely complex environment with the actors in capital cities only transient figures able to shape some events but also shaped by them."<sup>167</sup> The institutions

of parliamentary government are not treated as the focal point of the political system, but are embedded in "the policy process" and are accorded space proportionate to their contribution to that process – no more, no less. The House of Commons is allocated a distinctly secondary role in the "Policy Refinery." The cabinet is accorded a positive role in the formulation of priorities, but policy-formation is clearly allocated to the bureaucracy whose growing importance is repeatedly noted and described as an inexorable process. Power is said to have shifted to the bureaucracy "simply because the environment within which positive government operates dictates that only experts in large information-gathering organizations are capable of finding the solutions to current problems."<sup>168</sup> Proportionately less space is allocated to parties, whose importance is "all too easy to overemphasize,"<sup>169</sup> than in Dawson and Ward whose fourth edition was criticized as a book on "government without politics."<sup>170</sup> Their objective is accurate description, and this entails the puncturing of those myths of parliamentary government which distort perception.

Academic writings respond not only to the shifting world they attempt to explain but also to the explanations of that world already provided in the existing literature. The desire to make a distinctive contribution<sup>171</sup> may stimulate over-reactions to competing interpretations. Thus I suspect that the opposed evaluations of parliamentary government in these three texts partially reflect the implicit competitiveness of academic debate. At a deeper level, however, the contrasting evaluations of parliamentary government reflect divergent definitions of political science. The realism of Van Loon and Whittington is in principle opposed to ideals masquerading as reality, and the last third of their book, Part v, is an elaborate, albeit preliminary, attempt

counts of politics in the sixties which "provide insight into the workings of politics in Ottawa: however ... the reader should try to maintain a broader perspective," Van Loon and Whittington, 389n. See also 231.

<sup>163</sup>*Ibid.*, 331.

<sup>169</sup>*Ibid.*, 231. They later argue that parties should be strengthened. 264–5.

<sup>170</sup>Verney, "Government without Politics," 18.

<sup>171</sup>New fashions of analysis stimulate the desire for academic distinctiveness and help to make it possible. For a general discussion of the effect of fad and fashion on the style and language of social science, see Herbert Goldhamer, "Fashion and Social Science," *World Politics*, vi (1954).

<sup>163</sup>Mallory, 242.

<sup>164</sup>David Butler, *The Study of Political Behaviour* (London, 1966), 88.

<sup>165</sup>Mallory, xi.

<sup>166</sup>*Ibid.*, 111.

<sup>167</sup>This comment is made after they noted a series of recent journalistic and personal ac-



to establish a descriptive model of the policy process which unmask the myths of parliamentary government. By contrast, the institutionally inclined approach of Mallory and Dawson and Ward does not view parliamentary ideals imperfectly realized as myths, but as goals and goads to action.

The general portrayal of parliament by Van Loon and Whittington is hostile to suggestions that it performs the important functions defined by tradition. However, scattered through their last chapter, "Parliament: The Policy Refinery," there is a tentative hint that Parliament may make a major contribution to the political system in other ways. Parliament is viewed as a symbol of several important values, such as representative democracy and responsible government, and as the symbol employed by Canadians to relate to the political system. They suggest that the visibility of Parliament and the focus of the media on its operations may make it "one of the core institutions in the political socialization of Canadians." If this is true, this function "would ... be vital" for it would be educating citizens, including future "policy-makers," into the system's norms, which "may provide at least a partial answer to why the political system ultimately survives."<sup>172</sup> This hesitant suggestion moves their text closer to the other texts by reasserting the (possible) centrality of Parliament to the functioning of the system. If it can be suggested that parliamentary government as well as being a system of relations and a body of procedures constitutes, even more fundamentally, a belief that restrains political leaders and channels their behaviour, it behooves us to study it. The importance of parliamentary government may simply be the belief that it is important.

In comparative terms parliamentary government provides one of the few homes for the democratic politician. There is a profound difference between a polity in which peaceful changes of power are possible between competing politicians who respond to popular support, or the lack of it, and polities in which the absence of such a need to court the populace reduces sensitivity, and relegates changes of government to the machinations of generals and assassins. Canada is one of the few countries whose politicians peacefully vacate office in accordance with well-understood rules. This practice is surely one of the great political achievements of mankind, and it rests upon the special role of the democratic politician responding to the conventions of parliamentary government.

<sup>172</sup>Van Loon and Whittington, 447, 465, 490, 495.

### Attitudes to the political system

The attitude of Van Loon and Whittington to the Canadian political system is a mixture of clinical detachment, sporadic antipathy, and infrequent appreciation. The replacement of the language of parliamentary government with the language of systems analysis has the effect of distancing them and their readers from the political system. There is none of the civics approach of sympathetically leading readers to an intimate and positive acquaintance with the political achievements of their forefathers. With rare exceptions, such as their appreciation of the constitution,<sup>173</sup> they are almost devoid of that conservative attitude so well expressed by Michael Oakeshott: "our determination to improve our conduct does not prevent us from recognizing that the greater part of what we have is not a burden to be carried or an incubus to be thrown off, but an inheritance to be enjoyed."<sup>174</sup>

Praise is sparing, almost inadvertent. The environment is described almost exclusively in terms of cleavages. As already noted, 40 per cent of the population who are poor, or below a "discomfort" line, are portrayed as victims of an insensitive polity. They sympathize with the young, intelligent, French-Canadian technocrats blocked by an English-Canadian managerial élite from gaining control of the economy, and describe them as a "rising class of French Canadians who understandably grow impatient with 200 years of waiting."<sup>175</sup> They gloomily speculate on the possibility of apolitical politics in Canada, "a politics which is not concerned with genuine ideological or policy differences."<sup>176</sup> Almost in passing they note that Canadians "demand and get one of the highest standards of living in the world."<sup>177</sup> Yet they do not pause over this provocative item which enjoys a lonely existence in the midst of the problems, cleavages, and disparities which insistently attract their attention. They leave to the postscript a judicious evaluation of the political system markedly different from the tone that pervades the rest of their book. "While the Canadian political system has many faults, when viewed on any sort of rational continuum, it must rate very near the top among the countries of the world in terms of satisfying its citizens. In part this success might be attributed to a felicitous physical and social

<sup>173</sup>*Ibid.*, chaps. 4, 5, 6.

<sup>174</sup>*Rationalism in Politics* (London, 1962), 113.

<sup>175</sup>Van Loon and Whittington, 55, italics mine.

<sup>176</sup>*Ibid.*, 94–5.

<sup>177</sup>*Ibid.*, 32.

environment, but that cannot be the whole answer. Somehow, in spite of all its imperfections, the political system does produce many fairly satisfactory outputs.<sup>178</sup> The reader, almost completely unprepared for this valid observation, closes the book wondering if this is the same political system operating in the same environment described in the previous 494 pages.

In marked contrast to Van Loon and Whittington is the strong element of conservatism in the attitudes of Dawson and Ward, and Mallory to the Canadian political system. They describe an ongoing process which they regard as basically effective. Inequalities of income, power, or access to government are not drawn to the attention of the reader. Dawson and Ward write fondly of the haphazard development of cabinet government, unplanned and unpredicted, a tribute to incrementalism.<sup>179</sup> "There can be little cause for wonder," they note with typical British pride, "that foreigners are frequently bewildered and exasperated by the curious mentality of a people who can remain satisfied with so preposterous and illogical an institution" as cabinet government.<sup>180</sup> In another revealing description they refer to "the tentative experiment in human relations which is the business of government."<sup>181</sup>

The system is fundamentally beneficent to Mallory. Canada, he asserts, enjoys a "constitutional democracy," a significant political

<sup>178</sup>*Ibid.*, 495. They quickly revert to their normal stance and conclude by referring to the "significant minority of Canadians for whom the political system is not providing satisfaction. The political system in Canada is better than most – but that is not to say that it cannot be vastly improved," 495. They previously noted "the central point ... that when output decisions are made in the political system they generally conform to our basic societal norms," 107, an extremely suggestive observation deserving investigation.

<sup>179</sup>Their discussion of the gradual erosion of British influence in Canadian affairs reveals their appreciation of evolutionary change. The distinction between local affairs and matters of concern to Britain "had the great advantage of yielding gradually to pressure whenever the occasion demanded. Material and far-reaching changes could thus be brought about not by sensational crises and bitter quarrels over great principles, but quietly, and as a rule temperately, through the settlement of minor problems arising in the day to day relationships of the British and overseas governments." Dawson and Ward, 40–1.

<sup>180</sup>*Ibid.*, 167.

<sup>181</sup>*Ibid.*, 380.

achievement which "provides effective means of preventing abuses of power, and ensures that those in authority cannot take away the ultimate right of the governed to remove them or reject their policies."<sup>182</sup> Given this positive evaluation, Mallory's attitude is respectful. He tenses the system.<sup>183</sup> His writings, indeed, contribute to and are part of the operating constitution in the same way as legal commentaries by academic lawyers are part of a working system of law. He too is a believer in incremental change, seeing the constitution as an evolving instrument of government which has successfully adapted itself to new demands.<sup>184</sup> He hopes to keep it in good repair to meet the crises of the future. The successful grappling with future challenges will necessitate an unusual degree of responsiveness and flexibility for he is highly conscious of the fact that we are "living in a time when patience with the existing order is not a common virtue."<sup>185</sup>

In sum, Mallory and Dawson and Ward are happy to identify with the political system. They write as its supporters, appreciative of its virtues, somewhat indulgent of its shortcomings, and deeply concerned for its survival.

#### The study of Canadian politics and the international community of political scientists

A reading of these three texts raises questions about the position of the study of Canadian politics in the larger world of political science of which it is a part. If footnotes are accurate indicators all the authors live almost exclusively in a world of English-language scholarship, thus accurately representing the bulk of Anglophone political scientists in Canada. Given the linguistic dualism of the

<sup>182</sup>Mallory, 1.

<sup>183</sup>Eugene Forsey undoubtedly has been the classic player of this role of tending the system.

<sup>184</sup>Perhaps the chief lesson Mallory derives from his historical research is the imperative need for constitutions, and the institutions of which they are composed, to be flexible and responsive. He returns again and again to the theme that no political system can be imperious to the changing world in which it lives, 369–71. The flexibility of the British constitutional system, p. 11, and of cabinet government, p. 108, illustrate the fortunate nature of the Canadian political heritage. For other illustrations of a much praised flexibility see 99, 126. See also Van Loon and Whittington for praise of the flexible Canadian constitution, 149.

<sup>185</sup>Mallory, 322.

polity their texts describe and the amount of untranslated literature by French-Canadian social scientists, this is a serious shortcoming. Anglophone scholarship devoted to Canadian politics is imprisoned in the English language, and seldom ventures beyond the United Kingdom or the United States for comparative material. History and institutional similarities elicit British data, while the contiguity of the United States and its impact elicit American comparisons. An escape from linguistic and cultural ethnocentrism to an examination of the non-English-speaking world, and the scholarship of that world, would improve our capacity to understand Canada. The recent useful introduction of the concept of consociational democracy<sup>186</sup> into studies of Canadian federalism is an indication of the benefits we might derive from transcending the insularity of the North Atlantic triangle.

The three texts exemplify different ways of doing political science. Van Loon and Whittington have been heavily influenced by those largely American trends that stress models, systems, functions, and a science of politics. Their references to non-Canadian literature are overwhelmingly American. Their footnotes constitute a parade of the contributors to contemporary political science in the United States: Easton, Laswell, Deutsch, Almond and Verba. British writers are conspicuously absent, with the exception of isolated references to Wheare, Bottomore, and Herbert Morrison. With Mallory and Dawson and Ward the situation is reversed, and the literature of postwar political science in the United States is scarcely mentioned.<sup>187</sup> On the other hand, they delve deeply into British literature, and their work is sprinkled with references to Bagehot, Dicey, Keith, and others, many of whom wrote in the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century. By contrast, relatively few of the references in Van Loon and Whittington are dated before 1945. The behavioural orientation which, I presume, partially accounts for their general indifference to earlier writings directs their attention to other bodies of literature. They display a vigorous eclecticism,

using the social sciences in a way alien to Mallory and Dawson and Ward who move comfortably among historians, lawyers, politicians, and the writers of government reports, but seldom exploit other social-science disciplines. The different academic worlds inhabited by the authors generate significantly different portrayals of the common political system they are bent on describing.

The comparison of three texts displaying two styles is clearly not an adequate method for investigating the nature of contemporary domestic political science dealing with Canada. The two-against-one aspect of the comparison possibly tilted the scales against *The Canadian Political System*, and no doubt also contributed to a relative failure to note those differences between the two institutionally focused texts which for other purposes would merit detailed scrutiny.

The texts by Mallory and Dawson and Ward also had the good fortune, as representatives of a more traditional approach, to have a relatively strong literature on which to build. Van Loon and Whittington's attempt to employ a new framework produced inevitable weaknesses, criticism of which should be combined with a sympathetic appreciation of the difficulties which attend all innovating work. They had to go beyond the available data to sustain their approach and the resultant shortcomings are noticeable in several sections of the book, particularly the section dealing with the environment.<sup>188</sup> However,

<sup>188</sup>Chapter III, "Political Participation: Input Behaviour," 65–95, is particularly weak, as John Wilson suggests. "The real problem is that the authors' treatment of what they regard as the key elements in the environment of the Canadian political system suffers from a lack of empirical data so staggering as to suggest that the analysis ought not to have been attempted. To be fair, they recognize that their data are inadequate to the task they have undertaken, but that does not cover the essential absurdity of seeking to discuss political socialization in Canada on the basis of two surveys of schoolchildren in communities in eastern Ontario. In short, this section of the book should never have been written. That it has been creates the possibility that the book as a whole may do more harm than good to the cause its authors seek to serve." Review, *Canadian Public Administration*, 15 (1972), 400.

Even Part v, dealing with the policy process, described as "possibly the most important part of the book," 1, has serious limitations to counterbalance its strong points. The latter lie in its refusal to accept a simplified view of the role of institutions in terms of

<sup>186</sup>See S.J.R. Noel, "Political Parties and Elite Accommodation: Interpretations of Canadian Federalism," in Meekison, *Canadian Federalism for a Canadian application of the theory of "consociational democracy" developed by Arend Lijphart, a Dutch political scientist. See also the papers by Lijphart, Noel, and Gérard Bergeron at the 1970 Colloque in the Canadian Journal of Political Science*, IV (1971).

<sup>187</sup>Except for American authors dealing with Canada, such as Hartz, and Taylor Cole.

the publication of their model or framework in the highly visible textbook field will doubtless stimulate research which will test and refine the utility of their approach.

The purpose of this article has been to clarify an implicit debate in Canadian political science concerning the best way of studying the Canadian political system. In this regard, it is necessary, I believe, not only to do political science, a kind of conversing by example, but to discuss openly the merits and consequences of different ways of doing it. Introspection is a luxury we cannot do without.

### Afterthoughts

Yesterday's political science in Canada was plural, although this has been little noticed by the present generation of political scientists which has tended to equate the whole of previous political science with one of its strands, historical-institutional analysis. This oversimplification is partly due to the long textbook dominance of *The Government of Canada*. Yet in the same era when that book was brought to completion, sociological approaches were evident in the works of Alexander Brady, and in the thirties by Escott Reid. The political-economy approach, although largely under the wing of the economists, was not without political-science supporters, and its great achievement, the Rowell-Sirois investigation, had political scientists on the Commission itself and on its research team. An additional incipient pluralist strand was class analysis, the use of which was strongly advocated by C.B. Macpherson as early as 1942.<sup>189</sup>

With the above considerations in mind, several points can be made. The past of political science in Canada is possessed of sufficient richness and diversity that it should not be discarded. Further, recognition of the interaction between political systems and their environments is not a new feature in the study of Canadian politics. The works of Siegfried, Bryce, Clokie, and Brady reveal

their manifest functions. The main limitation is the highly abstract nature of their description. They admit that remarkably little is known about the policy process "whereby inputs are actually converted to outputs," and the available knowledge is at a "very unsophisticated level."<sup>493</sup>

<sup>189</sup>C.B. Macpherson, "The Position of Political Science," *Culture*, III (1942). Eleven years later he heeded his own urging with the publication of *Democracy in Alberta: The Theory and Practice of a Quasi-Party System* (Toronto, 1953).

it as an old tradition. While the forceful reminder by Van Loon and Whittington that the environment cannot be left out of comprehensive overviews is salutary, it is also, as their own work shows, too open ended to constitute a guiding premise for research and writing. Specific criteria are required for the selection of environmental facts. The political scientist needs some simplifying mechanism to impose order on the deluge of data which threatens to overwhelm him.

One possibility is to approach the environment with the kind of central governing question, or theme, so effectively employed by other keen students of politics. Alexis de Tocqueville, for example, went to America to inquire into the future: "I sought there the image of democracy itself, with its inclinations, its character, its prejudices, and its passions, in order to learn what we have to fear or to hope from its progress."<sup>190</sup> André Siegfried organized his classic discussion around the fundamental issue of the race question in Canada.<sup>191</sup> *Democracy in the Dominions* by Alexander Brady, a study of the four original white dominions of the Commonwealth, took as its starting point the "interacting influences of physical environment and cultural inheritance."<sup>192</sup> These simple and compelling themes would satisfy few PHD examination committees seeking the conceptual framework of the jittery candidate before them; nevertheless, those who employed them had a unity and coherence fastened on their works which contributed to their enduring qualities.

A simple but helpful focus was used by Lord Bryce, the devourer of facts, who had a life-long interest in the action of political forces in democratic communities. Canada's attraction for him was that while "the economic and social conditions of the country are generally similar to those of the United States, the political institutions have been framed upon English models, and the political habits, traditions, and usages have retained an English character."<sup>193</sup> Obviously, an expansive North American society, thinly covering half a continent, with fluid class lines, no aristocracy, and a large geographically concentrated French minority, could not be expected to work British institutions in the manner of the mother country.

<sup>190</sup>*Democracy in America* (New York, 1954), Vol. 1, 15.

<sup>191</sup>*The Race Question in Canada*, ed. Frank H. Underhill (Toronto, 1966; originally published in French in 1906; first English edition in 1907).

<sup>192</sup>1.

<sup>193</sup>James Bryce, *Canada: An Actual Democracy* (Toronto, 1921), 1.

Unfortunately, Bryce devoted little of his prodigious energy to the examination of Canada. His theme, however, possesses the kind of grand simplicity capable of helping us make some sense of the Canadian political system. While we await the arrival of theory

and, as previously suggested, work for its coming, we must also allocate some resources to develop the improved understanding possible from the employment of those pre-theories known as themes.

## Alternative Styles: A Comment

NORMAN WARD *University of Saskatchewan*

Harold Innis used to impress on his graduate students that while a scholar who had not written a book, and thus flushed himself from cover so that his peers could pot at him, was at best an unfinished piece of work, one who had come out to be got at had no reasonable recourse but to accept all honest volleys. At the same time, a refusal to accept an invitation to comment on Alan Cairns' admirable article could so easily be misunderstood that I feel obliged to say at least something, preferably – in the Innisian tradition – as little as possible, and that obscurely.

Dawson, not I, was the creator of *The Government of Canada*, and since Dawson and I (though Professor Cairns rightly assesses part of our compatability) disagreed profoundly about many things in Canadian society, I should make clear that I am writing here solely as the reviser of the book. I think the Cairns article is admirable, not only eminently fair to Dawson and Ward's *The Government of Canada*, but full of observations on that work with which I agree. Indeed, if I were to accept for inclusion in a sixth edition all the Cairns points with which I agree, a text whose "size and detail" has already prompted Professor Cairns to employ the word "formidable" would have to become at least two volumes, the second of them to include some major sections on topics about which I do not feel competent to write. Professor Cairns, that is, underestimates the enormous pressure that space puts on anyone trying to produce a comprehensive text and overestimates how much I know. (Dawson, I think, might not have put that quite the same way.) I may, of course, underestimate the enormous pressure that space puts on anyone trying to write a comprehensive review article, though I am deeply impressed by how much Professor Cairns knows.

No writer of such a book as *The Government of Canada* can say all he wants to in one book, and a second general comment is that any attempt to assess the book as part of "Alternative Styles in the Study of Canadian Politics" should surely include an appraisal of the authors' other work. It is true that Professor Cairns makes clear he is concentrating on the texts, and they presumably make their greatest impact on students. But he notes, for example, the centralist bias of *The Government of Canada*, without exploring the possible emergence of that bias from regional influences on the authors in small, poorly endowed provinces; or their writings about those provinces.

He also properly sets the texts in a broader context of political science, and this permits him conclusions such as this: "The institutionally inclined approach of Mallory, Dawson, and Ward does not view parliamentary ideals imperfectly realized as myths, but as goals and goads to action." Yet in 1960, years before I touched *The Government of Canada*, I prefaced another text with these opening words: "Readers of this book who have had some experience of politics will realize that this is a book about the ideals and myths of democratic government in Canada, as well as a factual (or in some cases hypothetical) description of political institutions." In writing that sentence, in my first text, I actually thought I was passing on the benefits of my own graduate work in sociology, which I have always felt was a major influence on my writing (not that I know). Professor Cairns does not appear to find that influence in my editions of *The Government of Canada*; he might have less trouble with it in *The Public Purse* – or *Mice in the Beer*. In all this, to be sure, I am using a standard reviewer's ploy, by suggesting that Professor

Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique, VII, no. 1 (March/mars 1974). Printed in Canada/Imprimé au Canada.