

**CURRENT STATE OF RESEARCH ACTIVITIES ON
THE PARLIAMENT OF CANADA**

**SUMMARY OF PUBLISHED SCHOLARSHIP ON CANADIAN INSTITUTIONS
AND SCHOLARS' ACTIVITIES OTHER THAN PUBLICATION
(CONFERENCE PAPERS AND WINNING GRANTS)**

Submitted to the Library of Parliament by Sharon Sutherland

June 2009

CONTENTS

	Page
WHY STUDY PARLIAMENT?	1
SUMMARY OF PUBLISHED SCHOLARSHIP ON CANADIAN INSTITUTIONS, AND SCHOLARS' ACTIVITIES OTHER THAN PUBLICATION (CONFERENCE PAPERS AND WINNING GRANTS): OVERALL OBSERVATIONS	3
SUMMARY OF PUBLISHED SCHOLARSHIP ON CANADIAN INSTITUTIONS	5
INTRODUCTION	5
THE LITERATURE: REPRESENTATIVE INSTITUTIONS AMONG POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS	7
A. The Rationale and Research Design: Titles Captured	7
B. Implementation: Search Activity for Publications	9
1. Scholarly Publication Counts for Representative Institutions Compared to Context	11
2. Canadian Parliamentary Review: Topics of Interest	13
3. Scholarly Publishing: Topics of Interest Compared	16
4. Comment	18
SUMMARY OF PUBLISHED SCHOLARSHIP ON CANADIAN INSTITUTIONS: APPENDIX	22
PUBLICATIONS CAPTURED IN THE REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF THE DOMAIN OF ACADEMIC WRITING ON CANADIAN POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS, 2009–1999	24
<i>CANADIAN PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW</i>	26
BOOKS ON CANADIAN POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS: 2009–1999	39
<i>UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LAW JOURNAL</i>	49
SPECIALIZED CANADIAN JOURNALS: CONSTITUTIONAL, PARLIAMENTARY, GOVERNANCE AND CANADIAN STUDIES, 2009–1999	53
MAINSTREAM CANADIAN POLITICAL SCIENCE	64
A. Selection of Articles from Canadian Journal of Political Science and <i>Canadian Public Administration</i> , 2009–1999	64
B. Selection of Articles from <i>Politiques et Sociétés</i>	70
C. Notes de recherche (<i>Politiques et Sociétés</i>)	71

CANADIAN INSTITUTIONS: INTERNATIONAL JOURNALS.....	73
COMPILATION OF PUBLICATIONS ON CANADIAN REPRESENTATIVE INSTITUTIONS, 2009–1999 (ALPHABETICAL BY AUTHOR).....	82
COMPILATION OF PUBLICATIONS ON CIVIC EDUCATION, OUTREACH TO YOUTH AND USES OF THE INTERNET FOR CIVICS AND POLITICS, 2009–1999 (ALPHABETICAL BY AUTHOR)	92
STUDY OF REPRESENTATIVE INSTITUTIONS: CANADIAN RESEARCH ENTITIES AND INSTITUTIONAL OUTREACH ACTIVITIES..	95
TABLE 1 – STUDY OF REPRESENTATIVE INSTITUTIONS: CANADIAN RESEARCH ENTITIES.....	97
TABLE 2 – STUDY OF PARLIAMENT: INSTITUTIONAL OUTREACH ACTIVITIES	101
SUMMARY OF SCHOLARS’ ACTIVITIES OTHER THAN PUBLICATION (CONFERENCE PAPERS AND WINNING GRANTS)	106
INTRODUCTION.....	106
COUNTS FOR TOPICS ON CANADIAN REPRESENTATIVE INSTITUTIONS COMPARED TO TOPICS ON CANADIAN POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS, 2009–1989	108
THE REVIEW OF CONFERENCE PAPERS AND AWARDS OF GRANTS: “STUDY” AND “ACTIVITY” AS BY PRE-PUBLICATION ACTIVITY.....	110
A. The Pipeline: Offering Papers to the Primary Scholarly Conferences.....	112
1. Summary: Annual Conferences of the Canadian Political Science Association, 2009-2003	114
a. Methods.....	114
b. Counts.....	114
c. Analysis.....	115
2. Summary: Annual meetings of the Société québécoise de science politique, available online, 2004-2009	116
a. Methods, Counts and Analysis.....	116
3. Summary: SSHRC Grants for Study and for Investigator-Framed Research, 1998-2008	118
a. Methods.....	118
b. Caveats	118
c. Counts.....	119
d. Analysis.....	120
4. SSHRC Canada Research Chairs (CRC), 2000-2008	122
a. Methods.....	122
b. Analysis.....	122
5. The Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences Activities, 2008-1998	124
a. Methods.....	124
b. Caveats	124
c. Results	124

ACADEMICS ON ACADEME: THE IMPACT OF INCENTIVE SYSTEMS	126
SUMMARY OF SCHOLARS' ACTIVITIES OTHER THAN PUBLICATION (CONFERENCE PAPERS AND WINNING GRANTS): APPENDIX	134
THE PIPELINE: SCHOLARLY CONFERENCES (CPSA, SQSP), GRANTS FOR RESEARCH AND CANADA RESEARCH CHAIRS (SSHRC), AND GRANTS FOR PUBLICATION (CFHSS)	136
SUMMARY: ANNUAL CONFERENCES OF THE CANADIAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION (CPSA), 2009-2003	138
A. Methods: Selection of the Papers	138
B. Counts of Collaboration among Researchers	138
C. Counts of Core and Contextual Topics	139
1. Analysis	140
SUMMARY: ANNUAL MEETINGS OF THE SOCIÉTÉ QUÉBÉCOISE DE SCIENCE POLITIQUE (SQSP), 2009-2004	142
A. Methods and Results	142
SUMMARY: SSHRC INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH GRANTS, 2008–1998	144
A. Methods	144
B. Caveats	145
C. Counts	145
D. Analysis of Results	146
SSHRC CANADA RESEARCH CHAIRS (CRC) RELATED TO THE STUDY OF PARLIAMENT: PROGRAM HISTORY AND DETAILED RESULTS, 2000-2008	148
A. Methods	148
B. Analysis.....	149
C. Awards Details, 2000–2007	150
D. Individual Chair Results	151
E. CRC Program Total and Sub-totals	154
THE CANADIAN FEDERATION FOR THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES (CFHSS): AID TO SCHOLARLY PUBLICATIONS, PROGRAM HISTORY, AND DETAILED RESULTS, 2008–1989	155
A. Methods	155
B. Caveats.....	155
C. Analysis.....	156
D. Further Details of the Federation's Activities Relevant to Canadian Representative and Political Institutions	156
1. Lecture Series	156
2. Book Prize	157

3. Grants in Aid of Scholarly Publishing	158
4. Results: Topics of Interest in the Aid to Scholarly Publications Program	158
a. Cabinet.....	158
b. House of Commons	158
c. Ministers.....	158
d. Parliament	159
e. Senate	159

ATTACHMENT A: ANNUAL CONFERENCES OF THE CANADIAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION (CPSA): [CONGRESS OF THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES] DETAILS OF CONFERENCE PAPERS ON THE TOPICS, REPRESENTATIVE AND POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS IN CANADA, 2009–2003 160

A. 2009, 81 st Annual Conference, May 27-29, Carleton University	160
1. A1(a): Political Careers and Party Activists (Wednesday, May 27)	160
2. A1(b): Finance and Fundraising.....	161
3. K2: 20 th Century Prime Ministers and Public Administration: Wilfrid Laurier and Robert Borden	161
4. A3: Electoral Dynamics	161
5. C3: Comparative Political Ethics	161
6. L3(b): Institutional Reform and Policy Change in the Canadian Judicial System	161
7. A4: Online Politics	162
8. F6(b): Online Politics (Thursday, May 28)	162
9. A7(a): Interpreting Political History	162
10. K7: Partnering with the Voluntary Sector: Dangerous Relationships.....	162
11. L7: Judicial Mobilization and Court Impact: Canada and Europe Compared	162
12. A10 (a): The Impact of Electoral Rules (Friday, May 29)	163
13. D10(a): Public Discourse on Canadian Foreign and Defence Policy.....	163
14. K10(a): Maintaining Accountability Through Public Oversight: Are Behaviours Changing?.....	163
15. N10(b): Indigenous Rights: Framing Self-Government.....	163
16. A11(b): Open Federalism and Equalization.....	163
17. F12(b): Youth and Politics	164
18. H12(b): Revolution and Re/founding	164
19. *K12: Roundtable: New Parliamentary Officers: Assessing the Value of Independence.....	164
20. M13(b): Glass Ceiling #4: Organizations and Institutions.....	164
B. 2008, 80 th Annual Conference, June 4-6, University of British Columbia	165
C. 2007, 79 th Annual Conference, May 30-June 1, University of Saskatoon.....	169
D. 2006, 78 th Annual Conference, June 1-3, York University	174
E. 2005, 77 th Annual Conference, June 2-4, University of Western Ontario	177
F. 2004, 76 th Annual Conference, June 3-5, University of Manitoba	181
G. 2003, 75 th Annual Conference, May 30-June 1, Dalhousie University	185
H. 2002, 74 th Annual Conference, May 29-31, University of Toronto	186

ATTACHMENT B: ANNUAL CONFERENCES OF THE SOCIÉTÉ QUÉBÉCOISE DE SCIENCE POLITIQUE (SQSP), 2009-2004: DETAILS OF CONFERENCE PAPERS ON THE TOPICS, REPRESENTATIVE AND POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS IN CANADA 187

A. 2009, 27-28 mai, Université d'Ottawa.....	187
1. Thème: Les voies multiples de la science politique	187
a. Panel J, Politiques publics et fonction gouvernementale et juridique.....	187
2. Séance conjointe: Comparaisons Québec et Ontario	187
B. 2008, 8-9 mai, Université de Montréal	187
1. Thème: Les nouveaux acteurs politiques.....	187
a. Atelier 24: Le débat public.....	187
C. 2007, 24-25 mai, Université Laval, Québec.....	187
2. Thème: Politique: entre le discours et l'action.....	187
a. Atelier I: Dissonance dans la public budgétaire	187
b. Atelier II: Dissonance dans la public budgétaire.....	188
c. Atelier III: Discours et activité législative.....	188
d. Atelier IV: Projets, promesses et actions	188
e. Discours et démocratie I: Les parties politiques	188
f. Discours et démocratie II: représentation et légitimité	188
g. Discours et démocratie III: les médias	188
D. 2006, 24-25 mai, Université du Québec à Montréal.....	188
1. Thème: Les transformations de l'État contemporain et les nouveaux modes de gouvernance.....	188
a. Séance: Politique et expertise.....	188
b. Séance: Politique canadienne.....	188
c. Séance: La politique sous l'empire du droit	189
d. Séance: Ethique et politique	189
E. 2005, 24-25-26 mai, Université d'Ottawa.....	189
1. Thème: Territoires de l'Amérique.....	189
a. Redéfinition de la citoyenneté et participation politique au Nord et au Sud.....	189
(i) Panel: Les représentations de la démocratie	189
(ii) Panel: Les représentations de la démocratie III	189
(iii) Panel: Les représentations de la démocratie IV.....	189
F. 2004, 26-27-28 mai, Université de Montréal	190
1. Thème: L'engagement et le disengagement politique.....	190
a. Panel D1: La participation chez les jeunes	190
b. Panel E2: La culture politique et les technologies de l'information.....	190
c. Panel F2: Mobilisation: villes, femmes et communautés culturelles.....	190
 ATTACHMENT C: THE SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH COUNCIL'S (SSHRC) AWARDS AND RESEARCH GRANTS: DETAILS OF TOPICS ON REPRESENTATIVE AND POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS, 1998–2008.....	
	191
A. Methods	191
B. Caveats.....	192
C. Post-Doctoral Grants (Total cluster count 2,620, political science 170).....	192
D. Doctoral Projects (Total cluster 14,600, political science 1,100)	192
E. Masters Projects (Total cluster count 5,600, Political Science 340)	195

F. Investigator-Framed Research Grants/Major Collaborative Research Initiatives (Total cluster count 326, political science 47).....	196
G. Investigator-Framed Research Grants/Standard Research Grants (Total cluster count 23,010, political science 1,390).....	197
H. SSHRC Targeted Research/Training Grants (cluster total 3,180; political science 260 [including Federalism and Federations, Crossing Boundaries and Scholar in Residence])	202

WHY STUDY PARLIAMENT?

Parliament is at the centre of Canadian democracy, whether its components function well or poorly. Indeed whether we understand how components are organized and how they function or not, the “industrial organization” of Parliament defines important aspects of the relationship between the electorate and representative democracy in Canada.

No matter how powerful the executive may appear to be in the House of Commons, the House and the opposition within it remain the public face of the executive’s decision making. This is at the very least, regardless of secrecy or evasion. Despite the undeniable impact of world forces on state sovereignty, the politics of amelioration remain with the territorial state’s revenue and expenditure budgets. The House of Commons is the site of the final decision about from whom, from what activities and by what forms of taxation the revenue budget will be acquired by the territorial state – by government. It is the site for debate about how money will be spent across programs and territory inside Canada, and outside Canada in aid, diplomacy, security activities and war. These activities are public, and the results are assessed by the public, with temporal delays in accountability for the last two. At the very least, the House of Commons is the forum within which a government lays out its strategies for mitigating (or not) the effects of local and world economic and other forces by expenditure of public money and credibility. One can say that the government of the day *publishes in Parliament* (bills, regulations) more revealingly than elsewhere – although announcing initiatives outside of the House of Commons does meaningfully expose a given Government’s lack of respect for its place within Parliament and the restraints of process. The House of Commons holds the Government’s life in its hands through its ability to refuse confidence. Eventually a Government’s philosophy and performance will be characterized by its conduct within Parliament and by its performance (not discounting media effects), the electorate will elect its representatives, and a plurality or a majority of one party’s representatives will normally form the government (although coalitions are constitutional). Even stated in a minimalist way, this is an integrated account. It states that our government is a democratic one, if only because elements of substantive (program) and procedural (restraint, respect and adherence to rules) democracy exist in our form of representative government.

The minimalist integrated account of the representative institutions, however, cannot assist understanding of how these institutions, and their components, do in fact function internally: it tells us nothing about the “industrial organization” of Parliament (as legislature) for its work. In regard to the institutions at present, scholars are simply not describing (are not explaining to themselves) how Parliament is organized internally for its work, why components are organized the way they are, how each component works, and what proximate and distant effects each has on other elements. This matters very much if one believes that momentum is growing for reform of the institutions, and to bring about

certain suggestions for reform of the legislative-executive balance.¹ We may not know, even broadly, what the clockworks look like and how they function at the moment reform is implemented.

For just one example of the need for focused work, no scholar since Douglas Hartle in 1978 has offered an adequate, integrated and fully comprehensible account of the federal expenditure budget process.² So far as one can discover, Canadian scholars have almost stopped trying to grasp and explain supply (appropriations) as either part of our type of democracy or in respect to its technocratic managerial aspects (said to be value-free) as executed and explained by appointed officials. The methodological challenges of the 30-years of revisions to schemes to measure “results” instead of mere effort or commitment (via expenditure) are exasperating, the central agencies constantly and arbitrarily change the range of application of key terms, and, worse, there is almost no audience for the work beyond Parliament. If not for the research studies of the Library of Parliament, the few interested Canadian academics would have no access to fine-grained work based on primary sources from which to learn about the serial reforms to appropriations from the 1960s to the present. What is at stake is a democracy question: do the peoples’ representatives perform a genuine role in supply, and on what account is that role substantial?³

Most generally, if we do not know our own institutions as they are in our own time, we cannot hope to know which “world forces” are created by governments’ own policy actions, and what problems can be reversed. We cannot be a self-governing, knowledgeable people in regard to what the various components of our institutions can or should be expected to do. Democracy is a big question that can and should be tested against the current practices of *our* representative institutions, because our institutions shape and ration the elements of the democracy that emerges in our territory.

-
- 1 Some scholars push reforms uniquely aimed to remove power from the Government, often (sensibly enough) from the prerogative powers. But the assumption is often made that the legislature would naturally benefit from any power lost by the executive if only partisanship could be neutralized by free votes and other cultural changes. However, Canadian history since 1985 shows us that MPs must understand their constitutional role in scrutiny and press for reforms on their own initiative, or they will be unable to integrate reforms that could potentially have increased legislative capacities to challenge the executive. If powers are simply devolved by the executive, “loose” power is there to be taken up by other actors: public servants, the judiciary, or the statutory offices called “Officers of Parliament.” Models of government other than the Westminster institutional design do exist. Some models serve federations better than others. They are there to be learned from.
 - 2 Douglas G. Hartle, *The Expenditure Budget Process in the Government of Canada*. Toronto: Canadian Tax Foundation, 1978.
 - 3 See Jean Dupuis, “Appropriations and the Business of Supply,” Parliamentary Research Branch, May 2004, and the contributions made by Jack Stilborn of the Library of Parliament, including his paper to the 2009 CPSA meeting, “Committees of the House of Commons: Reform Expectations and Actual Performance.”

SUMMARY OF PUBLISHED SCHOLARSHIP ON CANADIAN INSTITUTIONS, AND SCHOLARS' ACTIVITIES OTHER THAN PUBLICATION (CONFERENCE PAPERS AND WINNING GRANTS): OVERALL OBSERVATIONS

A search for publishing over the last ten years uncovered close to 100 titles by professional scholars most directly relevant to Parliament. These titles were reviewed to classify them by topic. Most academics that do take an interest in parliamentary institutions want to express themselves on the most foundational topics: the Constitution, Canadian democracy, Parliament and its reform, the Senate, political parties, cabinet and prime ministers.

This leaves us – speaking approximately – with few papers examining budgeting matters or committees of Parliament, almost nothing on supply or scrutiny and procedures, only a few papers on the independent statutory offices created by the executive such as the Privacy and Information Officers or the Office of the Auditor General, a handful of papers on accountability, one on the budgetary processes, and a couple on the accounting officer reform.

The major scholarly conferences of the professional scholars working the area of political studies were also looked at for “pipeline” activity leading to publication of books or journal articles. The total of papers on the representative institutions (Parliament) is approximately 60 for the seven years, or, more cautiously, 50 for the years 2003–2008 (since the 2009 preliminary program totals will not be the same as the real number of papers delivered). From among these papers, we count about 30 that are the most directly relevant to Canadian representative institutions, of which ten are on the various officers of Parliament.

If one steps back from 2009's preliminary program, and averages the yearly output 2003–2008, using the average to compute a ten-year production estimate, one would have about 80 papers from the conference decade that could be submitted for publication. Even making the unrealistic assumption that each and every one of these efforts has already been or will be accepted for publication, it seems fair to conclude that papers presented to the annual meetings of the CPSA do not constitute a major “push” or supply of work on the representative institutions.

In conclusion, the Library's primary deliverable was to create an empirical base to assess the current state of publishing and other research-related activity by academics focusing on Parliament. This study's ten year review of publishing offers little promise that existing academic research trends are adequate to keep either parliamentarians or citizens up to date. We are also unable to identify more than a few collaborations (“Who works with who?”) for the study of representative institutions.

The “gaps” in publication topics, noted above, are worrying while the question of identifying “overlaps” seems irrelevant – the latter are difficult to differentiate from centres

of interest, when interest is so limited. The current scholarly publication record, the publishing output of the existing research entities and the award categories and spending choices of Canadian granting organizations do not indicate that scholarly research and publishing on Parliament will increase in the coming years. Non-profit bodies, Parliament itself and the Library of Parliament will largely determine what assistance parliamentarians will get in understanding the Canadian representative institutions.

SUMMARY OF PUBLISHED SCHOLARSHIP ON CANADIAN INSTITUTIONS

INTRODUCTION

This summary outlines the approach taken to consolidate the research-related activity as well as publishing by scholars on Parliament, and presents the conclusions thought to be tenable. Throughout, “Parliament,” as the representative institutions, is the focus or “case.” The Library asked for an overview of publishing and other activity by academics on Parliament.⁴ The search of scholarly journals on Parliament (among political institutions) was soon extended by the researcher to ten years before 2009 after initial findings demonstrated small yields. These results for the longer period are consolidated into a bibliography of articles and books, presented as “Appendix: Publications Captured in the Review and Analysis of the Domain of Academic Writing on Canadian Political Institutions 2009–1999.” This Appendix is the only document of this collection that reproduces all citations identified by the general and specific choices below, the broader choices yielding a domain of approximately 470 entries, of which 115 are most directly focused on Parliament. The Appendix opens with a document which portrays the counts of topics on Canadian institutions.

For the readers’ convenience, following the Appendix are two documents entitled “Compilation of Publications on Canadian Representative Institutions 2009–1999” and “Compilation of Publications on Civic Education, Outreach to Youth and Uses of the Internet for Civics and Politics 2009–1999.”

4 The approach through topics, although time consuming, allows entry to our lists of any person published in a venue that is generally accepted as “academic” or “scholarly.” (Thus a small number of the scholars whose work is captured in this summary are independent scholars, from other disciplines than political science, and are perhaps even “Canadianists” from countries other than Canada, although most names are familiar.) In addition, we built up a bibliography for books. See also, in the present paper, a review of scholarly literature on developments in academic incentive systems that helps to interpret the relative lack of interest in country-specific work in all countries except those where most of the core or top field journals are located.

THE LITERATURE: REPRESENTATIVE INSTITUTIONS AMONG POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS

A. The Rationale and Research Design: Titles Captured

Because the first weeks of consolidating publishing on Parliament revealed so little literature compared to publications within the many other fields of study in political science, there was a concern that a narrow selection might exclude work that could later assume more importance. Thus we relaxed the criteria for capture. It was decided to record publications on *all Canadian political institutions*, and to include some publications by academics appearing in specialized journals on Canada that are not peer-reviewed, and in two cases, are not print-based. The literature most clearly on Parliament could be presented in one list, but it would be accompanied by contextual literature. This strategy provides freedom to secondary analysts to draw up their own lists on their own criteria.

Among considerations in expanding the definition from Parliament to all Canadian representative institutions for the search was that the *Journal, Canadian Parliamentary Review (CPR)*, invites contributions from all Canadian parliamentarians, and also engages the experts who directly sustain and serve MPs, MLAs (sometimes MPPs) and the MNAs as clerks, procedural experts and researchers in the institutions. Thus contributions to *CPR* feature provincial and territorial legislatures as well as the federal Parliament. One is reminded by *CPR* that all Canadian representative institutions share an interest in structures such as committees, independent “officers,” and in procedure and privilege as well as more general topics. Thus the decision was taken to capture any work based in legislatures and assemblies found by searches of academic literature. Briefly, expanding the category made almost no difference in the results for academic literature. If one removes titles referencing any representative institution other than the federal Parliament, about 95 percent of the publications found in scholarly outlets for the last decade are about the federal Parliament. See Attachment One for the core list of publications on Canadian representative institutions that constitute the “overview” of academic publishing on the topic in the period 1999–2009.

The Canadian Parliamentary Review had a unique role in this study. Its contents identify the preoccupations of the parliamentarians and experts who serve in Canadian representative institutions. A content analysis of these practitioners’ contributions was conducted. The results are used to compare the interests and concerns of parliamentarians and experts with the research interests of academics as students of Parliament.

Titles were searched using various search engines sequentially (while overlap was high, each major search engine yielded unique items), by electronic searches of table of contents of individual journals where available, and in many cases by visual inspection of tables of contents for the period. Titles were retained and recorded if there was any mention of a Canadian representative institution (provincial or federal), or, obviously, of the government/executive, or of the Crown. These constituted the core of representative

institutions. (see the Appendix to "Scholars' Activity other than Publication (Conferences and Winning Grants).")

Titles were also captured if they mentioned a political institution whose activities flow into or affect the operations of Canadian representative institutions, the broader category being designated as "Canadian political institutions." Parties, the electoral system and federalism thus relate closely to the representative institutions – their character and composition. The judiciary interprets the Charter, with implications for legislative power, thus discussions of judicial-legislative relations are included. When there was reason for doubt, the title would be included.⁵

It was also decided to allow for the "governance" perspective, in part because it, like the "first ministers" and bilateral agreements affecting federalism that bypass legislatures, can be conceived as a "democratic deficit" in the responsible government explanation. To paraphrase a common definition, "governance" or decision-making occurs, but is not localized in any single formal institution, and thus settlements ("decisions") are reached without government (defined as an over-arching institution with formal jurisdiction for the problem or area).⁶

Globalization topics, world institutions, and slightly more narrowly, multi-level governance, plus the management by states of treaties and any machinery established to manage treaties, also occur in the literature on Canada, and were retained. Perhaps this shift of perspective is best captured by the title of a publication by Stephen Clarkson, "Canada's External Constitution." (*American Review of Canadian Studies*, 2003).

5 However, studies pertaining to gender or minority rights (or other group rights) were not included unless the title or any available purpose statement indicated relevance in that the topic indicated an expected result either to or through Parliament. This decision will be offensive to many, but available resources could never have captured and managed the enormous literature on gender. The literature on Commissions of Inquiry and Royal Commissions, for the most part, is not included, although these bodies can indirectly impinge upon centuries of parliamentary self-regulation and sovereignty in that judges and businessmen do sometimes recommend that the executive use its plurality or majority to implement their recommendations.

6 "Governance" resembles the phenomenon the American political scientist and economist Charles Lindblom calls "partisan mutual adjustment" in his own work on decision making. New situations that represent *de facto* public policy emerge fluidly. The governance idea also says that the boundaries of the state are sometimes imperceptible, and indeed that the state and its institutions have been "hollowed out" by other actors.

B. Implementation: Search Activity for Publications

The relevant references from the *Canadian Parliamentary Review (CPR)* were captured by visual inspection of tables of contents for the period. Its contents are not included in domain counts for academic literature because the practitioner count would inflate the academic contribution.

A list of books published on Canadian political institutions was compiled, and with difficulty. *Canadian Books in Print* stopped publishing within the last few years, and now offers only periodic updates to the last volume. However, *Canadian Books in Print* had never been complete; it depended on publishers to notify it of new books. Thus a first list from *Canadian Books In Print* and its supplements was augmented by searches of other international monograph indexes and publishers' websites. However, a similar attempt to capture contents of edited books was unworkable. Publishers' websites vary in detail reported, thus many volumes would have to be acquired physically, and time did not allow.

The contents of the *University of Toronto Law Journal* were also inspected visually, to see whether public law lawyers are writing on the representative institutions (the Journal does not however restrict publication by credentials).

The broader searches start with print and electronic journals specializing on Canadian topics, including journals on constitutional affairs, public policy, parliamentary government and Canadian studies generally. Next are the "mainstream" Canadian Journals in both French and English, the *Canadian Journal of Political Science* and its French-language equivalent, *Politiques et Sociétés*. These last two journals were searched visually after the search engines had been used, because a visual test search indicated that the search engines did not find every article that was of interest. The other mainstream Canadian journal, *Canadian Public Administration*, was also reviewed visually, as was the case of several of the publications in the category of Canadian specialized journals. For additional information about the publication, one can refer to the notes on these categories in the Appendix to "Scholars' Activity other than Publication (Conferences and Winning Grants)."

We then move to the English language international journals that accept submissions on all topics of interest to students of political science, government, or governance. Here search engines were used and where available visual review of tables of contents.

The nine-page compilation (Appendix) on the discovered titles about Parliament, including a few provincial references, is the result of the above work. Throughout the Appendix, publications that appear on the above list are asterisked, thus if one is looking over the full domain capture in the Appendix to "Summary of Published Scholarship on Canadian Institutions, "the list" on representative institutions remains visible among other titles retained on political institutions. Because of the Library's civics work, titles on encouraging voting and generally improving civic responsibility, outreach to youth as well as titles on e-

government are marked with an "at" sign (@) for identification. (A second compilation is attached.) It must be remembered that these list are as inclusive as possible.

1. Scholarly Publication Counts for Representative Institutions Compared to Context

In what follows, the comparative counts between the “base” count of topics on political institutions broadly construed are loosely compared with the “core” of topics on Parliament (representative institutions). See “Publications Captured in the Review and Analysis of the Domain of Academic Writing on Canadian Political Institutions”: it compares the title counts for the two topics of interest with various categories of academic journals. It is headed by the counts for *Canadian Parliamentary Review* for contrast (but, as noted, *CPR* counts are not part of the totals for academics). The counts being approximate, mathematical operations should not be used to extend or summarize comparisons. One can however talk more loosely about the rank of a journal or group of journals for the relative frequency with which articles on the representative institutions appear. Following the frequency rank, the discussion will move to a comparison between the preoccupations of parliamentarians and expert officials as shown by the *CPR*, and the interests of academic researchers so far as they are revealed by the counts for all scholarly journals.

As noted, the various searches uncovered, in the last decade, approximately 470 titles on contextual topics, including 115 titles for representative institutions in this total. Not surprisingly, the rough ratio of frequency of treatment of Parliament in comparison to any other subject in the field of political institutions is highest in the *CPR*, with a considerable distance between *CPR* and any other publishing outlet.

2. Canadian Parliamentary Review: Topics of Interest

Turning now to *CPR*, what do MPs and expert officials who serve Parliament write about? What are their concerns? A selection of approximately 80 out of 140 articles in the period was made for topics on Parliament and political institutions. Each topic below is followed by a count, plus an indication of whether the counts were spread out over a number of aspects of the topic, or appear to be concentrated on the central theme. The most frequent subjects are listed first, then the less frequent. Six or more articles on a topic are classified as higher frequency, and five or fewer articles as less frequent:

Highest frequency *CPR* topics:

- Committees of the House of Commons or of a Legislative Assembly: The eight articles are wide-ranging across sub-topics, including audit committees, fairness in committees, coercive powers of committees, the confidentiality of committee reports, and reforms of committees in Ontario and Quebec.
- The role of Parliament in general – malaise, decline and need for reinvention: Some of the seven articles mention the globalization effects on Parliament and democracy.
- The role of the private member: Nine articles were counted as treating how the private member might be kept in the information loop or take on a more significant role than at present; the role of parliamentarians in trade negotiations and other functions that are dominated by the executive, and private members' legislation.
- Officers of Parliament/Legislature: There is one general article on the role of Officers in one legislative assembly among the six, and another on methods of funding for Officers. The rest take up individual Officers; Parliament's Budget Officer, the OAG in Ontario, the Public Service Integrity Officer, and whistle-blowing in Canada.
- Power and Privilege: Seven papers treat parliament's power to summon and parliamentary privilege, with one directly on the need for codification of privilege.
- Senate: The seven papers cover a great variety of sub-topics, including reforms, committees, role in scrutiny of legislation, the speakership, and the legislative process in general.
- Elections: Half of the six articles on elections were on the difficulties with fixed-date elections (the Governor General's right to grant dissolution taken up in one). Other topics were methods of financing parties.

Lesser frequency topics:

- New communications technology and cyber democracy: These five topics are varied, dealing with the effect on the deliberative institutions, the use of new technology to facilitate the work of legislatures and experiments on e-democracy.
- Crown: These five articles cover the future of the Crown in Canada; modernization of Royal Assent, with academics writing on the vice-regal function in provinces.
- Estimates/supply: Of the three papers here, one is on the B.C. estimates process, another is a Library research paper on the federal estimates process, and the last, by a former MP, is on the Gomery commission and accountability.
- Speakers: The three papers cover challenging the Speaker, election of the Speaker, and the use of the casting vote.
- The Constitution: Three broad papers, including one on parliamentary privilege in this context.
- Question Period: One paper on question period generally, one in 2008 on the role of the Speaker in Question Period.
- Procedure: One general paper, one on procedure in the context of a minority Parliament.
- Party switching: Two.
- Unique topics: Women in legislatures, sub-justice convention, access to information, youth, the media and Parliament.

Summarizing, it appears that MPs, MLAs and Senators, and the career officials who serve them directly, are concerned about the following: what committees now do and the legislator's role in committees; the power of the legislature relative to the executive; parliamentary privilege; how the independent "Officers" fit into legislatures; and the problems associated with changes to provisions for elections. However, if one combines the topics about Parliament in general with those on the role of the private member, one can note that the largest number of articles is concentrated in this area.

Estimates (appropriations, supply, scrutiny) still concern MPs, as do the Crown or vice-regal functions. One also sees a fair amount of interest in the role of the Speaker, if one combines the three Speaker topics with the one question period topic.

Thus MPs and the career officials who support them in their work do in fact take an interest in what is sometimes called "the industrial organization" of the legislature – the form it takes to conduct its work. Do scholars share these interests? If so, one would expect that

raw counts for the scholarly literature as a whole would be many times higher than for *CPR* alone?

3. Scholarly Publishing: Topics of Interest Compared

Moving now to academic work published in the last ten years captured in the Appendix, one must again conduct a content analysis on the 115 titles. (See "Publications Captured in the Review and Analysis of the Domain of Academic Writing on Canadian Political Institutions"). Note that not all titles can be placed.

Again we will cluster six or more titles as "higher frequency," and five or fewer as "lower frequency." The results are as follows:

Higher frequency topics:

- General background on parliamentary government, including general critiques: 21.
- Cabinet and Ministers: Eight.
- Senate: Nine.
- Partisanship and Opposition in the House of Commons: Seven.
- Mixed constitutional titles, including its legal basis, the impact of globalization and deregulation, judicialization, and the role of the Attorney General: Seven.
- Need for reform in general: Six.
- Mixed political accountability topics: Six.
- Budgetary and fiscal accountability, including federal complications: Six.⁷
- A group of mixed topics on the need for better surveillance by both executives and legislatures: improving legislative surveillance of executive action including political appointments, improving procedural correctness in making policy, and political surveillance of police activity: Eight.

Lower frequency topics:

- Prorogation: Four.
- Officers of Parliament: Four.
- House of Commons Committees: Three.

7 The following is of interest here: Mike Joyce, "Prudent Budgeting and Budgetary Process Effectiveness in Canada's Federal Government," *IRPP Choices* 15, 6 (June 2009): 27 pp. This just published paper is not on how the House of Commons is itself involved in or activated by budget decisions. It is however an example of how useful public financial reporting documents are to researchers of Parliament.

- Representation, one article being on the Bloc's position in the Federal legislature: Four.
- Theory of Westminster Government: Five.
- Unique topics: Parliamentary Secretaries; powers to send for persons, papers and records; search warrants in a legislature; and the Governor General and making governments (not on prorogation).

4. Comment

What can be said about these results? It is easy enough to see that treatment of the more specialized topics reported in *Canadian Parliamentary Review* hardly exists in the academic outlets. Apart from general subjects, accountability is the most represented, but from many different angles, for 21 titles. These include “accountability” as ministerial and prime ministerial accountability; the potential (or not) for improved legislative surveillance of the executive, including of political appointments; and a small group of articles on fiscal accountability.

The Senate is not neglected, at least in comparative terms, at nine titles, some of them books. Papers on party politics in the institutions, including the role of the opposition in the House of Commons, have a comparatively good representation at about seven examples. A number of difficult constitutional titles are found, including the impact of globalization, deregulation and judicialization on the representative institutions, and the role of the Attorney General. Five more “theory” papers are on Westminster government as such. Six titles are on the need for reform of Parliament as the main topic. After this, we see a few titles on Officers of Parliament in Canada, and just three on House of Commons committees.

Thus the difference in the two lists – the *CPR* list and the list of topics taken up by academics – would seem to be that committees and their roles do proportionately preoccupy parliamentarians and their expert officials more than they do scholars, and there are proportionately many more contributions in *CPR* than in the general academic literature on what the private member’s role is and should be. One sees a fairly strong interest in parliamentary privilege, and its potential abuse among parliamentarians, and in the fixed-date election legislation and party financing. The academic literature, on the other hand, simply does not show any concentrated interest on these topics, despite their centrality for the work of the institutions. These latter topics may well be taken up in books, but they are certainly not given the more focused and up-to-date treatment that one should find in research publications in journals.

Overall, searching for a way to interpret these differences, one might say that the topics chosen by parliamentarians and the experts who assist them appear to be about the boundaries of the role of the private member, and understanding conduct (the role of privilege) within the House in standing committees and generally. Parliamentarians are also naturally interested in the new rules on election dates and party financing.

The academic publications, on the other hand, look at *behavior* of actors within the House of Commons from a distance. Academics do not appear to be interested in how rules and procedures create a power structure. For example, scholars do not generate material evidence on committee systems, nor do they provide analysis of whose interests are served by the overall number of committees in operation in given periods, or on the nature, variety of work and perceived significance of work done in committees overall. Likewise, scholars today are not taking up the topic of the roles of the statutory

“accountability” officers in the House of Commons and the impact of unilateral changes to officers’ products on MPs’ interest in their work and on their capacity to perform scrutiny of government.⁸ Expertise is accepted in its own terms, and not examined. The reader may recall that the research-based Gomery recommendations laid the responsibility for having missed the sponsorship scandal at the door of the Public Accounts Committee, not mentioning the Office of the Auditor General as bearing any responsibility.⁹ The study supporting the recommendations has no footnotes, and no bibliography. In short, academics are barely into the detail of whether or how the representative institutions are organized to perform their work, or what the daily work of a legislature adds up to.

Thus, and to use the Library’s word, almost any specialized topic on how Parliament is organized to perform its work, how it acquits its work, or whether the House or legislature receives information that is sufficiently finely-grained to encourage reasoned debate, constitutes a “gap.”¹⁰

Teamwork to produce work on Parliament proves to be rare in our search for publications. The one exception would be the scholars invited to participate in the Democratic Audit project at Mount Allison University. Scholars who work with survey or census-type data, including voting data, have always been more likely than students of institutions to form collaborations.¹¹ The two examples of collaborations in the representative institutions literature search involve Bruce Hicks of Montreal, and Christopher Kam of UBC, not with each other but with different scholars. There are a few more collaborations in the writings found in the larger domain – political institutions. Paul Howe (UNB) had five publications with other colleagues; then three times each for Herman Bakvis (UVic), David Docherty

-
- 8 The British Parliament provides an example for maintaining democratic accountability of its own Officers for both general directions in the types of products they offer to Parliament, and for budgets. House of Commons Committees and Commissions are more closely involved in Britain in the work of organizations that are similar in nature to Canadian Officers (the arrangements for the National Audit Office being the “gold standard”). There is also a rich body of work by Michael Power and Christopher Hood among others on the kinds of audit in the UK, and on the poorly-understood policy-relevant regulatory role played by external audit. For a post-Parliamentary view, see Frank Vibert, *The Rise of the Unelected: Democracy and the New Separation of Powers*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- 9 Commission of Inquiry into the Sponsorship Program and Advertising Activities, *Restoring Accountability: Recommendations*, Ottawa: Minister of Public Works and Government Services, 2006, Recommendation 3, p. 200.
- 10 There are a few individuals who stay with difficult technical topics and record developments. Peter Dobell, for one notable example, kept the manner in which estimates were handled by the House of Commons in view through the 1980s and 1990s, and one sees him writing on the budget in this collection of publications (*IRPP*, 2002).
- 11 The study of elections sees a long history of partnerships back to the 1960s. Professor André Blais (Université de Montréal) has been providing leadership now as a funded Canada Research Chair since the late 1990s and we see his name in many joint publications. In 2000, he received an SSHRC “Major Collaboration Research Initiative” grant for seven years to work with over twenty-two colleagues at 17 universities nationally and internationally (including the two endowed chairs of parliamentary studies: Professors Massicotte at Laval and Cross at Carleton) and partnerships with 12 university and non-academic organizations. There is a rich record of collaboration among academics specialising in elections, polling and parties across Canada (among others, Blais, Gidengill, Howe, Nadeau, Nevitte).

(Wilfrid Laurier), Manon Tremblay (U of O) and Linda Trimble (U of A) with different colleagues.

An effort was likewise made to identify collaborations to produce papers for conferences that are on the representative institutions – none were found. However, there were about twenty collaborations on the larger domain of political institutions in the various conference sessions.¹² Overall, scholars of the representative institutions do not share work in their efforts to publish or to present papers at scholarly conferences.

12 There are three examples in the CPSA conferences (2009–2004) of two professors working together at least twice in making presentations in the larger political institutions domain: Harold Jansen [Lethbridge] and Lisa Young [Calgary] (four times); Eric Bélanger [McGill] and Francois Gélinau [Laval]; and, third, Cameron Anderson [UWO] and Elizabeth Goodyear-Grant [Queen's]. Belanger has in addition four other collaborations with different colleagues while Young and Jansen have each two additional collaborations with different colleagues. Four other presenters have each three or more separate collaborations with different colleagues: André Blais [Montréal], Fred Cutler [UBC], Neil Nevitte [UofT] and Royce Koop [UBC].