

The Canadian Political Science Association/Association canadienne de Science politique et/and La Société québécoise de Science politique.



RETURN ADDRESS:

The Canadian Political Science Association, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, K1S 5B6

CONTENTS / CONTENU

On the Front Burner / du bureau du Secrétaire-Trésorier ACSP.....p.1...
Annual Reports / Rapports annuels.....p.2...
Constitution CPSA/ACSP.....p.15..
Aupres de l'Association / At the CPSA
 AGM Minutes / Procès verbal, RGA 1981.....p.24..
 Essex.....p.24
 Africa Workshop / Atelier en Afrique, autre.....p.28
 Levy Award.....p.28
Abstracts/Resumes.....p.23.. Vacancies/postes vacants.p.31
Community news/de la Communauté..p.28.. Letters/lettres.....p.27..

ON THE FRONT BURNER /
DU SECRETAIRE-TRESORIER DE L'ACSP

I would like to take this opportunity to welcome all of our members and guests to the 54th Annual Meeting of our Association. We note that this year's programme involves in direct programme participation, some 350 of you in the nearly 85 sessions of a rich and varied programme. We would urge that your first act upon receipt of this newsletter would be to sit down in a quiet corner and read

most particularly the section of the President's report (page 4ff.) which deals with the issue of SSFC membership. I recommend to you most highly the summary that you will find there and urge you to consider it and discuss it among yourselves or with Board members before proceeding to the vote that faces you on Tuesday afternoon at the Annual General Meeting.

PUBLISHERS/EDITEURS: The Canadian Political Science Association/Association canadienne de Science politique and/et La Société québécoise de Science politique; Co-Editors/Co-directeurs: CPSA/ACSP: V. Seymour Wilson, Canadian Political Science Association, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario K1S 5B6 Telephone: 1-613-231-7160; SqSp: Michel de la Durantaye, Département de Science politique, Université d'Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario K1N 6N5 Téléphone: 1-613-231-3350.

ANNUAL REPORTS / RAPPORTS ANNUELS

PRESIDENT'S REPORT / RAPPORT DU PRESIDENT

DENIS STAIRS (DALHOUSIE)

1. General

Although cynics (in a bad year) might find evidence to contest the point, the purpose of the CPSA is to promote the study of politics, not the practice of politics. On occasion, no doubt, the two are confused and brawls break out. But from the point of view of our internal affairs, 1981-82 has been a good year, and the cynics have had a thin time.

Your Board of Directors held three meetings, and your Executive, four. The Board has been unusually conscientious in subjecting its own behaviour to self-criticism—so much so that last spring it charged Susan McCorquodale with the task of collating, with a critical eye, all the resolutions passed by CPSA Directors over the preceding ten years. This initiative took courage, for there was genuine fear that her investigations would reveal patterns of erratic decision-making, uncover commitments honestly made but never met, and cause the professor herself to experience repeated attacks of *déjà-vu*. It is a pleasure, therefore, to report that her review of motions, presented at our November meeting, demonstrated that your Directors have been neither inconsistent nor repetitious in their successive acts of collective will, and that the Association displays an admirable "group-memory". It would be pleasant to attribute this to the favour of divine guidance, or even to solid homework, but the credit must actually go to our Administrator, Joan Pond, who does so much to protect us from ourselves.

Members of the Association who have a keen eye for damage wrought by inflation and other financial diseases will notice that we end our fiscal year with a modest deficit. The details are in the report of the Secretary-Treasurer, but it should be observed that, in the short term, at least, the situation is not appropriate cause for either financial or emotional depression. More specifically, we expect the deficit to be relieved by effects of the new fee schedule authorized at the 1981 Annual General Meeting.

Broadly speaking, your Executive and Board have been concerned in 1981-82 more with external, than with internal, affairs. To the extent that agendas are defined by problems, this circumstance pays tribute to the sanity of mind and generosity of spirit of our own membership, but it may suggest a somewhat less flattering portrait of the external environment with which we must deal. At the behest largely of government, in any case, that environment has been changing. In particular, there have been major adjustments—actual and threatened—to both the tenor and substance of government policies affecting higher education and research, and these have significantly influenced the programmes and priorities of the SSHRCC, have substantially altered our own recommended position in relation to the Social Sciences Federation, and may eventually have a profound impact on the character of our Journal, on the conduct of our academic conferences and workshops, and on many of our other scholarly pursuits, both inside and outside the Association. The

issues involved promise to be with us for some time, and some of them will be evident in the discussion of other items in this report.

2. Canadian Journal of Political Science

John Courtney and Duff Spafford assumed on schedule their responsibilities as English Co-Editor and Assistant Editor, respectively, of the Journal, and with David Smith in charge of book reviews, the editorial function on the anglophone side is now almost entirely in the secure and capable care of prairie intellectuals. With the help of John McMenemy, who daily demonstrates his indispensability as Managing Editor on location at W.L.U., the transfer of authority from Kal Holsti and Don Blake at U.B.C. was smoothly accomplished, and the Journal continues to display its customary high standard of scholarship.

Thanks are also due to Denis Monière, who retired as francophone Co-Editor early in 1982. The ScSp arranged for him to be succeeded by Jean Crête, who had previously been assistant editor with responsibility for reviews of French-language books. Jean has been replaced in his former position by Graciela Ducatenzeiler of the University of Montreal.

The Journal, of course, is the product of much labour from many minds—contributors, assessors, reviewers, members of the Editorial Advisory Board—but the task of these various members of the Editorial Board is particularly difficult and onerous. More than other members of the Association, they are responsible for safeguarding the standards of our scholarship, and for representing them to the academic community at home and abroad. We owe all our editors—those who have retired, and those who have succeeded them alike—a professional debt we can never hope to repay.

But if the editorial fortunes of the Journal go well, it may shortly face on another front a challenge of a different kind. Some time ago, the SSHRCC, from which we obtain a substantial grant in support of the Journal's publication, established a committee under the chairmanship of Paul Park to review its programmes in aid of scholarly publishing. The impetus for the review came partly from the unprecedented increases in the cost of book and periodical publication which have become so evident in the past few years, and partly from the proliferation in the number of journals actually being published. The effect of both these developments has been to intensify the demands currently being placed on the Council's limited aid-to-publications budget.

By the summer of 1981 there were indications that the Park Committee would be recommending that at least a portion of the Council's resources be allocated to the funding of alternative methods of scholarly communication (microfiche, and the like), in the hope that this would encourage the academic community to move away from its traditional reliance on conventional journals. In an effort to exert some influence on the Committee, the SSFC in the autumn organized a meeting in Toronto between

various journal representatives and members of the Committee. Our own Association was represented by one of its former co-editors, Paul Fox, and by Fred Fletcher, who had served several years ago on our Ad Hoc Committee on Publications, and was familiar with the advantages and limitations of some of the new technologies.

The meeting appears to have produced a number of useful exchanges, and in November your Board authorized the Secretary-Treasurer to send a letter of concern to members of the SSHRCC Council and of the Park Committee, indicating that the Association was anxious to cooperate as much as possible in achieving economies in the scholarly publication field, but urging that changes in aid-to-publications policy not be introduced until the financial implications of the new technologies had been fully examined, and until academic editors had had an opportunity to comment on such proposals as the Committee might generate.

The Committee's report was subsequently presented to Council in March, but action has been postponed pending a response to its recommendations from the academic community. This has provided our Association and others with a short breathing space in which to consider the matter further, but it seems improbable that the Council will support traditional academic journals like our own, at current rates, indefinitely into the future if, as seems likely, costs continue to increase and the number of periodicals continues to expand, while the resources available for the support of publishing do not significantly grow. It follows that we may eventually face greater-than-normal fee increases if we are to maintain the Journal in its present elegant form. Certainly the issue will reappear again on our agenda.

3. The Bulletin

Members will have noticed that the Bulletin has appeared this year in a new and more durable format. This is the result largely of the dedication of our Secretary-Treasurer, Vince Wilson and our Ottawa staff, who very generously agreed to add the Bulletin's editorship to their other intricate and time-consuming duties. The teething problems caused by technical changes in the production process last year have been largely overcome, and we expect now to publish regularly on schedule. The Bulletin depends very heavily, of course, on submissions of copy from individuals as well as Departments, and we hope that members will make full use of it as a vehicle for communicating information to their colleagues in the discipline.

It is with some distress that I must also report, however, that the ScSp indicated last June that the Bulletin was not fulfilling the needs of the Société, which has its own instruments for the internal communication of professional news, and that it would therefore like to withdraw from what the Protocol between the two associations identifies as a joint publication. The Société's representatives on the Liaison Committee very kindly agreed to withhold final judgment until Vince Wilson had had an opportunity to undertake his revamping of the format, but we were advised again earlier this year that the improvements he had introduced were not sufficient to change their minds, and they have therefore withdrawn from their participation.

Our understanding is that the Société would prefer a Bulletin that was geared less to the conveyance of "straight" professional news, and more to the publication of commentaries on various intellectual, professional, and public policy issues. To some extent, the difference of conception between the two organizations may reflect the greater availability in English-speaking Canada of

alternative outlets for this sort of article, together with the fact that the wider physical dispersion of the anglophone political science community leads to a somewhat greater need for a formal mechanism to distribute professional information. In any event, the CPSA position has not been opposed in principle to the publication of commentaries, and within practicable limits, space is available for this purpose provided only that expressions of opinion are clearly identified as personal to the author. Your Executive also believes, however, that a properly managed publication of this kind would require substantially more editorial, administrative and financial resources than our already overburdened head office would be able to provide.

4. The Programme Committee

If the Programme Committee has had problems this year, your Executive and Board have been blissfully unaware of them. The members of the Committee, as we all know, perform one of the Association's most important functions, and their willingness to serve leads to a merciless exploitation of their time and energy. We are exceedingly grateful to them all, and particularly to that well-known glutton for punishment, Fred Fletcher, who has so inobtrusively guided the Committee's activities from the Chair, and who continues to serve the Association in so many other ways.

As a close observer of Herman Bakvis at work last year, I know what it takes to be the on-site anchor for our annual visitations, and I would therefore like to express particular thanks also to Clinton Archibald, who has acted as our liaison at the University of Ottawa.

5. The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada

The support of the SSHRCC continues to be a vital factor in sustaining our operations, and we are grateful to its officers for the time and attention they give to our affairs. The task of allocating administrative grants to social science societies has been delegated by the Council to the SSFC, and as the report of the Secretary-Treasurer reveals, we have continued to do well under the Federation's formula. Funding for the Journal has been maintained on the basis of the reduced projections of which we were advised by the Council some years ago. On the other hand, we have received slightly expanded funding for fellowships for the Essex Summer School, and this has enabled us to maintain the number of fellows at three, in spite of rapidly increasing costs. The high reputation of the Parliamentary Internships Programme has led to its receiving another grant again this year, and the fund in support of travel to our annual meeting was renewed in the usual way through the Federation. In addition, the Council provided substantial support for the India Workshop held last August.

It is clear from the foregoing that the SSHRCC has continued to respond very generously to the needs and proposals of our Association. At the same time, however, a number of the Council's policy initiatives have attracted the attention of your Board over the past year, many of them ultimately reflecting the funding priorities of the federal government, to which Walter Young referred in his report last spring. These have since been discussed quite widely in the press and elsewhere, and have included a substantial decline, in relative terms, in government funding for independent research in the social sciences and humanities. This phenomenon has not been peculiar to Canada, and in many ways we have been treated much more generously than our counterparts abroad. Nonetheless, one of the consequences of our comparative lack of resources, when coupled with the accelerating cost of academic publication, was the Report of the Park Committee, already

discussed. Another was the SSHRCC's decision some time ago to allocate a small proportion of its resources to research in areas which, after consultation with various academic bodies, could be defined as "strategic".

Since this had become established Council policy, the SSFC last year took the position that it should cooperate with the SSHRCC in the process of identifying themes suitable for special "strategic" attention. Member associations were asked to strike committees that would participate in the consultative proceedings required. The issue was controversial, however, since many members of the scholarly community felt that the "strategic grants" policy threatened the very principle of free and independent research, and ought for this and other reasons to be regarded with suspicion, and treated, at best, with circumspect care. Your Board—concerned as much with the role played in this by the SSFC as with the policies of the Council itself—responded by requesting that our own Committee be guided by a concern about the unusual weight the SSHRCC had been giving to strategic grants, and by the Board's own re-affirmation of the central importance of independent research conducted by independent scholars.

The Executive subsequently appointed a Committee composed of Alan Cairns, who had recently seen service on the Council's Academic Panel, Michael Atkinson, as a representative of the Board, and Vince Wilson, who was in the best position to keep track of the flow of information in Ottawa and hence to act in the Chair. The Committee has been performing "watchdog" functions, and will continue to supply the Board with information and advice on developments as they occur, both in the Federation and in the Council.

In the meantime, however, the "strategic grants" issue, which reflected an important question of principle but only about 5% of the Council's budget, was to some extent eclipsed by a new funding initiative of much more substantial proportions. Facing a situation in which its existing five-year programme was being turned aside by the Cabinet, and in which its budget was rapidly losing ground relative to those of MRC and NSERC, it determined after careful inquiry that its only hope of maintaining its position and securing additional resources would be to advance a proposal for the funding of research that would coincide with the priorities identified in the government's "social development" envelope. The result was a request to the government for several millions of dollars in additional resources, on the understanding that these would be allocated for research and related activities falling generally within the area of "Canadian studies". The existing programmes of the Council would not be directly affected.

The Canadian Federation of the Humanities and the Social Sciences Federation both became aware of this initiative during the summer, and began consultations with their member associations. It was difficult for your President to take part in these proceedings, since I had been appointed to the SSHRCC Council in the spring. Ed Black therefore kindly agreed to act in my place for the PSA. The eventual result was a Federation decision to give quiet support to the SSHRCC initiative on the general ground that this was the best available course of action in the circumstances, even if the dirigiste character of the proposal itself was distasteful. (The CFH in the meantime took the view that it could not actively support the Council's proposal, although it would not attempt to lobby against it.) Although troubled by what many Directors regarded as a further extension of the premises underlying the Council's original policy in support of "strategic" grants, your Board at its November meeting endorsed the Federation's position as a reasonable response to generally melancholy circumstances.

The eventual result was a substantial increase in the SSHRCC budget for a three-year period. Both your Board and the Federation, of course, will be watching the administration of these funds very carefully with a view to assessing their impact on the research community, and to encouraging as liberal an interpretation as possible of the "Canadian studies" guidelines. It should be understood, however, that the issue of principle, as well as of substance, will arise again as the Council responds to the need to forecast, and to bargain for, its budget requirements farther into the future.

6. The Social Sciences Federation of Canada

The various issues arising from the activities of the SSHRCC, when taken in conjunction with government initiatives in connection with manpower training policy and federal-provincial discussions of EPF, have had a significant effect on the position of a majority of your Directors in relation to the SSFC. Members of the Association will recall that a resolution was passed by last year's AGM which authorized the withholding of our membership fees for the second year running, and that the Board then gave notice of a motion to be presented at the 1982 meeting calling for our formal withdrawal from the Federation. As will become clear later in these proceedings, the present recommendation of the Board is that this motion be defeated, and that we retain our membership and pay our outstanding dues. This position obviously represents a reversal of our advice last year, and it reflects a decision taken by a narrow majority. It has been agreed that Directors who wish to speak for those who are opposed to the Board's new position should feel free to do so.

Before considering the reasons for the Board's volte-face on this issue, members should be aware of the arrangements that were made during the course of the year for CPSA representation on Federation bodies. André Blais and John McMenemy very kindly agreed to represent the Association in the SSFC Assembly. They succeeded Condé Grondin and O.P. Dwivedi, who had been manning their posts through a difficult period last year when Bill Badour was challenging the SSFC with his clear and effective statements of our concerns, and to all these we owe a very considerable vote of thanks. Given the seriousness of our disagreement with the Federation as a whole, and the need for close liaison with our own Executive and Board, it was thought advisable that the Association be represented on the Federation Board this year by the President. As already explained, this later caused a personal difficulty in that the Federation became embroiled in discussions of how to respond to the new initiatives of the SSHRCC, of which I was also a member. Since the issue was considered largely within the SSFC's Internal Communications Committee, however, the problem was resolved when Ed Black agreed to act for the Association in that context. In addition, the Board's elected member-at-large on the Executive, Rianne Mahon, agreed in the wake of the Board's change of position at its November meeting to keep a particularly close watch on SSFC activities from her vantage point in Ottawa. I retained my own seat on the Federation Board until early April, when consideration of SSFC affairs in the SSHRCC made my continued participation in both bodies impossible, and Ed Black was dragooned to take my place.

Your Board reached its decision to recommend the retention of our membership in the Federation only after prolonged and careful debate at its November meeting. The concerns that has been expressed in a series of discussions and reports that began in the Association as long ago as 1979—were expressed once again in the Board's debate. They included, for example, complaints that the Federation had become a bureaucracy out of touch with its

constituents; that it cost too much; that it was addicted to make-work projects, including a ceaseless round of not-very-useful conferences; that it had been diverted from its primary function as a lobbyist in support of the social sciences; that it had become the captive of the SSHRCC (which ought to be its principal target of opportunity); that it was prone to burying itself and its constituents in reams of self-serving memoranda, most of them coached in a mindless gobbledegook of abstract objectives; that it wished to grow for the sake of growing; that it exploited its position in the interstices of the organizations of academia and government to elude the requirements of genuine accountability; and that in the end it was totally impervious to criticism. Nonetheless, at the end of the discussion the majority came to the conclusion that our interests would be better served if we were to retain our membership, and in so doing take a more active and aggressive role in the Federation's internal affairs. Different Directors were naturally influenced by different considerations, but among the latter were the following:

- (1) The Federation had demonstrated considerable utility in recent months as a vehicle for the expression of academic interests, including our own. The initiatives it had taken in relation to the Park Committee and the SSHRCC's new funding drive, discussed elsewhere in this report, were cases in point.
- (2) The developing tone of discussions in Ottawa bearing on a number of areas of public policy related to academic matters suggested that this was a bad time to contribute to an impression that the scholarly community was divided or in disarray.
- (3) Even where the Federation could not be counted as successful, and even where it took positions of which our Association might not approve, it nonetheless had established its usefulness as a source of information on developments in Ottawa that were potentially relevant to our concerns. The need for such information extended, of course, to the requirement that we be knowledgeable about the activities of the Federation itself.
- (4) It had become clear that such other associations as had expressed dissatisfaction with the SSFC's operations—notably the historians and the economists—were unlikely to carry their protests to the point of withdrawing their memberships. If we were to act, it would be to act alone.
- (5) There was encouraging evidence, particularly under the initiative of the current SSFC President, Gilles Paquet, that the Federation was beginning at last to respond to constituency complaints. Paquet was particularly energetic in his attempt to maintain continuous contact by discussing important issues with members of the various association executives as they arose.
- (6) On one or two occasions, vigorous interventions by the CPSA had had an effect on Federation policies, and there were indications that a more active involvement in SSFC affairs could from time to time have a usefully moderating effect.
- (7) Although this concern was not widely shared, some Directors also felt that the increased role played by the Federation in the distribution of SSHRCC administrative grants made it important for the Association to maintain its participation in the processes by which financial allocation decisions were made.

Ultimately, one's position on a matter of this kind reduces to a "judgment call", and the intangible character of the various considerations involved made it especially

difficult for your Directors to reach a firm conclusion. The element of uncertainty may itself have contributed to the view of the majority that we ought to avoid precipitate action. Members will be asked later in this meeting, of course, to respond to the Board's recommendation, and reach a final decision on the issue.

7. Relations with La Société québécoise de Science politique

La Société has continued to function this year under the energetic presidency of Paul Painchaud, and has embarked on a number of important new ventures, including the publication of a journal entitled Politique, the first issue of which appeared earlier this year. Our Liaison Committee held an excellent meeting at Dorval last summer, and while we have experienced some difficulty in scheduling additional meetings since then, there has been a steady exchange of correspondence, and in December I was able to meet informally with members of the Société's executive in Montreal.

During the course of the year, a number of policy issues have arisen between the two organizations. The Société's withdrawal from its participation in the joint publication of the Bulletin has already been mentioned, and we have discovered that the policies of the associations differ in relation to such matters as the administration of joint workshops. Practical difficulties arising from the need for constant coordination in the management of a variety of administrative tasks have also tended to increase the burden of our Secretary-Treasurer, and the results have not always been satisfactory from the point of view of the SCSp, whose officers naturally feel accountable to their own members. Late last autumn, moreover, the Société raised the possibility of our undertaking a joint legal incorporation of the Journal/Revue, which would allow it to be managed by an independent board composed of representatives of the two associations, and which would make it possible to separate its financial affairs from the general financial administration of both the CPSA and the SCSp.

This proposal seemed to your Board to raise a number of complex legal and administrative issues. It was therefore decided to initiate a full examination of the implications, and a committee chaired by Paul Fox, and including Ed Black and Vince Wilson, was appointed for this purpose. Since the proposal appeared to have a bearing on the Protocol, and since a number of other important issues, including that of the Bulletin, were already on the agenda of relations between the two associations, the Committee was also authorized to comment as it saw fit on the general suitability of the Protocol in its current form. At the time of writing this report, the Committee is still at work, but it seems probable that adjustments will be required as relations between our two associations mature.

8. Chairpersons' "State of the Art" Seminar

The annual meeting of department chairpersons, designed to review developments in the discipline and related matters of professional interest, was held this year at Simon Fraser University, where Quei Quo was kind enough to see that we were magnificently treated, and to ensure that it did not rain. These meetings are of enormous value in disseminating a general awareness of the conditions of Political Science in Canada, and they also produce important comparative data on such matters as course enrolments (thanks again this year to Michael Stein), teaching loads (Steve Wolinetz), the requirements of graduate programmes in various departments across the country (Yvan Gagnon), and job vacancies (everyone).

On the combined invitation of Queen's and R.M.C., the

seminar will be held next year in Kingston, and it now seems probable that some funding in support of travel will be made available by the SSHRCC upon request by the Social Science Federation.

9. Parliamentary Internships Programme

The P.I.P. has been described by Canadian parliamentarians who are familiar with legislatures abroad as the best programme of its kind in the western world, and it continues to be directed in the most able fashion by Bob Jackson at Carleton. As reported elsewhere, the SSHRCC has again made a financial contribution to its operations, and Bob has displayed his capacity once more for attracting generous donations from the Canadian Life and Health Insurance Association and other members of the business community. Without this assistance, the programme could not be sustained.

This year we invited the Interns to join the Board of Directors for dinner at the time of our November meeting, and I feel bound to report that our guests frequently outshone their hosts. This may not be regarded as a particularly generous compliment, but there can be no question that the calibre of those who are accepted into the Programme is very high.

10. Ontario Legislative Internships Programme

The Directorship of the Ontario programme was assumed last summer by the indefatigable Fred Fletcher, and it, too, remains one of our most successful activities. The esteem of the Ontario Legislature has been tangibly reflected in a substantial increase in its financial support, and there is every indication that the programme will continue to prosper. We owe Fred an enormous debt for adding this to the many other onerous burdens he carries on our behalf.

11. Workshops

The demand for Canadian participation in international workshops has increased quite noticeably over the past two years. Funding has been pursued for a joint CPSA-ScSp workshop with the ECPR (Committee: Bill Irvine, CPSA Ch., Herman Bakvis, Jeanne Laux, André Liebich, and Charles Pentland), and preparations are well advanced for a workshop with political scientists from Africa (Tim Shaw, Peter Aucoin, and Herman Bakvis). Bill Chandler is in the process of following up on an inquiry from West Germany, and the ScSp has proposed that we join it in arranging a conference with political scientists from the Soviet Union. There has also been discussion from time to time of organizing workshops with Yugoslavia and with the People's Republic of China, although at the moment both these proposals appear to be somewhat inactive.

This increase in activity has led your Board to the conclusion that we should introduce a somewhat more systematic process for establishing a coherent workshop policy and for determining our priorities. While most of the organizational preparations involved are undertaken by the administering committees, a considerable head office effort is nonetheless required, and our resources are limited. Moreover, there has been a tendency for our counterparts abroad to focus their interest primarily on the problems of Canadian federalism, and over time this could have the effect of over-working the field. We would like in any case to make these opportunities for international contact available to as wide a variety of specialists in our membership as possible. With these considerations in mind, therefore, it was agreed that we would establish a Standing Committee on Workshops, which is currently composed of Audrey Doerr, Paul Tennant, and Walter Young (Ch.), and workshop proposals are now routed

to this Committee for preliminary consideration.

One of the reasons for the heightened interest in these activities, of course, has been the success of workshops in the past. The India Workshop held last August was a case in point, and the reports we received from both the Canadian and Indian participants indicate that it was an enormously useful and stimulating experience—so much so that there is a probability that an attempt will be made to arrange a return-engagement sometime in the near future. The transnational arrangements required for an enterprise of this kind, needless to say, are intricate and complex, and the Association is greatly indebted to M.V. Naidu for devoting so much of his time and energy to organizing what was obviously an important intellectual encounter.

12. UNESCO

Guy Gosselin has represented the CPSA on the Canadian Commission for UNESCO with such great care over the past few years that the Executive has asked him to serve another three-year term. The degree to which the Association is sustained by the efforts of exploited volunteers is quite extraordinary, as Guy's representational activity on our behalf clearly demonstrates.

13. Committee on the Status of Women

Since some years had elapsed since our last examination of the status of women in the profession, the Board requested at its May meeting that a Committee be established to conduct a new analysis. Caroline Andrew, Janine Brodie (Ch.), and David Rayside subsequently agreed to serve the Chair. The Board received a preliminary report in November, and the final one reached the Board for its June deliberations June meetings.

14. Essex Summer School in Data Analysis and Collection

As reported elsewhere, the SSHRCC this year increased its support for this programme, and competition for the three available fellowships has been unusually intense. The Selection Committee has been composed of Bill Irvine, Richard Simeon, and Robert Hackett (who attended Essex on one of our fellowships in 1981). The large number of impressive and highly qualified applicants has made the Committee's task particularly difficult, and we are greatly indebted to its members for the care they have taken in fulfilling an arduous responsibility.

15. International Political Science Association

The IPSA Congress will be held this summer in Rio de Janeiro, which makes it an expensive trip for Canadians. The CPSA, however will have excellent representation in Don Rowat, Lloyd Brown-John, O.P. Dwivedi, Ed Black, André Vachet and Vincent Lemieux, the latter two named by La Société.

16. Conclusion

This has been a long report, which no doubt results from its author's garrulous lack of discipline. But it also reflects the breadth and intensity of our activities, and the vitality and initiative of our members. Many of these who have been responsible for contributing their time and talent to our various operations have already been mentioned, and the names of many more will appear in other reports. I would like to extend my personal thanks to the members of this year's Nominating Committee—Tom Flanagan, Réjean Landry, and Larry LeDuc—for performing a difficult task with sophistication and skill, and I know the membership will want me to express our gratitude to Murray Beck for so conscientiously representing the

