

David R. Cameron  
Jacqueline D. Krikorian

## **The study of federalism, 1960–99: A content review of several leading Canadian academic journals**

*Abstract:* A number of observers have suggested that there is a decline in the level of “traditional” federalism research undertaken in Canada. They contend that scholarly interest has shifted away from areas like fiscal federalism and the division of powers to newer areas of interest like social movements, identity politics and citizenship issues. An interdisciplinary review of a number of Canadian journals reveals, however, that studies in traditional areas of federalism are not in decline and continue to dominate the field in English-language federalism scholarship. At the same time, the authors did not find a robust literature on federalism-related issues in French for the forty-year period under review.

*Sommaire :* Un certain nombre d’observateurs semblent indiquer que le niveau de la recherche entreprise au Canada sur le fédéralisme « traditionnel » a baissé. Ils prétendent que les intellectuels se sont détournés des domaines comme le fédéralisme fiscal et la répartition des compétences pour s’orienter vers de nouveaux centres d’intérêt comme les mouvements sociaux, la politique identitaire et les questions relatives à la citoyenneté. Une étude interdisciplinaire d’un grand nombre de revues canadiennes révèle cependant que les études portant sur les secteurs traditionnels du fédéralisme ne sont pas en baisse et que ces secteurs continuent à faire l’objet de la majorité des bourses d’études en langue anglaise sur le fédéralisme. Par contre, nous n’avons pas parallèlement trouvé d’études importantes en langue française sur les questions liées au fédéralisme au cours de la période de 40 ans que nous avons étudiée.

In 1998, the government of Canada launched two new initiatives to promote the study of federalism. The first, known as the “Forum of Federations,” received \$10.5 million over three years to establish a non-governmental

David R. Cameron is professor, Department of Political Science, University of Toronto. Jacqueline D. Krikorian is a doctoral candidate, Department of Political Science, University of Toronto, and a fellow at the Institute of International Economic Law, Georgetown University Law Center. The authors would like to thank Nathalie Behnke, Robin Boadway, Larry Leduc, Richard Simeon, Allan Tupper, Ronald Watts, and the anonymous reviewers of this journal for their helpful comments, and extend their sincere appreciation to Denise Atrial, Elizabeth Christie, Michelle Hopkins, Donald Krikorian, Allyson MacKenzie, Ruth Mas and Julie Simmons for their assistance. All errors and omissions are the responsibility of the authors.

organization dedicated to facilitating information and research exchanges pertaining to federalism. More specifically, this initiative was designed to help "practitioners compare experiences and best practices in order to improve the practice of federalism in a wide range of countries," to "provide assistance to established and emerging federations," and to "encourage the interest of youth in federalism."<sup>1</sup> The program was renewed and, to date, has organized federalism conferences in Canada, Brazil, Nigeria, Russia and Mexico.<sup>2</sup> The second initiative, announced just months later, was the "Federalism and Federations" grant program. It received \$1.77 million over four years "to stimulate research, training and [the] dissemination of knowledge in the field of federalism studies."<sup>3</sup> Co-sponsored by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, the Federalism and Federations program provides grants and fellowship supplements to doctoral, postdoctoral and university researchers and funding to universities and institutes to create federalism networks. This program was also recently renewed.

The impetus behind these initiatives was two-fold. First, there was a belief that enhancing knowledge about federalism as a form of good governance would help to combat the constitutional crisis facing Canadians. As Stéphane Dion, minister of intergovernmental affairs, explained, the Federalism and Federations program "will help us to rise more effectively to the challenges facing federations today."<sup>4</sup> Similarly, in a speech at the Canadian-American Center of the University of Maine, he "expressed his conviction that a knowledge of other federations will strengthen Canadian unity."<sup>5</sup>

Secondly, the government was concerned about the general state of federalism studies in Canada. Two informal reviews of the field were undertaken on behalf of Ottawa's intergovernmental affairs unit that indicated that there was less research on federalism undertaken in "traditional" areas, such as the division of powers, than in the past. The first review, known as the "Leslie Report," prepared by Peter Leslie of Queen's University, was a summary of a meeting among Canadian political scientists held during the Learned Societies' Congress at Brock University in June 1996 on the current state of the "research and teaching of federalism in Canadian universities." The summary notes that among the academics present, there was a belief that the "interest in federalism has not so much increased or declined, as it has shifted focus: Especially in the context of repeated constitutional failure, it is hardly surprising that the traditional fixation of scholars of federalism on the division of powers, the conduct of intergovernmental relations, and the arcane world of fiscal transfers and tax harmonization, kindles only a limited degree of enthusiasm among students, and that researchers have turned to other topics." Evidence for such a finding was based on a number of factors, including concerns that we were witnessing a "marked decline in the number of articles on federalism submitted to the *Canadian Journal of Political Science*."<sup>6</sup>

Tom McIntosh's follow-up report, written in 1997, reaches a similar conclusion based on a survey of 120 academics and researchers in Canada. As a result of the comments he received, he reported that students "were less interested in the traditional areas such as the division of powers, intergovernmental relations and constitutionalism" and "were increasingly interested in areas less directly tied to federalism such as rights, identity politics and those other areas noted by the Leslie report,"<sup>7</sup> including issues such as ethnicity, citizenship and new social movements.<sup>8</sup> McIntosh recommended a series of grants, the establishment of research centres and the creation of networks to try to combat the decline in traditional approaches in federalism studies, without discouraging new methods of approaching the field.<sup>9</sup> And, as noted above, this is exactly what has occurred.

The purpose of this present project is to determine the condition of federalism studies in Canada between 1960 and 1999 in an attempt to ascertain whether the perception of changes in the field adequately reflects the reality. To this end, we systematically analyse the content of a series of Canadian journals, focusing on those articles that either directly address federalism, or indirectly as a significant component of the research. We examine the 1960–99 time-frame because it is the period during which modern Quebec nationalism and the emergence of province-building manifest themselves. This is as well the era in which alternative conceptions of politics and different ways of framing political issues and priorities came to the fore and have gradually altered the character and practice of the Canadian federation, as they have influenced the academic study and understanding of the phenomenon.

Adopting this methodology means however that we did not analyse the richness of federalism scholarship in books and edited collections. Instead, we focused our research on journal publications to place our findings on federalism in the context of the broader range of scholarly inquiry reflected in academic journals and in order to permit an interdisciplinary approach to our subject-matter. In doing so, we realize that our conclusions are limited by the method, but they have the virtue of being empirically grounded. Our article might usefully be regarded as a companion piece to a recently published essay by Richard Simeon, which offers a comprehensive overview of the general themes of federalism and regionalism in the discipline of political science during the twentieth century.<sup>10</sup>

Our project is divided into three parts. The first provides an empirical analysis of federalism-related studies in political science journals in Canada. We look at both the nature and extent of scholarship on federalism and examine the articles' footnotes to ascertain whether political scientists pursuing federalism research engage with literature in both official languages and with federalism scholarship outside their own discipline. The second part of our project provides a more qualitative examination of general themes in leading journals in law, economics, history and public administra-

tion in order to understand what issues are addressed in other fields. The last part of our article then provides some observations on the nature of studies on federalism based on our journal review, contrasting some of the myths and realities of the field.

### **Federalism-related articles in Canadian political science journals, 1960–99**

To gain an insight into political scientists' approach to the study of Canadian federalism in the period under review, we undertook a comparative analysis of the *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* (CJEPS), 1960–67, its successor the *Canadian Journal of Political Science* (CJPS), 1968–99, *Politique: Revue Québécoise de Science Politique*, 1982–95, and its successor, *Politique et Sociétés*, 1995–99. We are aware that these are not the only journals in which Canadian political scientists publish their work; in particular, we recognize that traditional scholarly approaches at any given point may be somewhat over-represented as compared to new or alternative forms of scholarship, which may at the beginning be more likely to appear in alternative publications. Nevertheless, we make the assumption that, as the leading journals in the field, the publications we have identified generally reflect trends and patterns in the discipline.

In undertaking this analysis, we wanted to achieve a number of objectives. In particular, we wanted to determine whether there had been an increase or decline in the amount of work being published on federalism-related issues in these journals during the last four decades, in both absolute and relative terms; what federalism-related issues were studied during the time-period and how the pattern of scholarly interest evolved as the decades passed; what similarities and differences were apparent in French- and English-language scholarship as reflected in these journals; and what types of sources political scientists relied on when pursuing their federalism-related research.

Our review of CJEPS and CJPS reveals that eighty-seven articles have been written on federalism-related issues between 1960 and 1999 and that the number has grown each decade. As shown in Table 1, there were fifteen articles in the first decade, twenty articles between 1970–79, twenty-three articles between 1980–89, and twenty-nine articles in the 1990s. Moreover, we found that there has not only been an increase in the absolute number of articles on federalism published each decade but there has also been an increase in the number of articles on federalism relative to the total number of articles published in the journal. Table 2 reveals that there has been a consistent increase in federalism articles as a percentage of all articles published in these journals, moving from approximately five per cent in the 1960s to just over twelve per cent in the 1990s.

Table 1 also sets out the nineteen categories we used to identify and clas-

Table 1. *Focus of Federalism-Related Articles in CJEPS (1960-67) and CJPS (1968-99)*

	1960-69	1970-79	1980-89	1990-99	Total
collective identities	0	0	0	1	1
Confederation	0	0	4	3	7
consociational politics	0	2	0	0	2
constitutional amendments	1	0	1	1	3
constitutional process	0	0	0	4	4
decentralization	0	0	1	1	2
dualism	2	0	0	0	2
fiscal federalism	3	0	0	0	3
institutions	1	2	2	3	8
intergovernmental relations	1	0	0	1	2
judicial review	0	1	2	1	4
nationalism	1	3	1	1	6
parties and the electoral system	3	2	2	2	9
public policy	1	2	1	2	6
Quebec sovereignty	0	4	2	5	11
regionalism	2	2	2	1	7
royal commissions	0	2	3	0	5
secession	0	0	1	2	3
theory	0	0	1	1	2
Total	15	20	23	29	87

Note: We have adopted a similar approach to surveying the subject-matter of journals used by Robin Neill and Gilles Paquet, "L'économie hérétique: Canadian economics before 1967," *Canadian Journal of Economics* 26, no. 1 (March 1993), pp. 3-13.

Table 2. *Federalism-Related Articles as a Percentage of all Articles Published in CJEPS (1960-67) and CJPS (1968-99)*

	1960-69	1970-79	1980-89	1990-99
CJEPS/CJPS	5.45	8.81	10.04	12.5

sify federalism-related issues. The largest number of articles (eleven) that we found addressing a single issue pertained to Quebec sovereignty. The second most common issue addressed in the federalism literature was the subject of parties and the electoral system (nine), while the third most significant category was composed of articles examining institutions and federalism (eight). Fourth place was shared by two issue categories: articles pertaining to the history of federalism at Confederation and articles pertaining to regionalism. Each was the focus of seven articles. We were intrigued to find that those articles reflecting "traditional" concerns of federalism scholars were, for the most part, published consistently during the forty-year study period. In other words, we did not witness a decline in these "tra-

ditional areas" of federalism scholarship as other issues pertaining to such matters as identity politics, ethnicity, citizenship and new social movements came to the fore.

Articles on sovereignty peaked during the 1970s with the emergence of the Parti québécois and again in the mid-1990s coinciding with the 1995 referendum in Quebec; nine of the eleven articles were published during these time-periods. This is graphic evidence of the interplay in this field between major political events in the system and their study in the academy. For the most part, the sovereignty studies explore the significance of some of the factors affecting support for, or opposition to, the Quebec sovereignty movement, such as the degree of security of French-Canadian identity and the French language, as well as the state of the economy.<sup>11</sup> Many of these articles (five) were jointly authored, and six of the eleven were written in French. We might add that three other articles were published on the issue of secession – one during the 1980s and two during the 1990s.

The second most popular topic on our list displays significant regionalism overtones, namely, the relationship between federalism and the electoral system and political parties. These articles generally focused on the ways in which electoral politics shaped or influenced institutions and politics. In 1968, for example, Alan Cairns challenged the prevailing wisdom that national parties acted as a unifying force in Canada. Instead he argued that the party system, conditioned by the electoral system, "exacerbates the very cleavages it is credited with healing," and, in so doing, considers the merits of a proportional representation system. Herman Bakvis and Laura Macpherson wrote a more recent article in this category, examining the phenomenon of Quebec block-voting and its effect on federal election outcomes.<sup>12</sup>

The third-largest category of federalism-related articles in CJEPs and CJPS pertained to the interplay between federalism and government institutions. For the most part, these studies focus on bodies like the senate and the cabinet. Included in this category, for example, is the 1995 presidential address to the CPSA, where David E. Smith argues that the royal prerogative of the executive was a significant factor in province building.<sup>13</sup>

The fourth category of articles, on regionalism, attracted about the same level of interest throughout the four decades. For the most part, these studies defined regions according to provincial boundaries and were devoted to examining questions of regional political economy and regional political culture. For example, Richard Simeon and David J. Elkins' 1974 research demonstrates that independent of both political and economic forces, there are a number of cultural differences among provinces that can be attributed to sociological and historical factors. As a result, citizens within each province, as well as among language groups, have different perspectives and orientations towards politics. In their 1980 research, Michael Ornstein, Michael

H. Stevenson and Paul A. Williams conclude that horizontal cleavages across the regions exist, although they note that there are more distinctive attitudes in Quebec.<sup>14</sup>

Seven articles were also written on the history of Canadian federalism. They examine the nature of the Confederation agreement. All of these articles have appeared in the *Canadian Journal of Political Science* since the mid-1980s – evidence of what Janet Ajzenstat and her colleagues have already noted, namely, an increase in the study of Canadian constitutional history. One example in this category is Robert C. Vipond's article entitled "1787 and 1867: The federal principle and Canadian Confederation reconsidered." Vipond compares the history of the federal principle in Canada and the United States. Countering prevailing opinion, he demonstrates that those who drafted the Constitution Act, 1867 created a federal state that was "strongly reminiscent of the Federalists' classic exposition of constitutional federalism." The principle of federalism adopted in Canada was designed to ensure that "each province ha[d] the 'exclusive' power to legislate," just as the federalists outlined their vision of federalism in 1887.<sup>15</sup>

We also want to note the emergence of a series of articles on the constitutional process in the 1990s. Four were written in the last ten years, none in the three previous decades. These constitutional analysts were interested in the relationship between constitutional processes and constitutional outcomes. For example, in his 1991 presidential address to the Canadian Political Science Association, Peter Russell reviews the ongoing constitutional negotiations and the emergence of public participation in the debates. He questions whether there is adequate common ground among the Canadian people to reach an agreement and expresses the strong view that the debate must come to an end. And in her 1998 study entitled "Of 'special interest': interest, identity and feminist constitutional activism in Canada," Alexandra Dobrowolsky contends that the women's movement in the constitutional debates "not only influenced political discourses and practices, but it also challenged notions of democracy and representation."<sup>16</sup>

In our other constitutional category, that of constitutional amendments, just two articles were written, one in the 1960s and the other in the 1980s. The literature in this area seems surprisingly slight, considering the profile the Constitution and constitutional reform had in Canadian politics until very recently.

Lastly, we were somewhat surprised at the paucity of articles with a focus on fiscal federalism. While there were three such articles published during the 1960s in *CJEPs*, no others have been published since that time. We attribute this omission, in part, to the 1968 split of *CJEPs* into two separate journals – one for economics and one for political science – and to the emergence of other journals such as *Canadian Public Administration*, where authors seem more inclined to publish such material.

Let us turn now to the journals of the Quebec political science association. *Revue Québécoise de Science Politique* began operations in 1982, so the time-period we are covering is briefer than that with CJEPS/CJPS. In the fall of 1995, *Revue* became *Politique et Sociétés*. At the time of its re-naming, the journal made a statement about its mission: "La revue *Politique et Sociétés* se veut pluraliste, interdisciplinaire, internationale et ouverte aux débats de l'heure. *Politique et Sociétés* affirmera sa différence en faisant porter d'abord et avant tout son regard sur la société québécoise."<sup>17</sup> Given its focus, and the fact that it is the journal of the Quebec association, articles on various dimensions of Quebec's social and political experience form the lion's share of what appears within the covers of the journal. What is more, most issues of the journal focus on a single theme – public finances in Quebec, the reform of political institutions, democracy, the post-Cold War period, towards a new welfare state, and so on. The articles under each of these rubrics appear to centre either on Quebec government and society or on the international and comparative dimensions of the relevant political experience. Occasionally, Canada will be the focus of a contribution, but this is relatively rare. So far, there have been no issues focusing on the theme of federalism.

---

*A review of the contents of Politique et Sociétés and its predecessor in the eighteen years of its existence suggests a fairly autonomous Quebec-based discourse*

---

Our review of *Revue/Politique et Sociétés* revealed thirteen articles written on federalism-related issues, from 1982–99. Table 3 demonstrates that only three of these articles were written between 1982–89, and the remaining ten between 1990–99. Table 4 demonstrates that approximately nine per cent of all articles published in this journal over the last ten-year period were written on federalism-related issues. Although this figure is only moderately less than the 12.5 per cent ratio of federalism-related articles found in CJPS during the same period, there is one notable difference in the material.

Table 3 reveals that four of the ten federalism-related articles written between 1990 and 1999 dealt with issues pertaining to the debate on Quebec independence. Chantal Maillé and Manon Tremblay, for example, examine women's attitudes towards the 1995 Quebec referendum, finding, among other things, that women do not share a common view of Quebec's constitutional position. Gilbert Gagné, on the other hand, examines the relationship between continental free trade and sovereignty, contending that such trade practices assist the quest for independence. Moreover, the two articles (by Desrosier and Potvin) that fall under the category of political parties and the electoral system, deal with the Parti québécois discourse, particularly in



Table 3. *Focus of Federalism-Related Articles in Revue Québécoise de Science Politique (1982–1995) and Politique et Sociétés (1995–99)*

	1982–89	1990–99	Total
<i>collective identities</i>	0	0	0
<i>Confederation</i>	0	0	0
<i>consociational politics</i>	0	0	0
<i>constitutional amendments</i>	0	0	0
<i>constitutional process</i>	1	0	1
<i>decentralization</i>	0	0	0
<i>dualism</i>	0	0	0
<i>fiscal federalism</i>	0	0	0
<i>institutions</i>	0	0	0
<i>intergovernmental relations</i>	0	1	1
<i>judicial review</i>	0	0	0
<i>nationalism</i>	0	1	1
<i>parties and the electoral system</i>	0	2	2
<i>public policy</i>	0	0	0
<i>Quebec sovereignty</i>	1	4	5
<i>regionalism</i>	0	0	0
<i>royal commissions</i>	1	0	1
<i>secession</i>	0	0	0
<i>theory</i>	0	2	2
<i>Total</i>	3	10	13

Table 4. *Federalism-Related Articles as a Percentage of all Articles Published in Revue Québécoise de Science Politique (1982–95) and Politique et Sociétés (1995–19)*

	1982–89	1990–99
<i>Revue and Politique et Sociétés</i>	3.7	8.93

regard to accusations concerning racism in its platform.<sup>18</sup> In other words, although there are ten articles written between 1990–99, the majority of them focus on dimensions of Quebec sovereignty.

Only two articles on aspects of federalism written during this 1990–99 period address issues relating to the Canadian political system, and both of these were written by anglophones.<sup>19</sup> Now, part of the explanation for this situation might be that *CJPS* is a bilingual, Canadian review that attracts francophone scholars who wish to write about Canadian themes for a Canadian audience. Given the nature of federalism, we thought perhaps that it was natural that francophones who wish to examine issues relating to that

Table 5. *Percentage of Language of Sources Used in English and French Federalism-Related Articles in CJPS (1980–99), Revue Québécoise de Science Politique (1982–95), and Politique et Sociétés (1995–99)*

	English sources	French sources
Articles written in English (44 articles)	95	5
Articles written in French (21 articles)	51	49

system would choose to do so in a bilingual journal that reaches the entire Canadian scholarly community as opposed to a journal whose focus was on Quebec. To determine the validity of this argument, we looked at the topics covered by the French-language articles in CJPS and discovered that four of the six address the sovereignty question, suggesting that there is no significant difference in subject-matter covered in the French-language articles in CJPS or those in *Revue Québécoise de Science Politique* and *Politique et Sociétés*.

---

*[W]e believe that political scientists pursuing federalism-related research rely less than one would expect on the relevant work done in other disciplines, given the degree to which a comprehensive understanding of federalism depends on insights from a number of different perspectives*

---

A review of the contents of *Politique et Sociétés* and its predecessor in the eighteen years of its existence suggests a fairly autonomous Quebec-based discourse. The ratio of French-language to English-language books that are reviewed in the journal is higher than the ratio of English-language to French-language books reviewed in CJPS. On its face, this might not be surprising, given that the latter is bilingual and the former is unilingual; however, the powerful presence of English-language North American scholarship in which the québécois academic community is immersed does not appear to be much in evidence in the book review pages of *Politiques et Sociétés*. Yet a different picture emerges when one looks at the sources francophone scholars employ in their research. As Table 5 shows, despite the Quebec-focused nature of most of the twenty-one French-language articles under review in CJPS (1980–99) and *Revue Québécoise de Science Politique* and *Politiques et Sociétés* (1982–99), the sources cited in these articles were half in French and half in English, suggesting a serious engagement on the part of francophone scholars with English-language political science discourse.<sup>20</sup>

This is not true on the other side of the language divide. The English-

language articles under review contain very few French citations. As Table 5 shows, of the forty-four articles on federalism written in English in these journals, approximately ninety-five per cent of the sources cited were in English. It is, as well, relatively unusual for an English-language political scientist to publish in *Politique et Sociétés* or to participate in its management. Those who do, have clearly immersed themselves in the Quebec reality, are fluent in French, and capable of full participation in that scholarly community.

We are not, of course, the first scholars to observe that two relatively autonomous political science worlds exist in Canada. Gilles Lalancé, in his presidential address to the CPSA in 1971, reviewed some of the difficulties in the discipline and noted that one of the problems facing French-Canadian political scientists was that their work was not translated into English and hence had little impact outside of Quebec.<sup>21</sup>

On the basis of this evidence, then, it appeared that anglophone scholars simply did not read their colleagues' French-language research. At the same time, we wondered if the English federalism scholars did not use French sources because there were relatively few sources available. Therefore to try to account for the significant variation in the sources used in the French and English articles, we decided to specifically examine the sources used in the seven English articles written on Confederation, as there is no dispute that there is an abundance of French-language material available to scholars on this subject. For example, in the special 1967 edition of the *Revue d'histoire de L'Amérique française*, entitled "Cent ans d'histoire 1867-1967," there is a bibliography on Canadian Confederation that includes 189 French citations (excluding government documents, statutes and case law), which constitutes over half of the full bibliography.<sup>22</sup>

We found that in the seven English articles on Confederation in *CJPS*, only eight of the 373 books and articles cited were written in French. In other words only about two per cent of the sources cited in these English articles on Confederation were based on French-language sources.

Our findings suggest that francophone scholars are very familiar with the English-language scholarship in their field, although their intellectual interests are chiefly directed towards the Quebec, rather than the Canadian, political system. Much of their work in fact, addresses issues pertaining to Quebec sovereignty. On the other hand, English-speaking scholars are less familiar with federalism-related articles written in French, even where there are ample sources available.

We also looked at the footnotes of these articles to gain an insight into the extent to which political scientists were informed by studies from other disciplines. As set out in Table 6, the federalism-related studies in the political science journals under review cited political science journals more often than journals of any other discipline. Research from law and public administration was used, though to a significantly lesser extent. We were perhaps

Table 6. *Journals Cited as a Source More than Five Times in English and French Federalism-Related Articles in cjs (1980-99), Revue Québécoise de Science Politique (1982-95), and Politique et Sociétés (1995-99) between 1980 and 1999*

	Number of times articles from the journal were used as a source in 44 English articles	Number of times articles from the journal were used as a source in 21 French articles	Total number of times articles from the journal were used as a source
Canadian Journal of Political Science	89	12	101
American Political Science Review	14	19	33
Canadian Public Policy	23	9	32
Canadian Public Administration	21	1	22
Canadian Bar Review	16	0	16
Journal of Canadian Studies	13	1	14
British Journal of Political Science	7	6	13
Canadian Historical Review	11	0	11
American Review of Canadian Studies	0	11	11
Publius	4	6	10
Recherches sociographiques	1	8	9
American Journal of Political Science	5	4	9
Journal of Politics	4	4	8
Osgoode Hall Law Journal	6	0	6
La Revue nouvelle	0	6	6
International Organization	6	0	6
Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology	6	0	6
American Sociological Review	6	0	6
University of Toronto Law Journal	6	0	6
Alberta Law Review	5	0	5
Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science	4	1	5
Dalhousie Review	5	0	5
Policy Options	5	0	5
Studies in Political Economy	4	1	5
World Politics	3	2	5

most surprised, however, that scholars publishing in the Canadian political science journals under review, rarely, if ever, cited material from economics journals.

In our analysis of the sources used, we also found something we were not expecting. French scholars were more likely than their English counterparts to use American or British sources in their research. For example, the twenty-one French articles under examination cited the *American Political Science Review* as a source on nineteen occasions, as compared to the forty-four English articles that used the journal as a source on only fourteen occasions. Similarly, the twenty-one French articles cited the *American Review of Canadian Studies* eleven times and the *Journal of Canadian Studies* once. On the other hand, the forty-four English articles cited the *Journal of Canadian Studies* on thirteen occasions and never cited the *American Review of Canadian Studies*.

Based on our findings in Table 6, we believe that political scientists pursuing federalism-related research rely less than one would expect on the relevant work done in other disciplines, given the degree to which a comprehensive understanding of federalism depends on insights from a number of different perspectives. Is the relatively fewer citations from law, public administration, history and economics due to a lack of scholarship related to federalism in these fields? In the next section of this article, we examine the federalism-related studies in these other disciplines to gain a sense of the extent and nature of their interests in the field.

### **The Study of federalism in academic journals in the fields of law, economics, history and public administration**

To help us gain an insight into the issues addressed in studies on aspects of federalism outside the field of political science, we examined the contents of a number of leading journals and annual publications that address issues in law, economics, history and public administration.<sup>23</sup> Although we recognize that by no means does a journal review of this nature reflect the full range of the scholarship in a given discipline, we believe that it will provide us with some insight into general trends and themes. Given the number of publications we are reviewing, our analysis of the contents of these journals and publications is less detailed than our political science review in the previous section.

#### **Law**

In the area of legal scholarship, we reviewed the contents of three law journals – the *Canadian Bar Review* (CBR), the *University of Toronto Law Journal* (UTLJ) and *La Revue Juridique Thémis* (RJT), the law review for the Faculty of Law at the University of Montreal – between 1960 and 1999. Each journal contains studies by leading members of the judiciary, the bar and the aca-

demic community – the last, primarily, though not exclusively, from law. We note that after the 1980s there was a relative decline in federalism-related articles in these journals, largely, we believe, owing to the post-1980 growth of Charter research.

Our review of this legal material revealed several trends and each will be examined in turn. First, and quite apart from the policy-making issues regarding the Charter, the legal community extensively examined the judicial review powers of the Supreme Court of Canada in disputes over division of powers. Those who contend that the Charter ushered in a new era of so-called “judicial policy-making” might wish to examine this material. There was widespread acceptance among distinguished constitutional scholars that in federalism cases, more than just the black letter of the law shaped legal decisions. Mark MacGuigan, for example, argued that we had to accept “the subjectivity of judicial legislation” and our only choice was whether we did so “gratefully or grudgingly.” He noted that, “although the Supreme Court’s past devotion was to precedent, its future commitment must surely be to policy.” Patrick J. Monahan also contended that the “suggestion that judges decide cases through the application of logic or language alone has become an object of ridicule and parody.” Similarly, W.R. Lederman accepted that “the value assumptions of the judges will enter into their decisions,” but argued that the judicial interpretations of federalism cases “must be related to the cultural, social and economic realities of the society.”<sup>24</sup>

Exactly how to deal with the existence of this “judicial policy-making” was a second theme in the literature. In his critical analysis of the Supreme Court of Canada’s decisions in federalism cases, Paul C. Weiler argued that the judiciary needed “to articulate the policy factors which are persuasive to them in justifying their conclusions.” On the other hand, Jacques-Yvan Morin argued that we should make every effort to limit the judicial discretion of the judiciary to ensure that any significant constitutional changes remained within the purview of the government, not the courts. Morin also believed that the judiciary “can never escape entirely the influence of political circumstances,”<sup>25</sup> and advocated limits on judicial discretion because he was concerned that the abolition of appeals to the Judicial Committee would result in a shift away from provincial autonomy towards greater federal government intrusion in local politics.

A third interesting feature in these law journals was the recognition of the importance of an individual judge on the Supreme Court of Canada. In Katherine Swinton’s article on Justice Bora Laskin and federalism, she uses extensive evidence to convincingly argue that his centralist approach to federalism shaped his decisions:

Laskin had a commitment to the rule of law ... and he never satisfactorily came to terms with this in his federalism decisions. He was willing to depart from the politi-

cal community's expectations about the distribution of powers and to do what he could to shift power to the federal government without an examination of the legitimacy of so doing or consideration of the provinces' interests.

Swinton accepts that in constitutional cases "the outcome of decisions [is] rarely determined solely by an examination of the constitutional document and by precedents." And, like Weiler, she believes that judges should articulate policy issues in their decisions. In her opinion, this was a significant weakness in Laskin's judgements, as he failed to adequately account for his centralist policy positions in his legal decisions. Other articles that recognize the importance of judges include Gérald-A. Beaudoin's study entitled "Jean Beetz et le partage des compétences législatives" and Brian Dickson's "Federalism, civil law and the Canadian judiciary: An integrated version."<sup>26</sup> Both of these latter studies are part of a special 1994 issue of *RJT* in honour of Justice Beetz.

A fourth notable feature of the articles appearing in the three law journals under review, particularly in *RJT* and the *CBR*, is their emphasis on the relationship between matters pertaining to the federal structure of government and public policy issues. Although both of these journals look at a wide variety of policy matters, it is interesting to note their different emphases. For example, in the *CBR*, there are a number of articles that examine issues pertaining to the environment and natural resources, including Gerard V. La Forest's "Water law of the future," Dominique Alh  riti  re's "Les problem  s constitutionnels de la lutte contre la pollution de l'espace atmosph  rique au Canada," and William D. Moull, "Section 92A of the Constitution Act, 1867."<sup>27</sup> On the other hand, the public policy issues often addressed in *RJT* pertain to education issues. See, for example, Th  r  se Giroux-Masse, "La Constitution canadienne et l'  ducation dans une soci  t   moderne," Pierre Carignan, "La raison d'  tre de l'article 93 de la Loi constitutionnelle de 1867    la lumi  re de la l  gislation pr  existante en mati  re d'  ducation," and Jean-Pierre Proulx and Jos   Woehrling, "La restructuration du syst  me scolaire qu  b  cois et la modification de l'article 93 de la Loi constitutionnelle de 1867."<sup>28</sup>

In our review of political science journals, we noted that there has been a growth in studies in constitutional history. As our fifth theme, we also found this trend in the law journals we examined. In a series of articles, R.C.B. Risk has examined the studies of constitutional lawyers and scholars during the twentieth century, including A.H.F. Lefroy, W.P.M. Kennedy and J.S. Ewart.<sup>29</sup> And although federalism per se is not necessarily the focus of each of these articles, taken together they provide an important overview of early twentieth-century federalism studies. Another historical work is David Schneiderman's "Harold Laski, Viscount Haldane and the law of the Canadian Constitution in the early twentieth century," in which he argues, among other points, that "Haldane's constitutional views in some signifi-

cant ways are harmonious with the pluralist position on state sovereignty and the multiple allegiances of citizens in the modern state."<sup>30</sup>

A sixth theme worth noting in these law journals during the 1960s is their examination of issues pertaining to the dualist or "two nations" approach to Canadian federalism. Both Jacques-Yvan Morin and Edward McWhinney for example, consider the nature and importance of French and English representation on the Supreme Court of Canada. Gerald LeDain, for his part, argued that the creation of a "national character" with which both French and English Canadians could identify was essential. He contended that French-Canadians required equality both as individuals and as a community.<sup>31</sup> On the other hand, one might consider the arguments of Bora Laskin in 1967, then a justice at the Ontario Court of Appeal. Laskin suggested that the "deux nations" conception should not invite a "realignment of law-making power between the Dominion and the Provinces, or in favour of the Provinces or any one of them." According to him, the "reach of law-making power should not be embarrassed by interposing ethnic-linguistic-cultural qualifications which would make the central government less one for the people of a particular Province than it is for the people of other Provinces."<sup>32</sup>

Last, but not least, it is not surprising that the law journals dealt extensively with issues pertaining to Canada's perpetual constitutional crises. For example, in "Canada at the constitutional crossroads," Bruce Ackerman and Robert E. Charney held that the nature of Canadian federalism makes representation difficult as all levels of government claim to speak for the people. They note for example that the Patriation Case both reinforced and legitimized the province's right to act on behalf of its citizens. More recently, Benoît Pelletier examined the constitutional amendment process and suggests ways in which the procedure can be improved.<sup>33</sup>

We note that the law journals reviewed did not include much on fiscal federalism, but we do want to draw the readers' attention to one notable exception. In 1989, Andrew Petter wrote a provocative article entitled "Federalism and the myth of the federal spending power." He argued that English-Canadians traditionally ignore the fact that the federal government's use of the spending power has no foundation in law and intrudes on provincial autonomy. Only Quebec, he noted, has challenged the federal government's actions: "The lack of academic controversy, particularly among legal academics, is more difficult to fathom. Constitutional scholars from English Canada have viewed the shift from co-ordinate to administrative federalism with uncritical eyes. Rather than questioning its legitimacy, the bulk of their energies has been devoted to devising doctrinal justifications for the federal spending power."<sup>34</sup> He concluded that the federal spending power allows Ottawa to use its national majority to set the political agenda of regional majorities and in the process compromises political accountability.<sup>35</sup>



## Economics

In this next part of the article, we focus on the nature and scope of federalism-related topics in the *Canadian Journal of Economics* (CJE). Although a bilingual journal, most of its articles are written in English. We found that the CJE contains a wealth of research relating to federalism, and, as Harry G. Johnson noted in 1968, Canadian economists have made a distinct contribution to the study of federal finance by grounding "the principles of federal-provincial fiscal relations in the fundamental theory of welfare economics."<sup>36</sup>

In some respects, the debates in economics mirror the same issues traditionally addressed by legal scholars and political scientists. Economists are also concerned with issues of division of powers within the federal system but largely from the point of view of efficiency and welfare maximization. A number of the articles examined the question of which level of government should implement and deliver specific programs. At issue was whether we should decentralize legislative decision-making and implementation powers in fiscal matters to ensure efficiency and accommodate varying local needs and wishes. For example, in "The theory of public finance in a federal system," Wallace E. Oates argued that the central government is best suited to deal with distribution and stabilization aspects of fiscal policy, whereas local governments in conjunction with central governments should have responsibility for providing public goods and services. In 1982, Robin Boadway and Frank Flatters examined the efficiency implications of equalization payments in a federal system. They found that "self-interested provincial governments acting on behalf of their residents have an incentive to take budgetary actions that, from a national point of view, lead to inefficiencies and inequities." Consequently, they argued the federal government is "justified in using a system of equalization payments as a policy instrument in the pursuit of nationwide equity and efficiency." Others like John B. Burbidge and Gordon M. Myers argued that "only if regional authorities do *not* have diverse preferences for redistribution, should the redistribution function be decentralized."<sup>37</sup>

A second related theme in the federalism literature in the CJE pertains to the effectiveness of policies and programs. In other words, economists want to determine whether public policies are achieving their objectives. In 1996, for example, Dane Rowlands critically examined regional development programs and concluded that "the goal of regional development has become the encouragement of business activities in all regions; not necessarily the reduction in regional disparities." And two years later, Michael Smart analysed the relationship between intergovernmental transfer programs like equalization payments and provincial tax policies. He found that "attempts by federal authorities to promote regional equity through transfers may be hampered by the distortions in incentives for tax authorities at the subna-

tional levels that such transfers create." He concluded that fiscal federalism "creates conflicts between efficiency and equity analogous to those existing in personal tax systems."<sup>38</sup>

A third and related federalism theme in the CJE pertains to regionalism. In fact, this issue is widely addressed in the literature. Many of the articles focus on whether, and to what extent, there is a causal relationship between fiscal policy and issues such as regional unemployment, regional migration, and regional income differentials. For example, there has been a long-standing debate on the importance of fiscally induced migration. In 1970, Thomas J. Courchene argued that, but for federal government intervention, migration was an economic variable that was increasingly efficient:

Workers do respond to interprovincial earnings differentials and differentials in provincial unemployment rates in a manner that is conducive to efficient resource allocation. In this sense, then, migration tends to alleviate provincial economic inequalities. However, intergovernmental transfers, total federal transfers, and unemployment insurance payments serve to inhibit migration and ... they contribute to maintaining inequality among provinces.

In 1992, Kathleen M. Day found that both the level and the composition of provincial and local spending influences interprovincial migration. Her findings, however, suggest that there is an "efficiency argument in support of a system of equalization payments."<sup>39</sup>

A fourth theme of note to federalism scholars in the CJE is the relationship between constitutional events and economic factors. Two studies are of particular interest. In 1995, Pauline M. Shum examined the effect of the 1992 Charlottetown Accord referendum on investor behaviour. She argued that those who predicted financial disaster in the event of a "no" vote overestimated its effect on investor strategies. David R. Johnson and Darren McIlwraith's study on the relationship between bond yields and the 1995 Quebec referendum reaches a slightly different finding. They argue that the constitutional referendum did have an effect on bond yields issued by the Province of Quebec and the Government of Canada when there was an increase in support for sovereignty. Consequently, all taxpayers, and particularly those in Quebec, were paying higher costs because of bond interests.<sup>40</sup>

The last federalism-related theme we found in the CJE involves the relationship between international markets and federalism. These articles begin to emerge in the 1990s and no doubt will continue to flourish for some time to come. John F. Helliwell's work is particularly interesting. In a 1996 article entitled "Do national borders matter for Quebec's trade?," Helliwell contended that there are significant economic implications if Quebec separates, given that internal trade linkages are durable and more important than many thought. Based on 1988–90 merchandise trade patterns, he demon-

strated that Quebec is more than twenty times more likely to engage in trade with other provinces than with America states of a similar size and distance. And in a related study three years later with co-author Ross McKittrick, two conclusions are rendered. First, "provincial borders are not barriers to capital mobility in the way that a national border is." Secondly, "goods and capital market linkages among Canadian provinces remain far stronger than those among OECD countries."<sup>41</sup>

We also want to note a set of intriguing articles in CJE that examine the inter-relationship among language, nationalism and the economy.<sup>42</sup> Though not all of them can be reviewed here, we draw the reader's attention to Albert Breton's controversial research. In 1978, Breton published "Nationalism and language policies," which was a modification of his earlier 1964 study.<sup>43</sup> Breton contended in 1978 that nationalists are rational economic actors who "choose to forgo output or earnings for larger incomes or more utility." The nationalistic policies they pursue, like language policies, are in themselves public goods. The essential feature of these language policies is that "they seek to promote the exclusive or almost exclusive use of a particular language in the face of an objective reality or environment which demotes that use." Breton argued that the consequences of such policies can be quite significant:

In francophone North America, language policies have consisted of moral injunctions and laws inciting and forcing francophones away from the dominant *lingua franca*. They have been, and are, policies designed to shift resources away from the higher-yielding language asset towards a lower-yielding one. One of the consequences of such policies is to create a larger francophone market in which the local elite can sell goods and services as well as other valuable resources it could not otherwise dispose of at a profit. It is for that reason that language policies are nationalistic in character. They are also potentially divisive, since not everyone in francophone elite gains from captive markets and a confined unilingual society. To put it differently, there are some individuals whose incomes are raised by the effective implementation of language policies, while there are others whose incomes are lowered.

Breton suggested that wage differentials between the French and the English in Quebec could be understood by examining "the two-hundred-year-old nationalistic language policies effectively pursued by church and state" rather than by other factors, including "the attitudes of francophones towards commerce and industry."<sup>44</sup>

### History

To gain an insight into the study of federalism in the discipline of history, we examined the *Canadian Historical Review* (CHR), the *Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française*, and a new history journal established in 1997 entitled *National History: A Canadian Journal of Enquiry and Opinion*. This last journal

was specifically developed to remedy what some in the discipline of history perceive to be a deficiency in the coverage of Canadian political history. Since the *Journal of Canadian Studies* (JCS) contains a number of significant history articles, we have also included some of them in our analysis where appropriate. Though we will not be examining it here, we also note the importance of the Osgoode Society, which regularly publishes scholarly material pertaining to legal history.

We found that there were fewer federalism-related articles in these history journals than in the political science journals we examined. Moreover, we noted that there were only a handful of French articles published in this field. At the same time, these journals addressed many of the same issues found in law and political science journals.

---

*What did we find in CPA? First, and perhaps most significant, is its extensive coverage of matters pertaining to intergovernmental relations*

---

First, and not surprisingly, we found that there is a wealth of articles on Confederation in the history journals, many of which were written in the 1960s to coincide with Canada's centennial. It is intriguing to note, however, that while the number of such studies declines after 1967 in history journals, there is, as we noted earlier, a corresponding growth of Confederation studies in political science and law journals during the 1980s and 1990s.

In the first issue of the JCS, in 1966, there are two articles of particular note pertaining to Confederation. In "Confederation: The use and abuse of history," Donald G. Creighton argued that the purpose of Confederation was to create a strong central government to ensure the successful growth of the new nation. He challenged the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, maintaining that "the theory of natural decentralization and the theory of Confederation as a bicultural agreement" were both "doubtful and suspect in the hard light of history." W.L. Morton, in "Confederation, 1870-1896: The end of the Macdonaldian constitution and the return to duality," took a different perspective. Morton argued that the "duality of French and English in United Canada was at once politically absorbed and culturally guaranteed in Confederation" and that only when this proved untrue did "Quebec rely, not on national guarantees but on provincial rights, to safeguard the concern of French Canadians with religion and language." The CHR also contains several important studies on the nature of Confederation. In 1974, William M. Baker's contribution focused on New Brunswick and Confederation. P.B. Waite also made a number of contributions, including insights in 1990 with Baker and Phillip Buckner reassessing the Maritime

provinces and their participation at Confederation. More recent articles pertaining to Confederation appear in *National History*, including an article by Peter J. Smith and Janet Ajzenstat, as well as John T. Saywell's study entitled "Backstage at London 1864–1867: Constitutionalizing the distinct society."<sup>45</sup>

There are fewer contributions on the study of Confederation in the *Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française* than in the JCS and the CHR, but they also are concentrated in the 1960s. For example, see Jean-Charles Bonenfant's articles entitled "L'esprit de 1867," in 1963, and "Le Canada et les hommes politiques de 1867," in 1967. Also see an article by Lionel Groulx reprinted in the 1967 volume, entitled "Les Canadiens français et l'établissement de la Confédération."<sup>46</sup>

A second federalism theme addressed by historians in these journals pertains to French-Canadian or Quebec nationalism, and often in relation to Quebec separation. In 1969, for example, the *Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française* devoted an entire issue on nationalism.<sup>47</sup> There are also some important articles devoted to this topic in CHR. For example, in 1962, Fernand Ouellet published "Les fondements historiques de l'option séparatiste dans le Québec." In 1982, Michael Behiels wrote "The Bloc Populaire Canadien and the origins of French-Canadian neo-nationalism, 1942–8," and, more recently, in 1999, Ralph P. Guentzel published "The Centrale de l'Enseignement du Québec and Quebec separatist nationalism, 1960–1980."<sup>48</sup>

Regionalism is the third significant federalism-related theme found in these journals. J.M.S. Careless, for example, published an article entitled "'Limited identities' in Canada" where he contended that the Canadian experience can be understood in terms of the "limited identities" of region, culture and class. He concluded that "the true theme of the country's history in the twentieth century is not nation building but region building." Other articles with strong regionalist overtones include Ernest R. Forbe's 1978 examination of Prairie-Maritime relations, and Marc J. Gotlieb's 1985 examination of the conflicts between Ottawa and Toronto over issues pertaining to provincial economic rights.<sup>49</sup>

Lastly, let us note that *National History* has produced two important "theme" issues with a series of intriguing articles focusing on matters of contemporary constitutional and political concern. The first was a special edition on the 1997 Canadian general election, while the second, entitled "Canada at the crossroads," focused on Quebec's general election in 1999 and its implications for national unity.<sup>50</sup> The latter carried fifteen short articles by several distinguished scholars. Federalism-related scholarship appears to be an important feature of this new journal.

### Public administration

We also surveyed *Canadian Public Administration* (CPA) to determine the scope of its coverage of federalism issues. Among the journals we looked at,

it is distinctive in a couple of respects. First of all, it is the only journal that provides a genuine forum for practitioners as well as students of government and public administration. Like the professional association with which it is associated, it is one of the few institutional venues where the two worlds of government and academe come together. Secondly, CPA brings together the public administration and academic worlds associated with varying levels of government, including not only the government of Canada and the provinces but also the municipalities. Within the covers of this journal, one will find practitioners and scholars from a variety of disciplines and people who have moved back and forth between universities and public life.

What did we find in CPA? First, and perhaps most significant, is its extensive coverage of matters pertaining to intergovernmental relations. This is hardly surprising, given the nature of the journal. In the 1960s, a number of articles examined the scope and character of federal-provincial relations. See, for example, the article by A.R. Kear, "Cooperative federalism: A study of the Federal-Provincial Continuing Committee on Fiscal and Economic Matters," and the studies by Edgar Gallant and R.M. Burns detailing the machinery of federal-provincial relations. During the 1970s, we saw a rise in studies that focused exclusively on provincial linkages. Premiers Alexander B. Campbell, Gerald A. Regan, and Richard B. Hatfield examined Maritime relations, as did A.A. Lomas, while Gerry T. Gartner analysed collaboration among Western Canadian provinces. Also of particular note is a study by Richard H. Leach, Donald E. Walker and Thomas Allen Levy that examined the provincial government linkages with American state governments.<sup>51</sup>

The intergovernmental affairs studies published by federalism scholar Donald V. Smiley in CPA need to be mentioned. Like his colleagues during the 1960s and 1970s, Smiley took an institutionalist approach to the field. In 1964, he analysed the increase in the density and scope of intergovernmental relations in "Public administration and Canadian federalism."<sup>52</sup> He asserted that the rise of such governmental linkages was inevitable with the emergence of the modern state. The growth of what Smiley refers to as "executive interaction" and "executive collaboration" was necessitated by a desire to coordinate and integrate growing public policy concerns between the two levels of government. Seven years later, in "The structural problem of Canadian federalism," Smiley advanced what has come to be known as the intra-state federalism thesis – arguing that we have "to make federal institutions more effectively representative of territorially based attitudes and interests." According to Smiley, this would ensure that territorial particularisms had "a more effective outlet" to voice their concerns in central institutions like the Senate, cabinet and bureaucracy.<sup>53</sup>

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, we begin to see more observers commenting on the increasingly adversarial nature of the intergovernmental affairs process and ways to combat the problem. Gérard Veilleux, writing in 1980,

questioned the overall utility of federal-provincial conferences and wondered if they will be adequate to deal with new issues pertaining to the fundamental nature of our economic union, national unity, and matters where governments simply have divergent interests.<sup>54</sup> Veilleux's solution was either to enhance collaborative federalism or move towards a more classical federalism model.<sup>55</sup> And in an article published two years later, Audrey Doerr argued that new approaches were needed to remedy the existing processes "to break the pattern of 'organized politics.'" She emphasized that adjustments must be made to the public service to adapt to the new federal-provincial environment in which officials are working, noting also that questions regarding secrecy and accountability may be tempered if the issues shift from being discussed at closed meetings and conferences to the legislature.<sup>56</sup>

Another article that recognizes the increasingly conflictual nature of federalism is Alan C. Cairns' article "The other crisis of Canadian federalism." Cairns argued that flexibility with the division of powers "now looks dangerously like intergovernmental anarchy":

[T]he crisis of big government has produced a crisis of federalism. The federal system served Canadians well in simpler times of more limited government. It proved capable of accommodating big government at one level, notably in World War II and its aftermath. But contemporary Canadian federalism founders on the coexistence of big government at both levels. Contemporary Canadian federalism cannot restrain big government, and big governments do not respect federalism.<sup>57</sup>

Cairns contended therefore, that the competing levels of government act as a major barrier to federalism and accountability.

In the 1980s and 1990s, we witness a number of articles dealing with a closely related issue, the merits of centralization and decentralization. In "Considerations on centralization and decentralization," published in 1986, Richard Simeon analysed a series of often-neglected issues in the debate and found, among other things, that federalism had proven to be flexible and "a source of extraordinary innovation, adaptability and accommodation." Others, including David R. Cameron and Michel Fernet, both participating in the 1994 IPAC national seminar on decentralization have also written on the topic. Cameron, looking at the federal-provincial interface, distinguished between constitutional, administrative and fiscal forms of decentralization and argued that the current round of decentralization was driven by the attempt to grapple with large federal deficits. While it fostered national public discussion of fiscal policy, it suppressed consideration of the resulting unhappy social policy consequences. Michel Ferment focused on the impact of decentralization on municipal governments, asserting that, as senior governments moved away from service delivery and towards strategic planning, the role of local government will increase. While this may have

advantages from a democratic perspective, he held that the small size of many municipalities and their limited fiscal capacity were problems that will need to be addressed. And more recently, in "Towards a more diversified Canada," Michael A. Goldberg and Maurice D. Levi provided support for a more decentralized federation "as a means to achieve greater diversification and regional differentiation." They argued that regional differences ensure that provincial needs can be better achieved and "are not barriers to a strong confederation but rather elements of strength." Goldberg and Levi suggested that this would counteract the tendency that has allowed central Canada "to define federalism on its terms" without being sensitive to other regional concerns.<sup>58</sup>

A third significant focus in this journal is fiscal federalism. Although we are unable to review the richness and strength of this area, we wanted to highlight a few of the articles. In 1974, for example, Richard Bastien wrote "La structure fiscale du fédéralisme canadien 1945-1973," in which he suggested that the nature of federalism is in a constant state of tension between forces of centralization and forces of decentralization and therefore is regularly being re-adjusted to accommodate these competing pressures. More recently, Richard M. Bird and Duan-jie Chen contrasted provincial-local and federal-provincial fiscal relations, noting that "federal-provincial fiscal relations in Canada are essentially, and indeed almost exclusively, determined by political factors, though of course within a context set by economic realities." Bird and Chen noted that, although in the past executive federalism allowed for the resolution of conflict in this area, this may not be as easy in the future with the emergence of a confident francophone Quebec, a weakening of east-west ties due to the evolving global economy and the vastly changing ethnic composition.<sup>59</sup>

A fourth and related theme in CPA pertains to regionalism and its close friend, province-building. The wealth of articles in this field cannot be adequately addressed, but we draw the reader's attention to one study. Written in 1966, Edwin R. Black and Alan C. Cairns argued that we need to include a socio-political perspective in our analyses of the Canadian polity. They made the point that focusing on legal and economic factors alone overlooks the importance of social, political and physical communication networks that enhance provincial powers within the state.<sup>60</sup>

The fifth dimension of the CPA's coverage of federalism is found in its exploration of the relationship between federalism and public policy issues. Indeed, we think that this is one of the most distinctive features of the journal. We enjoyed, for example, Leslie Bella's 1979 article on the significant influence of provincial governments, particularly Alberta, on the provisions of the Canada Assistance Plan. She demonstrated that the literature on executive federalism traditionally underestimates the role of provincial governments and argued that the Canada Assistance Plan "contained nothing that



was not already being done by several provincial governments, and most of these inclusions were made as a result of provincial pressure, rather than as a deliberate predetermined policy of the federal government." Other articles also addressed a host of varying public policy concerns, including R.A. Vineberg's "Federal-provincial relations in Canadian immigration" and Peter N. Nemetz's "The Fisheries Act and federal-provincial environmental regulation: duplication or complementarity."<sup>61</sup>

We also note that beginning in the 1990s, CPA has provided readers with a rich literature on the relationship between aboriginal Canadians and constitutional matters. In her article, "The politics of aboriginal self-government," Kathy Brock showed that constitutional dialogue has enhanced the position of aboriginal Canadians and helped to reorder "constitutional relations among Canadian citizens, and of the executive-centred nature of the institutional structure of Canadian federalism." Other articles that need mention include Audrey Doerr's article entitled "Building new orders of government – the future of aboriginal self-government," and George Erasmus and René Dussault's work, "Allocution à l'occasion de la parution du Rapport de la Commission royale sur les peuples autochtones."<sup>62</sup>

### "The State of the Federation" series

Lastly, "The State of the Federation" series, as it is now known, deserves special mention, as it is the only annual publication dedicated exclusively to the study of Canadian federalism. Although technically not a journal, we include it in our analysis for three reasons. First, its peer-reviewed articles are of high quality akin to those found in journals. Secondly, it is the only annual publication in Canada dedicated exclusively to federalism-related issues. Lastly, unlike most of the journals we reviewed, "State of the Federation" is truly an interdisciplinary publication.

Since its inception, "State of the Federation" has evolved considerably over time. Published by the Queen's Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, its first seven volumes, from 1976 to 1983, were compiled by a single editor, whose objective was to provide for any given year "an ordered reference" to the complex and frequent interaction of the governments of the federal state.<sup>63</sup> In 1985, then-editor Peter Leslie broadened the nature of the publication and changed what had become the title of the series from "The Federal Year in Review: Intergovernmental Relations in Canada" to "The State of the Federation." In doing so, he recognized that it was impossible to sharply distinguish between federalism and intergovernmentalism. Moreover, he acknowledged that these interrelated fields could not be isolated as studies in themselves but needed to be understood in the context of the more general political situation in Canada.<sup>64</sup> The new format moved away from the single-author approach, to several authors each contributing an article on a certain aspect or feature of federalism in Canada. The advantage

of this new approach was that it allowed a variety of perspectives to be incorporated into the publication. At the same time, there was a distinctive shift – intentional or otherwise – away from intergovernmental relations. In general, the next eleven issues (1985–96) explored three major themes: public policy, provincial politics, and constitutional politics.

Of the ninety-one articles written during this period, approximately one-third focused on the relationship between federalism and a range of public policy concerns.<sup>65</sup> International trade policy, a top priority on the national agenda at the time, was addressed the most often, with seven articles devoted to this issue. Immigration policy – a hot-button topic of the period – was the focus of only one article. A range of other issues were examined, including cultural policy, communications, environmental concerns, language and social policy, among many others.

---

*During the 1980s and 1990s, "traditional" areas of research still dominated the field; research pertaining to areas like fiscal federalism and constitutional politics flourished, while dimensions of federalism relating to gender, identity, ethnicity and aboriginal self-government were under-represented in the journals we reviewed*

---

Chapters pertaining to constitutional politics also constituted about one-third of these volumes. Discussion pertaining to the Meech Lake and the Charlottetown accords were dominant. A distinctive contribution of this series to constitutional studies arose out of the editors' decision to include seven chapters dealing with the subject of non-élite participation in the constitutional process. Although many of the other journals surveyed included articles on this subject, no other devoted as much attention to this singularly important issue. Let us also draw the reader's attention to an important study by Janet Hiebert in 1994 entitled "The Charter and federalism: Revisiting the nation-building thesis." In it, she tackles the elusive relationship of the Charter and federalism, examining case law that allowed for provincial differences despite the existence of the Charter. She argued that the Charter is not necessarily a centralizing mechanism and that federalism itself has not been undermined.<sup>66</sup>

The third-largest component of this series focused on individual provinces. This was a very useful contribution to the field of federalism, and one often neglected or overshadowed by regional and national preoccupations. For example, the editors of the series commissioned articles on Ontario, often ignored because it is perceived not as a distinctive community and

jurisdiction but simply as the inexpressive ballast in the Canadian ship of state.<sup>67</sup>

With the 1997 edition, Harvey Lazar, now executive director of the Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, changed the format of the series to focus on a single issue facing the Canadian federal state. In *The State of the Federation, 1997: Non-Constitutional Renewal* and *The State of the Federation 1998/99: How Canada is Connect*, each volume took an "integrated view on a selected theme."<sup>68</sup> The former focused on the changes that had taken place since the 1992 failure of the Charlottetown Accord to promote national unity without formal constitutional changes, while the latter focused on the overlapping inter-connections of the country, including economic, social, cultural and citizenship connections. These collections of articles allow for a comprehensive approach to one subject.

### Some observations

As our research drew to a close, we were able to make a number of observations about the journals we reviewed. First, for the forty-year study-period, we have witnessed a striking continuity of preoccupation. While the specific topics reflect the events and crises in the domestic and international arenas, as well as the more mundane challenges of the day, we did not witness a shift in the nature of federalism-related studies. During the 1980s and 1990s, "traditional" areas of research still dominated the field; research pertaining to areas like fiscal federalism and constitutional politics flourished, while dimensions of federalism relating to gender, identity, ethnicity and aboriginal self-government were under-represented in the journals we reviewed.

Secondly, we did not witness a "decline" in the scholarly effort devoted to the study of federalism. Federalism-related scholarship in English-speaking Canada remains a dominant force in many disciplines, particularly political science, public administration and economics. There was, however, little evidence of a robust French-language literature on issues related to federalism during this forty-year period. Moreover, when francophones did pursue such research, it was often, though not exclusively, in the context of examining Quebec sovereignty issues. We also noted that even where French federalism scholarship existed, it was apparent from our analysis of political science journals that English-Canadian scholars were not incorporating it into their research.

Thirdly, we were struck by the under-representation of women in the field of federalism scholarship. During the 1960s and 1970s, this was a reflection of the fact that there were significantly fewer women in the academy, but their under-representation is harder to understand for the 1980s and 1990s. Moreover, we do not see evidence of this reality changing. A review of the five conferences related to federalism during the 1999–2000 academic year<sup>69</sup> revealed that women constituted only eighteen per cent of those making

presentations. Female scholars delivered or jointly delivered seventeen of the eighty-eight papers given at these conferences.<sup>70</sup>

Fourthly, we were interested to note the emergence of a number of articles in the 1990s that focused on the issues that would arise out of Quebec's secession, as opposed to those articles that examined whether Quebec will secede. See, for example Dane Rowlands, "International aspects of the division of debt under Quebec secession: The case of Quebec and Canada," Pierre Martin, "Association after sovereignty? Canadian views on economic association with a sovereign Quebec," and José Woehrling, "Les Droits des minorités linguistiques et culturelles en cas d'éventuelle accession du Québec à la souveraineté."<sup>71</sup>

Fifthly, we were surprised at the paucity of articles dedicated to the role of royal commissions.<sup>72</sup> Arguably, in our political system, royal commissions have been the privileged venue for the thorough public consideration and analysis of critical national policy choices. Their reports have not only had a significant impact on shaping the views of Canadians but also have acted as a catalyst for citizen involvement and participation in the political process. We understand that Frances Abele at Carleton University is currently working on a project that will address this deficiency, and we applaud the fact that it is being done.

---

*[I]t is apparent that the varied and intimate links between study and practice of federalism have markedly shaped the character of this academic territory*

---

In concluding, let us return to our point of departure at the beginning of this article, namely, the relationship between the practitioners of Canadian federalism and the scholars who study the system. Alan C. Cairns made a comment in 1977 that still has salience today. Cairns maintained, quite correctly, that "the deliberate creation and fostering by governments of interest groups to whose induced demands they wish to respond is a primary weapon for government survival in circumstances of aggressive intergovernmental competition."<sup>73</sup> The government of Canada made a judgement in the late 1990s that a broader academic examination of federalism, both domestic and international, would assist Canadians in confronting the challenges they face and would contribute to Canadian unity. With this in mind, the government committed resources to this purpose, creating both the Forum of Federations and the SSHRC-administered federalism programs. These initiatives clearly affect the scholarly community, as is evidenced by the fact that one of the authors of this article is on the board of the forum and is involved in one of the federalism networks that has been established,

while the other has received an SSHRC supplemental grant to support her doctoral study in the field.

Ottawa is far from being the only government in Canada to engage prominent academics as a way of bolstering its view of the Canadian constitutional reality. Many provincial governments, for example, involved distinguished academics in their negotiating teams to enhance their province's position during constitutional talks in the 1980s and 1990s. And as another example, the Government of Quebec, after declining to sign the Social Union Framework Agreement in February 1999, commissioned seven Quebec specialists to examine and evaluate the agreement in the light of "the gap between the provinces' initial negotiating position and the final outcome; and ... to compare the Framework Agreement and Quebec's traditional demands."<sup>74</sup> The politicized nature of the federal idea over the last several decades, particularly in Quebec, where it was inevitably set against the alternative of sovereignty, may explain in part why federalism studies are less in evidence among francophone scholars. At any rate, it is apparent that the varied and intimate links between study and practice of federalism have markedly shaped the character of this academic territory.

Students of federalism have participated actively in the political and public policy process over the years in many different ways – as government consultants, and as members of think-tanks, committees, advisory bodies and, that classical Canadian policy instrument, royal commissions. Some scholars have ruminated about the implications of this phenomenon and about whether the study of federalism has paid a price by having too many of its more prominent practitioners engaged in practical work at the federal coalface.<sup>75</sup> Has practical engagement limited the scholarly community's capacity to do the deeper, longer-term analysis that transcends the quotidian issues that inevitably preoccupy political actors? Most students in the field would acknowledge, we think, that practical experience can greatly enrich academic study, but the question is whether the balance between the boardroom and the study has been properly struck and whether the extent of civic and political engagement has stunted the broader intellectual processes upon which rich scholarship depends.<sup>76</sup>

One thing, at any rate, is clear: the study of federalism in Canada, unlike many other fields in the social sciences, has been profoundly shaped by the deeply problematic nature of the object of study, as well as by its scholarly proximity to the exercise of political power and the clash of government interests that has characterized the Canadian experience during the last four decades.

## Notes

- 1 n.a., "Minister Dion announces funding to support the Forum of Federations," *Canada News-Wire* (8 October 1998).

- 2 See [www.forumoffederations.org](http://www.forumoffederations.org).
- 3 n.a., "Minister Dion highlights the creation of the Federalism and Federations program," *Canada NewsWire* (22 December 1998).
- 4 Ibid.
- 5 n.a., "Minister Dion affirms that a better knowledge of other federations strengthens Canadian unity," *Canada NewsWire* (19 March 1999).
- 6 Summary of discussion held at Brock University on 2 June 1996 on the research and teaching of federalism, prepared by Peter Leslie (unpublished), paras. 4, 5 and 3(a), respectively.
- 7 Tom McIntosh, "Federalism studies in Canada: The current state and future options" (unpublished), p. 4.
- 8 Ibid., p. 3.
- 9 Ibid., pp. 9–12. Note that in some respects, these discussions about the study of federalism in political science have been echoed in the discipline of history. Historians Michael Bliss and J.L. Granatstein, for example, have expressed concern that there has been a rise in Canadian social history at the expense of the more traditional political approaches. See J.L. Granatstein, *Who Killed Canadian History?* (Toronto: HarperCollins, 1998), p. 59; and Michael Bliss, "Privatizing the Mind: The Sundering of Canadian History, the Sundering of Canada." Creighton Centennial Lecture, University of Toronto, 18 October 1991. For a competing view, see Linda Kealey, Ruth Pierson, Joan Sangstar and Veronica Strong-Boag, "Teaching Canadian history in the 1990s: Whose 'national' history are we lamenting?" *Journal of Canadian Studies* 27, no. 2 (June 1992), pp. 129–31.
- 10 Richard Simeon, *Federalism and Regionalism in Canadian Political Science* (Kingston: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University, 2002). He concludes that two major forces have shaped the character of the field and the preoccupations within it. The first is the influence of political events in the wider society. He argues that "research and analysis have been inextricably bound up with the political fortunes of the Canadian political system, even as they have helped shape popular and political definition of the problems." The second is "the changing theoretical and methodological interests of the discipline as a whole." These two forces, Simeon argues, "help to explain both the issues and concepts that have attracted scholarly attention and the strengths and weaknesses of the field." (p. 1)
- 11 For example, see Maurice Pinard and Richard Hamilton, "The Parti Québécois comes to power: An analysis of the 1976 Quebec election," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 11, no. 4 (December 1978), pp. 739–75; André Blais, Pierre Martin and Richard Nadeau, "Attentes économiques et linguistiques et appui à la souveraineté du Québec : une analyse prospective et comparative," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 28, no. 4 (December 1995), pp. 637–57; Richard Nadeau and Christopher J. Fleury, "Gains linguistiques anticipés et appui à la souveraineté du Québec," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 28, no. 1 (March 1995), pp. 35–50; and Paul Howe, "Rationality and sovereignty support in Quebec," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 31, no. 1 (March 1998), pp. 31–59.
- 12 Alan Cairns, "The electoral system and the party system in Canada, 1921–1965," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 1, no. 1 (March 1968), p. 64; Herman Bakvis and Laura G. Macpherson, "Quebec block voting and the Canadian electoral system," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 28, no. 4 (December 1995), pp. 659–92.
- 13 David E. Smith, "Bagehot, the Crown and the Canadian Constitution," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 23, no. 4 (December 1995), pp. 619–35.
- 14 Richard Simeon and David J. Elkins, "Regional political cultures in Canada," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 7, no. 3 (September 1974), pp. 397–437; Michael D. Ornstein, Michael H. Stevenson and Paul A. Williams, "Region, class and political culture in Canada," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 13, no. 2 (June 1980), pp. 225–71.
- 15 Janet Ajzenstat, Paul Romney, Ian Gentles and William D. Gairdner, eds., *Canada's Founding Debates* (Toronto: Stoddart, 2000), p. 479; Robert C. Vipond, "1787 and 1867: The federal prin-

- ciple and Canadian Confederation reconsidered," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 22, no. 1 (March 1989), pp. 5, 23 and 24.
- 16 Peter Russell, "Can the Canadians be a sovereign people?" *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 24, no. 4 (December 1991), pp. 691-709; Alexandra Dobrowolsky, "Of 'special interest': Interest, identity and feminist Constitutional activism in Canada," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 31, no. 4 (December 1998), p. 740.
  - 17 n.a., "Éditorial," *Politique et Sociétés* 28 (Autumn 1995), p. 3.
  - 18 Chantal Maillé et Manon Tremblay, "L'électorat féminin face aux options constitutionnelles : un groupe fragmenté," *Politique et Sociétés* 17, nos. 1-2 (1998), pp. 121-49; Gilbert Gagné, "Libre-échange, souveraineté, et américanité : une nouvelle trinité pour le Québec?" *Politique et Sociétés* 18, no. 1 (1999), pp. 99-107; Éric Desrosiers, "Nationalisme et racisme. Dix ans de discours du Parti québécois (1981-1990)," *Politique et Sociétés* 17, no. 3 (1998), pp. 143-64; and Maryse Potvin, "Les dérapages racistes à l'égard du Québec au Canada anglais depuis 1995," *Politique et Sociétés* 18, no. 2 (1999), pp. 101-32.
  - 19 William D. Coleman, "Le nationalisme, les intermédiaires et l'intégration politique canadienne," *Politique et Sociétés* 28 (Autumn 1995), pp. 31-52; Michael Keating, "Principes et problèmes du gouvernement asymétrique," *Politique et Sociétés* 17, no. 3 (1998), pp. 93-111.
  - 20 We examined the footnotes in each of the federalism articles in CJEPS, CJPS, *Revue Québécoise de Science Politique* and *Politique et Sociétés* and catalogued the language of their sources. Each new source used by an author was counted once; government documents, statutes and case law were excluded.
  - 21 Gilles Lalancé, "Presidential address to the CPSA," *CPSA Newsletter* 1, no. 1 (1971), p. 5. Although Lalancé was speaking about the international and not just the Canadian situation, his comments still illuminate the point.
  - 22 Patrick Allen, "Confédération canadienne - bibliographie sommaire," *Revue d'histoire de L'Amérique française* 21 (1967-1968), pp. 695-719.
  - 23 *Canadian Bar Review* / *La Revue du Barreau canadien*; *Canadian Historical Review*; *Canadian Journal of Economics* / *Revue canadienne d'Economie*; *Canadian Public Administration* / *Administration publique du Canada*; *Journal of Canadian Studies* / *Revue d'études canadiennes*; *National History: A Canadian Journal of Enquiry and Opinion*; *Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française*; *State of the Federation*; *La Revue Juridique Thémis*; *University of Toronto Law Journal*.
  - 24 Mark R. MacGuigan, "Precedent and policy in the Supreme Court," *Canadian Bar Review* 45, no. 4 (December 1967), p. 665; Patrick J. Monahan, "At doctrine's twilight: The structure of Canadian federalism," *University of Toronto Law Journal* 34 (1984), p. 47; W.R. Lederman, "Unity and diversity in Canadian federalism: Ideals and methods of moderation," *Canadian Bar Review* 53, no. 3 (September 1975), pp. 619 and 601, respectively.
  - 25 Paul C. Weiler, "The Supreme Court and the law of Canadian federalism," *University of Toronto Law Journal* 23 (1973), p. 308, also see p. 366; Jacques-Yvan Morin, "A constitutional court for Canada," *Canadian Bar Review* 43, no. 4 (December 1965), p. 551.
  - 26 Katherine Swinton, "Bora Laskin and federalism," *University of Toronto Law Journal* 35 (1985), pp. 387, 353 and 388-91, respectively; Gérald-A. Beaudoin, "Jean Beetz et le partage des compétences législatives," *La Revue Juridique Thémis* 28 (1994), pp. 307-31; Brian Dickson, "Federalism, civil law and the Canadian judiciary: An integrated vision," *La Revue Juridique Thémis* 28 (1994), pp. 457-80.
  - 27 Gerard V. La Forest, "Water law of the future," *Canadian Bar Review* 51 (1973), pp. 307-15; Dominique Alhériitière, "Les problèmes constitutionnels de la lutte contre la pollution de l'espace atmosphérique au Canada," *Canadian Bar Review* 50, no. 4 (December 1972), pp. 561-79; William D. Moull, "Section 92A of the Constitution Act, 1867," *Canadian Bar Review* 61, no. 4 (December 1983), pp. 715-34.
  - 28 Thérèse Giroux-Masse, "La Constitution Canadienne et l'éducation dans une société moderne," *La Revue Juridique Thémis* 5 (1970), pp. 367-98; Pierre Carignan, "La raison d'être

- de l'article 93 de la Loi constitutionnelle de 1867 à la lumière de la législation préexistante en matière d'éducation," *La Revue Juridique Thémis* 20 (1986), pp. 375-455; and Jean-Pierre Proulx and José Woehrli, "La restructuration du système scolaire québécois et la modification de l'article 93 de la Loi constitutionnelle de 1867," *La Revue Juridique Thémis* 31 (1997), pp. 398-510.
- 29 R.C.B. Risk, "A.H.F. Lefroy: Common law thought in late nineteenth-century Canada: On burying one's grandfather," *University of Toronto Law Journal* 41 (1991), pp. 307-31; R.C.B. Risk, "The many minds of W.P.M. Kennedy," *University of Toronto Law Journal* 48 (1998), pp. 353-86; and R.C.B. Risk, "John Skirving Ewart: The legal thought," *University of Toronto Law Journal* 37 (1987), pp. 335-57.
  - 30 David Schneiderman, "Harold Laski, Viscount Haldane, and the law of the Canadian constitution in the early twentieth century," *University of Toronto Law Journal* 48 (1998), p. 524.
  - 31 Morin, "A constitutional court for Canada," *Canadian Bar Review*, pp. 550, 55; Edward McWhinney, "Federal Supreme Courts and constitutional review," *Canadian Bar Review* 45, no. 3 (September 1967), pp. 604-607; Gerald E. Le Dain, "Reflections on the Canadian Constitution after the first century," *Canadian Bar Review* 45, no. 3 (September 1967), pp. 402-408.
  - 32 Bora Laskin, "Reflections on the Canadian Constitution after the first century," *Canadian Bar Review* 45 (1967), pp. 399 and 400, respectively.
  - 33 Bruce A. Ackerman and Robert E. Charney, "Canada at the constitutional crossroads," *University of Toronto Law Journal* 34 (1984), p. 117-35; and Benoit Pelletier, "Les modalités de la modification de la Constitution du Canada," *La Revue Juridique Thémis* 33 (1995), pp. 1-58.
  - 34 Andrew Petter, "Federalism and the myth of the federal spending power," *Canadian Bar Review* 68, no. 3 (September 1989), p. 454.
  - 35 *Ibid.*, pp. 465 and 466.
  - 36 Harry G. Johnson, "Canadian contributions to the discipline of economics since 1945," *Canadian Journal of Economics* 1, no. 1 (February 1968), p. 143.
  - 37 Wallace E. Oates, "The theory of public finance in a federal system," *Canadian Journal of Economics* 1, no. 1 (February 1968), pp. 37-54; Robin Boadway and Frank Flatters, "Efficiency and equalization payments in a federal system of government: A synthesis and extension of recent results," *Canadian Journal of Economics* 15, no. 4 (November 1982), p. 630; John B. Burbidge and Gordon M. Myers, "Redistribution within and across the regions of a federation," *Canadian Journal of Economics* 27, no. 3 (August 1994), p. 621 (emphasis in the original).
  - 38 Dane Rowlands, "Regional development in Canada: problems and prospects," *Canadian Journal of Economics* 29, special issue (April 1996), p. s342; and Michael Smart, "Taxation and deadweight loss in a system of intergovernmental transfers," *Canadian Journal of Economics* 31, no. 1 (February 1998), pp. 205, 206.
  - 39 Thomas J. Courchene, "Interprovincial migration and economic adjustment," *Canadian Journal of Economics* 3, no. 4 (November 1970), p. 574; Kathleen M. Day, "Interprovincial migration and local public goods," *Canadian Journal of Economics* 25, no. 1 (February 1992), pp. 139 and 140. Other articles addressing this issue include Thomas J. Courchene and David A. Beavis, "Federal-provincial tax equalization and evaluation," *Canadian Journal of Economics* 6, no. 4 (November 1973), pp. 483-502; and William G. Watson, "An estimate of the welfare gain from fiscal equalization," *Canadian Journal of Economics* 19, no. 2 (May 1986), pp. 298-308.
  - 40 Pauline M. Shum, "The 1992 Canadian constitutional referendum: Using financial data to assess economic consequences," *Canadian Journal of Economics* 28, no. 4 (November 1995), pp. 794-807; David R. Johnson and Darren McIlwraith, "Opinion polls and Canadian bond yields during the 1995 Quebec referendum campaign," *Canadian Journal of Economics* 31, no. 2 (May 1998), pp. 411-26. Other articles of interest in this area include André Raynald, "The Canadian federation," *Canadian Journal of Economics* 17, no. 3 (August 1984), pp. 635-53; John F. Graham, "Chez who?" *Canadian Journal of Economics* 4, no. 4 (November 1971),



- pp. 431–40; and Apostolos Serletis and Panos C. Afrentiou, "Electoral and partisan cycle regularities in Canada," *Canadian Journal of Economics* 31, no. 1 (February 1998), pp. 28–46.
- 41 John F. Helliwell, "Do national borders matter for Quebec's trade," *Canadian Journal of Economics* 29, no. 3 (August 1996), pp. 507–22. In an article three years later, Michael A. Anderson and Stephen L.S. Smith, confirmed Helliwell's findings. See "Canadian provinces in world trade: Engagement and detachment," *Canadian Journal of Economics* 32, no. 1 (March 1999), pp. 22–38. Also see John McCallum, "National borders matter: Canada-U.S. regional trade patterns," *American Economic Review* 85, no. 3 (June 1995), pp. 615–23; John F. Helliwell and Ross McKittrick, "Comparing capital mobility across provincial and national borders," *Canadian Journal of Economics* 32, no. 4 (November 1999), pp. 1171, 1166, respectively.
  - 42 Jean-Luc Migué, "Le nationalisme, l'unité nationale et la théorie économique de l'information," *Canadian Journal of Economics* 3 (1970), pp. 183–98; Albert Breton, "Nationalism and language policies," *Canadian Journal of Economics* 11, no. 4 (November 1978), pp. 656–68; Calvin J. Veltman, Jac-André Boulet and Charles Castonguay, "The economic context of bilingualism and language transfer in the Montreal metropolitan area," *Canadian Journal of Economics* 12, no. 3 (August 1979), pp. 468–79; Gilles Grenier, "Earnings by language group in Quebec in 1980 and emigration from Quebec between 1976 and 1981," *Canadian Journal of Economics* 20, no. 4 (November 1987), pp. 774–91; and Jeffrey Church and Ian King, "Bilingualism and network externalities," *Canadian Journal of Economics* 26, no. 2 (May 1993), pp. 337–45.
  - 43 Breton, "The economics of nationalism," *Journal of Political Economy* 72, no. 4 (August 1964), pp. 376–86.
  - 44 Breton, "Nationalism and language policies," *Canadian Journal of Economics*, pp. 658, 662, 663 and 667, respectively.
  - 45 D.G. Creighton, "Confederation: The use and abuse of history," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 1, no. 1 (May 1966), p. 11; W.L. Morton, "Confederation, 1870–1896: The end of the Macdonaldian constitution and the return of duality," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 1, no. 1 (May 1966), pp. 14 and 22, respectively; William M. Baker, "Squelching the disloyal, Fenian-sympathizing brood: T.W. Anglin and Confederation in New Brunswick, 1865–6," *Canadian Historical Review* 55 (1974), pp. 141–58; P.B. Waite, "Edward Cardwell and Confederation," *Canadian Historical Review* 43 (1962), pp. 17–41; P.B. Waite, "Edward Whelan reports from the Quebec conference," *Canadian Historical Review* 42 (1961), pp. 23–45; Phillip Buckner, P.B. Waite and William M. Baker, "CHR dialogue: The Maritimes and Confederation – a reassessment," *Canadian Historical Review* 71, no. 1 (March 1990), pp. 1–45; Peter J. Smith and Janet Ajzenstat, "Canada's origins: The new debate," *National History: A Canadian Journal of Enquiry and Opinion* 1, no. 2 (Spring 1997), pp. 113–26; John T. Saywell, "Backstage at London 1864–1867: Constitutionalizing the distinct society," *National History: A Canadian Journal of Enquiry and Opinion* 4 (2000), pp. 331–46.
  - 46 Jean-Charles Bonenfant, "L'esprit de 1867," *Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française* 17, no. 1 (June 1963), pp. 19–38; Jean-Charles Bonenfant, "Le Canada et les hommes politiques de 1867," *Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française* 21, no. 3a special issue (1967), pp. 573–96; and Lionel Groulx, "Les Canadiens français et l'établissement de la Confédération." Reprinted in *Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française* 21, 3a special issue (1967), pp. 679–94.
  - 47 For example, see André-J. Bélanger et Vincent Lemieux, "Le nationalisme et les partis politiques," *Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française* 22, no. 4 (March 1969), pp. 541–63; Joseph Levitt, "La perspective nationaliste d'Henri Bourassa (1896–1914)," *Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française* 22, no. 4 (March 1969), pp. 569–82; François-Albert Angers, "Nationalisme et vie économique," *Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française* 22, no. 4 (March 1969), pp. 589–610.
  - 48 Fernand Ouellet, "Les fondements historiques de l'option séparatiste dans le Québec," *Canadian Historical Review* 43 (1962), pp. 185–203; Michael Behiels, "The Bloc Populaire Canadien and the origins of French-Canadian neo-nationalism, 1942–8," *Canadian Historical*

- Review* 63, no. 4 (December 1982), pp. 487–512; and Ralph P. Guentzel, "The Centrale de l'Enseignement du Québec and Quebec separatist nationalism, 1960–1980," *Canadian Historical Review* 80, no. 1 (March 1999), pp. 61–82.
- 49 J.M.S. Careless, " 'Limited Identities' in Canada," *Canadian Historical Review* 50, no. 1 (March 1969), pp. 1–10, 3 and 9, respectively; Ernest R. Forbes, "Never the twain did meet: Prairie-Maritime relations, 1910–27," *Canadian Historical Review* 59, no. 1 (1978), pp. 18–37; and Marc J. Gotlieb, "George Drew and the Dominion-Provincial Conference on Reconstruction of 1945–6," *Canadian Historical Review* 66, no. 1 (Spring 1985), pp. 27–47.
- 50 See "Special Issue. The Canadian General Election, 1997," *National History: A Canadian Journal of Enquiry and Opinion* 1, no. 3 (Winter 1997–1998); and "Special Issue. Canada at the Crossroads," *National History: A Canadian Journal of Enquiry and Opinion* 3, special issue (1999).
- 51 A.R. Kear, "Cooperative federalism: A study of the Federal-Provincial Continuing Committee on Fiscal and Economic Matters," *CANADIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION* 6, no. 1 (Spring 1963), pp. 43–56; Edgar Gallant, "The machinery of federal-provincial relations: I," *CANADIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION* 8, no. 3 (Fall 1965), pp. 515–26; R.M. Burns, "The machinery of federal-provincial relations: II," *CANADIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION* 8, no. 3 (Fall 1965), pp. 527–34; Alexander B. Campbell, Gerald A. Regan and Richard B. Hatfield, "The move toward Maritime integration and the role of the Council of Maritime Premiers," *CANADIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION* 15, no. 4 (Winter 1972), pp. 591–609; A.A. Lomas, "The Council of Maritimes Premiers: A report and evaluation after five years," *CANADIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION* 20, no. 1 (Spring 1977), pp. 188–99; Gerry T. Gartner, "A review of cooperation among western provinces," *CANADIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION* 20, no. 1 (Spring 1977), pp. 174–87; and Richard H. Leach, Donald E. Walker and Thomas Allen Levy, "Province-state trans-border relations: a preliminary assessment," *CANADIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION* 16, no. 3 (Fall 1973), pp. 468–82.
- 52 Donald V. Smiley, "Public administration and Canadian federalism," *CANADIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION* 7, no. 2 (Summer 1964), pp. 371–88.
- 53 D.V. Smiley, "The structural problem of Canadian federalism," *CANADIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION* 14, no. 2 (Summer 1971), pp. 343, 341 and 342, respectively.
- 54 Gérard Veilleux, "Intergovernmental Canada: government by conference? A fiscal and economic perspective," *CANADIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION* 23, no. 1 (Spring 1980), pp. 33–53.
- 55 *Ibid.*, pp. 48 and 49, respectively.
- 56 Audrey Doerr, "Public administration: federalism and intergovernmental relations," *CANADIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION* 25, no. 4 (Winter 1982), pp. 573 and 577, respectively.
- 57 Alan C. Cairns, "The other crisis of Canadian federalism," *CANADIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION* 22, no. 1 (Spring 1979), p. 193.
- 58 Richard Simeon, "Considerations on centralization and decentralization," *CANADIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION* 29, no. 3 (Fall 1986), p. 460. The 24<sup>th</sup> national seminar was held in St. Andrews by the Sea, New Brunswick. See David Robertson Cameron, "Half-eaten carrot, bent-stick: decentralization in an era of fiscal restraint," *CANADIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION* 37, no. 3 (Fall 1994), pp. 431–44; Michel Fernet, "La décentralisation ou le redéploiement des pouvoirs," *CANADIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION* 37, no. 3 (Fall 1994), pp. 453–67; and Michael A. Goldberg and Maurice D. Levi, "Towards a more diversified Canada: Economic arguments for re-confederation," *CANADIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION* 41, no. 4 (Winter 1998), pp. 482 and 484, respectively. Also see Evert A. Lindquist, "Recent administrative reform in Canada as decentralization: Who is spreading what around to whom and why?" *CANADIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION* 37, no. 3 (Fall 1994), pp. 416–30; and Grand Chief Edward John, "Getting out of the way: On the road to aboriginal self-government," *CANADIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION* 37, no. 3 (Fall 1994), pp. 445–52.
- 59 Richard Bastien, "La structure fiscale du fédéralisme canadien: 1945–1973," *CANADIAN PUB-*

- LIC ADMINISTRATION 17, no. 1 (Spring 1974), pp. 96–118; Richard M. Bird and Duan-jie Chen, "Federal finance and fiscal federalism: The two worlds of Canadian public administration," CANADIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION 41, no. 1 (Spring 1998), pp. 68 and 69–72, respectively.
- 60 Edwin R. Black and Alan C. Cairns, "A different perspective on Canadian federalism," CANADIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION 9, no. 1 (Spring 1966), pp. 27–44.
- 61 Leslie Bella, "The provincial role in the Canadian welfare state: The influence of provincial social policy initiatives on the design of the Canada Assistance Plan," CANADIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION 22, no. 3 (Fall 1979), p. 452; R.A. Vineberg, "Federal-provincial relations in Canadian immigration," CANADIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION 30, no. 2 (Summer 1987), pp. 299–317; Peter N. Nemetz, "The Fisheries Act and federal-provincial environmental regulation: Duplication or complementarity," CANADIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION 29, no. 3 (Fall 1986), pp. 401–24.
- 62 Kathy Brock, "The politics of aboriginal self-government: A Canadian paradox," CANADIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION 34, no. 2 (Summer 1991), p. 279; Audrey D. Doert, "Building new orders of government – the future of aboriginal self-government," CANADIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION 40, no. 2 (Summer 1997), pp. 274–89; and René Dussault and George Erasmus, "Allocution à l'occasion de la parution du Rapport de la Commission royale sur les peuples autochtones," CANADIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION 40, no. 1 (Spring 1997), pp. 108–22.
- 63 Richard Simeon, "Preface," in Les Kom, ed., *The Federal Year in Review, 1976–1977* (Kingston: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University, 1978), p. 1.
- 64 Peter M. Leslie, ed., *Canada: The State of the Federation, 1985* (Kingston: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University, 1985), p. iii.
- 65 These eleven volumes contained 102 articles, eleven of which are introductory chapters and not included in this analysis.
- 66 Keith Brownsey, Hugh Mellon and Avigail Eisenberg, "Report on Round Table Discussions: Executive Federalism, Public Input and Public Interest," in Peter M. Leslie and Ronald L. Watts, eds., *Canada: The State of the Federation, 1987–88* (Kingston: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University, 1988), pp. 167–94; Alan C. Cairns, "Constitutional Minoritarianism in Canada," in Ronald L. Watts and Douglas M. Brown, eds., *Canada: The State of the Federation, 1990* (Kingston: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University, 1990), pp. 71–96; Kathy L. Brock, "The Politics of Process," in Douglas M. Brown, ed., *Canada: The State of the Federation, 1991* (Kingston: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University, 1991), pp. 57–87; David Milne, "Innovative Constitutional Processes: Renewal of Canada Conferences, January–March, 1992," in Douglas Brown and Robert Young, eds., *Canada: The State of the Federation, 1992* (Kingston: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University, 1992), pp. 27–51; Michael B. Stein, "Tensions in the Canadian Constitutional Process: Elite Negotiations, Referendums and Interest Group Consultations, 1980–1992," in Ronald L. Watts and Douglas Brown, eds., *Canada: The State of the Federation, 1993* (Kingston: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University, 1993), pp. 87–116; Richard Johnston, André Blais, Elisabeth Gidengil and Neil Nevitte, "The People and the Charlottetown Accord," in Ronald L. Watts and Douglas Brown, eds., *Canada: The State of the Federation, 1993* (Kingston: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University, 1993), pp. 19–43; John E. Trent, "Post-Referendum Citizen Group Activity," in Patrick C. Fafard and Douglas M. Brown, eds., *Canada: The State of the Federation, 1996* (Kingston: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University, 1996), pp. 45–76; Janet Hiebert, "The Charter and Federalism: Revisiting the Nation-Building Thesis," in Douglas M. Brown and Janet Hiebert, eds., *Canada: The State of the Federation, 1994* (Kingston: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University, 1994), pp. 153–78.
- 67 Donald W. Stevenson, "Ontario and Confederation: A Reassessment," Ronald L. Watts and Douglas M. Brown, eds., *Canada: The State of the Federation, 1989* (Kingston: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, 1989), pp. 53–74; and David R. Cameron, "Post-Modern Ontario

- and the Laurentian Thesis," in Douglas M. Brown and Janet Hiebert, eds., *Canada: The State of the Federation*, 1994 (Kingston: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University, 1994), pp. 109–32.
- 68 Harvey Lazar, "Foreword," in Harvey Lazar, ed., *Canada: State of the Federation*, 1997: *Non-Constitutional Renewal* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1997), p. v.
- 69 "Decentralisation and Regionalisation, More Power to the People?" Conference hosted by the Canada United Kingdom Colloquium, 18–21 November 1999, Belfast, Northern Ireland; "Roundtable on Canadian Federalism: Twenty-First Century Federalism, Institutions of Governance and Avenues of Change." Round table hosted by the Institute for Research on Public Policy, December, 1999, Montreal; "Perspectives and Directions: The Social Union Framework Agreement." Conference hosted by the Saskatchewan Institute of Public Policy, 2–4 February 2000, Saskatoon; "The Changing Nature of Democracy and Federalism in Canada." Conference hosted by the University of Manitoba, 13–15 April 2000, Winnipeg; and "Canadian Federalism in the New Millennium: Performance, Effectiveness and Legitimacy." Conference hosted by the University of Toronto, 4–6 May 2000, Toronto.
- 70 In 2000, there were over 300 women in the cpsa and the sqsp, making up approximately twenty-eight per cent of the membership of these organizations.
- 71 Dane Rowlands, "International aspects of the division of debt under secession: The case of Quebec and Canada," *Canadian Public Policy* 23, no. 1 (March 1997), pp. 40–54; Pierre Martin, "Association after sovereignty? Canadian views on economic association with a sovereign Quebec," *Canadian Public Policy* 21, no. 1 (March 1995), pp. 53–71; José Woehrling, "Les droits des minorités linguistiques et culturelles en cas d'éventuelle accession du Québec à la souveraineté," *La Revue Juridique Thémis* 28 (1994), pp. 1035–1089.
- 72 The few exceptions include G. Bruce Doern, "The role of royal commissions in the general policy process and in federal-provincial relations," *CANADIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION* 10, no. 3 (Fall 1967), pp. 417–33; Sylvia Bashevkin, "Does public opinion matter? The adoption of the federal royal commission and task force recommendations on the national question, 1951–1987," *CANADIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION* 31, no. 3 (Fall 1988), pp. 390–407; and Philip Resnick, "State and civil society: The limits of a royal commission," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 20, no. 2 (June 1987), pp. 379–401. Also note that three articles are devoted to this topic in a special issue of the *International Journal of Canadian Studies* in 1993 entitled "The Charter, Federalism and the Constitution." See Max Nemni, "La Commission Bélanger-Campeau et la construction de l'idée de sécession au Québec," *International Journal of Canadian Studies* 7–8 (Spring–Fall 1993), pp. 285–312; Michael Oliver, "The impact of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism on constitutional thought and practice in Canada," *International Journal of Canadian Studies* 7–8 (Spring–Fall 1993), pp. 315–32; and David R. Cameron, "Not Spicer and not the B & B: Reflections of an insider on the workings of the Pepin-Robarts Task Force on Canadian Unity," *International Journal of Canadian Studies* 7–8 (Spring–Fall 1993), pp. 333–45.
- 73 Alan C. Cairns, "The governments and societies of Canadian federalism," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 10, no. 4 (December 1977), pp. 716–17.
- 74 Alain-G. Gagnon and Hugh Segal, eds., *The Canadian Social Union Without Quebec: 8 Critical Analyses* (Montreal: IRPP, 2000), p. 4. The Institute for Research in Public Policy collected the papers and translated them into English.
- 75 See Richard Simeon's remarks in the Smiley festschrift: "We are All Smiley's People," David Shugarman and Reg Whitaker, eds., *Federalism and Political Community: Essays in Honour of Donald Smiley* (Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview Press, 1989), pp. 409–21.
- 76 The practical and scholarly roles of the public intellectual emerged as a significant theme at a conference honouring Alain Cairns, "Rethinking Citizenship in the Canadian Federation." Hosted by the University of British Columbia, 11–13 October 2001, Vancouver.