

NEWSLETTER

CANADIAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

VOLUME II Number 2. - NOVEMBER 1972

Hopefully, we have by now worked out some of the technical problems of producing the NEWSLETTER and you will really receive this copy in November. This means that the Newsletter is back on schedule and will next be appearing in early January. We would like to have suggestions for topics to be discussed in the January number so please send in ideas or, better still, articles !

This number deals basically with two subjects, the decisions reached at the October meeting of the Board of Directors of the Canadian Political Science Association and the beginning of a listing of political science data holdings in Canada. These two areas cover the kind of material we hope to continue presenting in the Newsletter, both material related to the CPSA and material related more generally to political science in Canada. We hope this is the role the membership of the CPSA sees for the Newsletter.

A final reminder: the Newsletter will appear in early January, March and May of 1973. The deadline for material for these issues is two weeks before publication; that is, mid-December, mid-February and mid-April.

*All correspondence
relating to the newsletter
should be directed to the editor:*

Caroline Andrew
Department of Political Science
University of Ottawa
Ottawa K1N 6N5

P A R L I A M E N T A R Y I N T E R N S H I P S P R O G R A M M E

On Friday, October 13th, 1972 the Board of Directors of the Canadian Political Science Association agreed to a new financing formula for the Parliamentary Internship Programme. Under this formula, a group of Canadian Life Insurance Companies including, Canada Life, Confederation Life, Crown Life, Great-West Life, Imperial Life, London Life, Manufacturers Life, Mutual Life and North American Life will supply \$75,000 per year to pay for the Parliamentary Interns' stipends for a three-year period 1973-76, subject to annual review. It was agreed that public statements concerning the programme should be subject to mutual agreement. The Speaker of the House of Commons has been asked to supply the administrative budget. This formula ensures the continued independence of the programme. Accordingly a new programme has been announced for 1973-74. The deadline for receipt of applications is January 15th, 1973.

James Ross Hurley.

From the Minutes of the CPSA Board of Directors Meeting
Ottawa, October 13, 14, 15, 1972.

F E D E R A L E L E C T I O N S U R V E Y

John Wilson, Chairman of the Interim Committee on Federal Election Survey Research, presented a written report to the Board listing the members of his committee and their planned operations. Of immediate concern is the refusal of the Canada Council to make a grant to any one of the three individual proposals to do a survey of the 1972 Federal Election. When informed of this on September the 20th, Wilson and Laponce, given the general responsibilities of the Canadian Political Science Association's Election Survey Committee, circularized departments of political science to establish their degree of interest in a survey of this election and whether or not the departments could find funds in their budgets over the next four years to purchase the data from a possible survey. Up to the moment of the Board meeting, twenty departments had replied. All were very anxious that the survey be carried out, and \$17,000 had been promised. However, the meeting agreed that although the offer of money was an excellent indicator of interest, it would be impossible for the Association to compromise the principle of general and immediate availability of the data by restricting it to those departments which at the present moment could find some money in their budget. To try and overcome the lack of a 1972 survey the following motion was proposed:

" . . . that the Association make an application to the Canada Council for funds to study the 1972 Federal Election by administering the Canadian Political Science Association core questionnaire, with the addition of such questions as seem appropriate to the circumstances; that the Association appoint its president and the chairman of its Interim Committee on Federal Election Survey Research to prepare an application to the Canada Council in the name of the Association for this purpose; and that the above persons supervise the collection of the data and that as soon as the data is in machine readable form, it be made public."

Wilson, Ouellet, 14 in favor, 1 opposed, 3 abstentions.

During the debate on this motion, Wilson said the intention was to use the Canadian Political Science Association core questionnaire in conjunction with questions representing particular theoretical concerns proposed by members of the Canadian Political Science Association Interim Committee and

the teams which had made the original proposals for surveys of the 1972 Federal Election. In addition, a small number of questions would be added concerning the particular nature of the 1972 Election. The Board gave Wilson and Laponce the authority to make the necessary selection among those questions which would be proposed. Wilson had already made preliminary contacts on the administration of a possible survey and it was his opinion the survey could be in the field by the end of November if the Canada Council gave its approval by the end of October.

Wilson and Laponce stressed that the main objective of the Association is to maintain the time series and to collect the needed data. They are not proposing major research hypotheses nor are they personally planning to work on the data. Trent said his information from the Canada Council was that they were not convinced such sums of money should be spent on data gathering alone. The Canadian Political Science Association's arguments will have to be very strong. The Secretary-Treasurer also suggested that, judging by recent comments by Canada Council personnel, we may be getting to the time when social science associations may have to act as a consultant on areas of strength and weakness in the discipline and resultant needs and priorities. Not only does the Board's decision on election survey establish a precedent for the Association acting on political science research concerns in Canada but the Board should see the seriousness of its action in the light of possibly committing the profession to a research priority. Meekison, while not denying the possible necessity of declaring research priorities in the future, did not feel the present decision constituted a statement of priorities. The Association is in a last minute crisis where no data is going to be produced in this election and as this type of research is abnormally expensive and can only be financed by the Canada Council, the Association must put its weight behind the grant request to make sure the data becomes available. Meisel stressed the arguments that feedback from the profession shows a definite desire for the data; that we are not only collecting political science material but are, in fact, recording Canadian history; that it is mainly elections that provide critical political data; and that all developed countries are now doing this type of research on a regular basis. In the ensuing discussion, as to the degree of the Association's responsibility in this particular case, the argument was made that we are

setting a precedent but the Association must commit itself in order to get the Canada Council to commit itself to election survey and our current decision is only a stop-gap in an emergency situation.

Hodgetts summarized the discussion by proposing that the application to the Canada Council must include:

1. a statement of the need of the data;
2. a recounting of what the Association is trying to do to co-ordinate Federal Election Survey research and to put the discipline's house in order in this regard;
3. that our aim is to make sure in the future, fund granting bodies will not be subjected to scattered competition for survey financing;
4. that there is evidence of interest throughout the profession, but not necessarily of the whole, for obtaining the election data;
5. the Canada Council should be aware that our decision may be indicating a priority for future political science research, but when our Interim Committee on Federal Election Survey research has completed its work, we will have a clear understanding of our priorities and methods for future study of elections;
6. in the meantime, we should not break the time series by letting the 1972 election pass by unanalysed.

It was agreed that Wilson and Laponce will put together the extra questions to be added to the core questionnaire from various sources, that they will warn those submitting questions that not all of them will be accepted and that they will be authorized to make appropriate selections. Wilson stressed that the main objective is to preserve the time series and not to service research interests of members of the Association.

It was also agreed that it will be specified in the application to the Canada Council that Laponce and Wilson are responsible for the study and will oversee the research and collection of data until such time as the data has been made available in machine readable form.

REPORTS FROM C.P.S.A. COMMITTEES

The C.P.S.A. Committee on Canadian Content, composed of Phyllis Clarke, Danny Drache, Harold Kaplan, Donald Smiley, and the chairman Paul Fox, has had several meetings to commence its work. It has set as its target date for submitting its report the annual meeting of the Association this coming August. The Committee has agreed that it will study only facts and figures and not make recommendations on policy. It will attempt to obtain data re nationality and citizenship for staff members and post-graduate students in departments of political science in Canadian universities. Existing studies will be utilized to secure information but the Committee also hopes to send questionnaires to departmental chairmen and C.P.S.A. correspondents to get data about the two groups mentioned above. The Committee is considering also trying to secure relevant information about the curricula in departments to determine the extent of Canadian content in courses, the number of Canadian courses, and the courses taught by Canadians and non-Canadians. Several other possible areas for investigation have been submitted to the Committee but it has not yet had time to discuss and reach a decision on these topics.

*

*

*

The Board of Directors has established a committee to investigate the desire for, the logistics of and the financing of small meetings of Political Scientists in various areas of the country. The Committee is under the Chairmanship of Susan McCorquodale, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's. Miss McCorquodale is anxious to hear from any member of the Association who has been involved in meetings of this sort, or from members who want to participate in such meetings. The idea is to take advantage of possible Canada Council funds to bring together twenty to twenty-five specialists in a particular field in a University for a 2-3 day meeting. The Committee would like some idea of how many meetings of this sort have taken place in recent years, an assessment of their effectiveness and, secondly, to have some indication of the interest of members of the Association. Perhaps we should be considering changing the format of the Annual General Meeting. Miss McCorquodale urges members to write to her as soon as possible.

Report of the Interim Committee on Federal Election Survey Research

The events of the last two months have led to a number of extraordinary developments in the activities of the Committee which the profession as a whole will want to know about.

When the present Committee was established by the Board in June its specific mandate was to discover who the people were in Canada who were in any way interested in federal election survey research, and to seek out and report on their opinions as to the best way to proceed in the future in this area. It will be remembered by those who were present at the discussions in June in Montreal that a good deal of concern (to say nothing of disagreement) was expressed about the way in which we had all proceeded in the past, and it was hoped by the Board that some superior form of procedure could be found which would satisfy the twin aims of preserving the collection of certain important data relating to federal elections while encouraging research innovations in this area.

During late June and July the membership of the Committee was established by the Chairman (John Wilson) writing to a number of people in different parts of the country soliciting their help. All but one of the people asked proved willing to serve and we set to work during the later months of the summer trying to enumerate social scientists in Canada (as well as in the United States) who had an interest in federal election survey research, with the aim of later sending to each of these a brief questionnaire designed to elicit opinions on all aspects of election research in Canada.

At the time of the June Board meeting two applications were before the Canada Council for funds to study the 1972 election, and while it was believed that one of these was bound to receive Council support the Board nonetheless instructed the Committee to keep a "watching brief" on developments so that in the event that no study proposal was supported by the Council steps could be taken by the Committee to do whatever had to be done to preserve the collection of data relating to the time series which was begun in 1965 and continued in 1968.

Towards the end of September the Council determined not to support any of the applications which had been made to it to study the 1972 election (a third application had reached it early in July) and the situation therefore was that no attempt would be made to study the 1972 election at all.

In these circumstances the Chairman of the Committee decided to see what could be done to "pick up the pieces." After consultation with the President of the Association and a number of members of the Committee, the Chairman wrote to all Committee members on September 26th suggesting that he and Laponce, together with several others, should mount an application to the Canada Council for funds to administer the CPSA Core Questionnaire only.

At the same time the reaction of Committee members to this proposal was sought, together with some indication of the kind of support which might exist for it in their "constituencies" (each member of the Committee is responsible for keeping in touch with a number of university departments of Political Science in his or her area). All the responses being positive, the Chairman proceeded to recommend this action to the Board meeting held in Ottawa on October 14th and 15th. At the suggestion of a number of members of the Committee, the proposal was for more than just the CPSA Core - the idea was to add a number of questions to this which might be suggested by various members of the Committee, and to add as well a small number of questions which might be suggested by any peculiarities in the campaign or the results of the election itself.

The Board accepted this recommendation (although not unanimously) and appointed the President of the Association and the Chairman of the Committee to make the application in the name of the Association. On October 15th the Chairman wrote to each member of the Committee, informing them of this development, and soliciting their aid in the construction of the questionnaire. At the same time, the Chairman of the Committee and the Secretary of the Association sought advice from a number of quarters as to the best way to proceed so as to ensure the success of the application and therefore the preservation of the data collection and the time series.

These investigations made it clear that a proposal merely to administer the Core Questionnaire was unlikely to receive support unless it was part of a proper research proposal. Laponce and Wilson therefore proceeded to put such a proposal together, with a very great deal of help by way of suggestion from a number of members of the Committee. The final draft of the questionnaire was completed on November 4th, and was submitted to the Canada Council on November 8th. The Council's decision will be made at its regular meeting on November 30th.

If the grant is made the study will go in to the field in January and the data will be available in machine-readable form to all interested users by the beginning of May. We believe that the proposal is a thoroughly respectable one, although we have asked the Council not to consider it if in the meantime it receives another proposal from some other source. The proposal which has been made represents an attempt to investigate a specific aspect of Canadian electoral behaviour - namely the regional variation which seems to have become a customary part of the process of Canadian politics - and in so doing collects data on a number of different phenomena which appear to be the principal concerns of most (if not all) scholars presently working in the field.

Since the Canada Council was not terribly anxious to receive an application from the Association, the proposal has been made in the name of Laponce and Wilson, although it has been made clear to the Council that we are doing it on behalf of the Association and because it appeared that no other proposal was to be forthcoming.

All members of the profession will naturally be concerned about the implications these developments have for the future. Now that the Committee has discharged the task assigned to it in respect of the 1972 election it will be possible for it to turn to its main purpose - the discovery of the most viable path for the future. In the meantime, however, interested members may wish to have a closer look at the application to study the 1972 election, and the proposed questionnaire. To that end copies of it have been given to each member of the Committee, and inquiries should be directed to the relevant person in each area, as follows:

In British Columbia - Don Blake (UBC)	In Alberta - David Elton (Lethbridge)
In Saskatchewan - Duff Spafford (Saskatoon)	In Manitoba - Paul Thomas (Manitoba)
Windsor, Western - Larry LeDuc (Windsor)	Brock, McMaster - H. Jacek (McMaster)
Guelph, Waterloo, WLU - J.Surich (Waterloo)	Carleton, Trent - J.Pammatt (Carleton)
Ryerson, Toronto, York - R.Drummond (York)	Ottawa, Laurentian - A.Blais(Ottawa)
Lakehead, Queen's, RMC - W.Irvine (Queen's)	In the U. S. - P.Regenstreif(Rochester)
Montreal, UQAM, Sherbrooke - D. Latouche (UQAM)	
McGill, Loyola, Sir George Williams, Bishop's - Michael Stein (McGill)	
Moncton, Laval, ENAP, Chicoutimi, Rimouski, UQTR - Vincent Lemieux (Laval)	
Atlantic Provinces (except Moncton) - Susan McCorquodale (Memorial)	

John Wilson

At the 1972 Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, a panel was held on the teaching of political science in the English-language community colleges in Canada. Following this meeting, the CPSA set up a committee to look into this question. In order to generally inform people about the state of political science in the community colleges, we are publishing here a copy of the report made on the panel as well as a report on the work of the CPSA Committee.

REPORT FOR CPSA ON SESSION AT ANNUAL MEETING WITH
REPRESENTATIVES FROM REGIONAL (JUNIOR) COLLEGES

1. **R e p r e s e n t a t i o n :** The session was attended by representatives from no more than four or five Ontario colleges. There was no one in attendance from any other province apart from Roger Elms and Martin Toren from B. C., and an Anglophone faculty member from CEGEP in Sherbrooke.

This indicates that the CPSA has little contact with the colleges, that this is particularly true with those outside Ontario, that individuals teaching political science in the colleges do not see themselves as being political scientists and that, accordingly, the annual meeting of the association is outside their area of interest. (How many college libraries subscribe to the journal, how many college faculty are members or subscribe?) Apropos the CEGEP, I suspect that the faculty at these institutions would view the CPSA as an Anglophone association and would be more likely to be involved with the Société.

2. One area of major concern that came up repeatedly at the seminar related to the nature of political science at the colleges. It seemed fairly clear that the faculty had little independence within their discipline, that Deans tended to exercise fairly specific curriculum control and that political science could be interpreted as anything from social studies to social science to civics. Part of the problem stems from the faculty teaching the subject being either inadequately qualified--i.e. not political scientists in any useful sense of the term--or being only partially in political science, i.e. being trained as political scientists but teaching courses in other subject areas as well. This raises fairly serious problems about course content and the quality of instruction in the discipline.
3. A second area of concern related to working conditions. Colleges, it appears, tend to function, at least in their early stages, as extensions of high-schools and, accordingly, the teaching staff are viewed primarily as teachers and not as scholars. College administration, do not therefore see any great need to provide their faculty with time for research or study beyond the usual summer period. The teaching load is equivalent to High School teaching loads and not

in any way to the university teaching load. The potential for a teacher of political science in a college in such circumstances to pursue any line of scholarly endeavor or to simply maintain some contact with the discipline is sharply limited.

4. It also emerged that there is a clear difference in philosophy between the colleges in at least two of the provinces--British Columbia and Ontario. The Ontario colleges operate on the premise that their students are not contemplating subsequent transfer to a university, and, indeed, they do not make provision for such transfer. The college is clearly an alternative to university post-secondary education and not an alternative route to university post secondary education. In British Columbia, this is not the case. Although the regional colleges there were established in the anticipation that for the most part, students would enroll in essentially conventional programmes with only a small number taking the "university transfer" programmes offered, the opposite has occurred. Depending on the college, up to 80% of the enrollment (and in no college less than 40%) is enrolled in the university transfer programme which, in effect, provides the first two years of university. Unfortunately, faculty members teaching the transfer programme do not have the advantages of time or library facilities which their colleagues teaching in the universities enjoy.
5. If the CPSA is in some ignorance of the state of the discipline in the colleges across the land, the teachers of political science in these colleges are equally ignorant of the state of the discipline in their sister institutions. Political scientists in the colleges tend to function in isolation from their colleagues in other colleges and in the universities. There seems to be little sharing of information about course content, text-books, working conditions and the like.

R e c o m m e n d a t i o n s

1. An inventory of political science courses and programmes at the post secondary level and of individuals teaching such courses. If only to promote the sales of the journal--and increase membership--the CPSA should be aware of who and where in political science in Canada.
2. The Association should officially contact individuals teaching the discipline at the post-secondary level at least to indicate the existence of a professional association and thereby enhance their awareness of the discipline to that extent.
3. The Association should include a session or two on the discipline in the colleges at the next annual meeting and send invitations to all those teaching political science in the colleges. One such session should deal specifically with the question of the relation of the CPSA to political scientists in the colleges.
4. The Association should produce a brief outline of the nature and role of junior colleges in each of the provinces as a means of indicating the differences that exist such as that between British Columbia and Ontario.
5. The executive should consider the extent to which the CPSA has any responsibility for the state of the discipline in colleges with regard to teaching load, library facilities, provision for study leave and the like.

6. The executive should consider the extent to which the CPSA has any responsibility regarding the teaching of political science at the secondary level and whether similar efforts should be made to encourage high school political scientists to join the association.

The arrival on the scene of the regional/junior colleges raises some fairly significant questions for the Association. Hitherto, the CPSA has been a professional association that existed primarily to publish the papers of its members and others in the discipline and provide an annual occasion for the exchange of ideas and gossip. Its role in the promotion and protection of the discipline has been negligible. It may be that there is no proper role for the association in this latter area since it involves a kind of accreditation process. Yet it is clear that on one level at least, professional political scientists have obvious interest in the maintenance of standards of accuracy, integrity and excellence in the discipline. Whether this extends beyond providing a forum for the exchange and criticism of ideas and research is an open question; it is one, nevertheless, that is fairly immediate given the developments in post-secondary education in Canada. Whether the present laissez faire attitude remains appropriate is a question which the executive and the association should confront without delay.

September 20, 1972.

W. D. Young,
University of British Columbia.

