

PSCI 461/661 (Fall 2012)
Canadian National Politics
University of Waterloo

Term: Fall 2012
Class Time: Th 1:30-4:20 in RCH 106
Format: Seminar
Office Hours: Tuesday 1-3pm
(or by appointment)

Instructor: Dr. Anna Esselment
Office: 304 Hagey Hall
Phone: 519.888.4567 ext.32190
Email: alesselm@uwaterloo.ca

Plagiarism detection software (*Turnitin*) may be used to screen assignments in this course. This is being done to verify that use of all materials and sources in assignments is documented. Students will be given an option if they do not want to have their assignment screened by Turnitin. In the first week of the term, details will be provided about arrangements and alternatives for the use of Turnitin in this course.

Prerequisite: PSCI 260

Course Description

The state of democracy in Canada is a popular subject for students and scholars alike. Is our democracy stable? Deepening? Eroding? Why all this talk about a democratic deficit? What does that mean? This course aims to provide an in-depth analysis of different “issues” related to democracy in Canada. Through the readings and seminar discussions, the course will provide the student with a better understanding of democracy within Canada’s parliamentary institutions. Topics of examination include, among others, the democratic deficit, the House of Commons, the Senate, political parties, electoral systems, prime-ministerial power, and direct democracy.

Required Readings

Aucoin, P., Jarvis, Mark D., & Turnbull, Lori. 2011. *Democratizing the constitution: Reforming responsible government*. Toronto: Emond Montgomery. Available at the bookstore.

Readings that are accessible online through the UW library are indicated in the seminar schedule below. There are also course reserves – these are readings on reserve at the Dana Porter Library and this will be indicated on the seminar schedule. All loans are for 2 hours – enough time to photocopy the relevant reading and return the book for your fellow students to do the same.

Format

This is a seminar course. Students are expected to attend all seminars, to do the readings each week and to participate actively in class discussions. Seminar classes only work where students are prepared for class, and willing to share and learn from each other.

Evaluation (Undergraduate)

Participation 20%

Presentation 25%

Critical Comment Papers 20%

Research Essay 35%

- Essay topic to be approved by October 18, 2012
- Essay due in last seminar of class November 29, 2012

Evaluation (Graduate)

Participation 25%

Presentation 20%

Critical Comment Papers 25%

Research Essay 30%

- Essay topic to be approved by October 18, 2012
- Essay due in last seminar of class November 29, 2012

Course Website

The course outline, detailed assignments, class announcements, grades, etc. will be available on the course website on LEARN. Users can login to LEARN via: <http://learn.uwaterloo.ca/>. Use your WatIAM/Quest username and password.

Participation

Participation grades are based on participation in each week's class discussion. It is expected that students will attend seminars having completed all of the required readings. Participation grades will reflect whether a student's contribution to class discussions demonstrates a familiarity with, and understanding of, these readings. While each student should participate frequently in discussions, the *quality* of the contribution is more important than quantity. Students are encouraged to come to class with prepared discussion questions to pose to the class.

Positively Evaluated: Responding to others' remarks or questions in a serious and thoughtful manner; drawing together ideas to create new ones; showing respect and interest for other arguments and points of view; engaging others in pertinent and informed dialogue; curiosity in the origin of other points of view; wit and insight.

Negatively Evaluated: The domination of class discussion by means of volume, tone, or sarcasm; 100% speaking or 100% listening with little attempt to balance both; refusal to acknowledge other points of view; not listening or appearing to listen; intemperate interruptions; uninformed or glib answers, including just general opinion; lack of weekly preparation.

Presentation

The course will be structured around student presentations. Each student will be responsible for making a 25-minute presentation on two or more of the assigned readings (depending on class size). The purpose of the presentation is not to simply summarize the readings but to outline and critically evaluate the main arguments and ideas addressed. The student should have prepared questions to pose to the class about the reading in order to

facilitate discussion. A summary of the main arguments from the readings and potential questions should be sent to the class (via the professor who will post them on LEARN) at least three days before our meeting to help focus discussions.

Critical Comment Papers

Undergraduate students are expected to submit three comment papers throughout the term. Graduate students are expected to submit five critical comment papers. Each paper will be approximately four to five pages in length and will examine one (or more) of the week's readings. **These papers must be handed in before the class in which the reading(s) in question are to be discussed (i.e. 1:30pm).** The purpose of the comment paper is NOT to summarize the readings but instead to briefly discuss one or two major points addressed by the author(s), to identify important questions or issues raised by the author(s) and to allow students to include their own observations, questions, and critical analysis. Students may choose the seminars for which to submit their papers. **However, students may not submit a comment paper for the week in which they are scheduled to present.** Late penalties do not apply to these assignments, and no extensions will be granted. Comment papers must be double spaced and submitted in hard copy form. Email submissions will not be accepted.

Research Essay

Undergraduate students will write a 12-15 page, thesis-driven (argumentative) research essay, to be submitted in the last class of the term. Graduate students will write a 15-18 page, thesis-driven research paper to be submitted on the last class of the term. Students are free to formulate any topic that they see as relevant to the course *in consultation with me*.

The subject of the research paper should be approved by the instructor by October 18 (I need a subject, a proposed thesis, and evidence of initial research). If a student wishes to change his or her topic, he or she must inform me of the intended change and approval must also be granted. Essays must be double spaced and submitted in hard copy form. Email submissions will not be accepted. Extensions will be granted for documented medical or compassionate reasons only. A 5% penalty per day will be assessed to late assignments without extensions. In absence of a pre-arranged extension, papers will not be accepted for grading if they are more than one week of overdue.

Email Policy

Assignments may not be submitted via email. Paper copies are required on the day assignments are due. Email is the best way to get in touch with me and I will try to reply within 24 hours. I do not check email after 5pm or on the weekends, so try to anticipate problems or questions throughout the week that I can help you address.

Academic Integrity

In order to maintain a culture of academic integrity, members of the University of Waterloo are expected to promote honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility.

Discipline: A student is expected to know what constitutes academic integrity, to avoid committing academic offences, and to take responsibility for his/her actions. A student who is unsure whether an action constitutes an offence, or who needs help in learning how to avoid offences (e.g., plagiarism, cheating) or about "rules" for group work/collaboration should seek guidance from the course professor, academic advisor, or the Undergraduate

Associate Dean. When misconduct has been found to have occurred, disciplinary penalties will be imposed under Policy 71 – Student Discipline. For information on categories of offenses and types of penalties, students should refer to Policy 71 - Student Discipline, <http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy71.htm>.

Grievance: A student who believes that a decision affecting some aspect of his/her university life has been unfair or unreasonable may have grounds for initiating a grievance. Read Policy 70 - Student Petitions and Grievances, Section 4, <http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy70.htm>.

Appeals: A student may appeal the finding and/or penalty in a decision made under Policy 70 - Student Petitions and Grievances (other than regarding a petition) or Policy 71 - Student Discipline if a ground for an appeal can be established. Read Policy 72 - Student Appeals, <http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy72.htm>.

Academic Integrity website (Arts):
http://arts.uwaterloo.ca/arts/ugrad/academic_responsibility.html

Academic Integrity Office (uWaterloo): <http://uwaterloo.ca/academicintegrity/>

Accommodation for Students with Disabilities:

Note for students with disabilities: The Office for Persons with Disabilities (OPD), located in Needles Hall, Room 1132, collaborates with all academic departments to arrange appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities without compromising the academic integrity of the curriculum. If you require academic accommodations to lessen the impact of your disability, please register with the OPD at the beginning of each academic term. <http://www.studentservices.uwaterloo.ca/disabilities/index.html>

Other Resources for Students:

Counselling Services (academic/career or personal):

<http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infocs/>

The Writing Centre: <http://elpp.uwaterloo.ca/writingcentre.html>

Seminar Schedule

September 13 – Introduction to course

September 20 – Democracy and Representative Government

Dahl, Robert. 1998. *On Democracy*. Chapters 1-5.

Schumpeter, J.S. 1976. *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*. Chapters 21-23 (pages 250 to 302) (Available as an online resource at UW library).

J.S. Mill – “That the Ideally Best Form of Government is Representative Government” (Chapter Three). *Considerations on Representative Government*. (Available as an online resource from UW library).

Aucoin et. al. *Democratizing the constitution* – Chapter 1.

September 27 – Responsible, Parliamentary Government

Mallory, J.R. 1974. “Responsive and Responsible Government.” *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Canada*, Vol. 12: 207-225 (available in the UW library).

Franks, C.E.S. 1987. “Introduction” and “Approaches to Parliamentary Government.” *The Parliament of Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press (available as an online resource from UW Library).

Aucoin et al. *Democratizing the constitution*. Chapters 2 and 3.

Sutherland, S.L. 1991. “Responsible Government and Ministerial Responsibility: Every Reform Is Its Own Problem.” *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 24 (1): 91-120 (available online from UW Library).

Malloy, Jonathan and Scott Millar. 2008. “Ministerial Responsibility Can Still Work.” In *How Ottawa Spends 2007 -2008: The Harper Conservatives – Climate of Change*, G. Bruce Doern (ed.). Montreal and Kingston: McGill - Queen’s University Press.

Weinrib, Lorraine. E. 2009. “Prime Minister Harper’s Parliamentary ‘Time Out’: A Constitutional Revolution in the Making.” *Parliamentary Democracy in Crisis*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press (on reserve at UW library).

October 4 – Democratic Deficit: Is there Really a Deficit?

Grace Skogstad. 2003. “Who Governs? Who Should Govern? Political Authority and Legitimacy in Canada in the Twenty-First Century.” *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 36(5): 955-973 (available online at UW library).

Martin, P., Jr. 2002. “The Democratic Deficit”, *IRPP Policy Options* p10-12. Available from <http://www.irpp.org/po/archive/dec02/martin.pdf>

Aucoin, Peter and Lori Turnbull. 2003. “The democratic deficit: Paul Martin and parliamentary reform.” *Canadian Public Administration*, Vol. 46(4):427-449 (available online from UW library).

Caccia, C. 2004. “Democratic Deficit? What Democratic Deficit?”, *IRPP Policy Options* p48-50. Available from <http://www.irpp.org/po/archive/may04/caccia.pdf>

Tanguay, B. 2009. “Reforming Representative Democracy: Taming the ‘Democratic Deficit’.” In *Canadian Politics*, 5th Ed., James Bickerton & Alain-G. Gagnon (eds.). Toronto: University of Toronto Press (available at UW Library reserves).

October 11 – House of Commons

Smith, Jennifer. 1999. “Democracy and the Canadian House of Commons at the Millennium.” *Canadian Public Administration*, 42(4): 398-421 (available online from UW library).

Russell, Peter. 2008. *Two Cheers for Minority Government*. Toronto: Emond Montgomery. Chapters 5-7 (on reserve at UW library).

Michael Chong. 2008. "Rethinking Question Period and Debate in the House of Commons", *Canadian Parliamentary Review*, 31(3): 5-7 (available online through the UW Library).

Franks, CES. 1997. "Free Votes in the House of Commons: A Problematic Reform." *Policy Options*: 33-36 (available online through UW library).

Malloy, Jonathan. 1996. "Reconciling expectations and reality in House of Commons committees: The case of the 1989 GST inquiry." *Canadian Public Administration*, 39(3): 314-335 (available online through UW library).

"Obstruction handbook leaked." *Canadian Press*. URL: <http://www.thestar.com/news/article/215532--obstruction-handbook-leaked>.

October 18 – Senate Reform

Murray, Lowell. 2003. "Which Criticisms are Founded?" In *Protecting Canadian Democracy: The Senate You Never Knew*, Serge Joyal (ed.). Montreal&Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press (available online from UW Library).

Stilborn, Jack. 2003. "Forty Years of Not Reforming the Senate." In *Protecting Canadian Democracy: The Senate You Never Knew*, Serge Joyal (ed.). Montreal&Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press (available online from UW library).

Heard, Andrew. 2009. "Assessing Senate Reform through Bill C-19: The Effects of Limited Terms for Senators." In *The Democratic Dilemma*, Jennifer Smith (ed.). Montreal&Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Kent, Tom. 2009. 'Senate Reform as a Risk to Take, Urgently.' In *The Democratic Dilemma*, Jennifer Smith (ed.). Montreal&Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

October 25– Prime Minister's Office

Savoie, Donald.1999. "The Rise of Court Government in Canada", *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 32(4): 635-664 (available online from UW library).

Bakvis, H. (2001). "Prime Minister and Cabinet in Canada: An Autocracy in Need of Reform?". *Journal of Canadian Studies* 35(4): 60-80 (available online from UW library).

Mellon, Hugh and Paul Barker. 2013. "Is the Prime Minister too Powerful?". In *Contemporary Political Issues*, 7th Ed.. Mark Charlton and Paul Barker (eds.) Toronto: Nelson.

Aucoin, et al. *Democratizing the constitution*. Chapter 4.

November 1- Federalism

Silver, A.I. 1997. "Confederation and Quebec". *The French-Canadian Idea of Confederation, 1864-1900*, 2nd Ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 33-50.

Robinson, Ian and Richard Simeon. 2009. "The dynamics of Canadian federalism." In James Bickerton and Alain-G. Gagnon (eds). *Canadian Politics*, 5th Ed. Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press (available on reserve at UW Library).

Smiley, D. 1979. "An Outsider's Observations of Federal-Provincial Relations Among consenting Adults". In *Confrontation and Collaboration*, Richard Simeon (ed.). Toronto: Institute of Public Administration of Canada, 105-113.

Simeon, R.& Nugent, A. 2012. Parliamentary Canada and Intergovernmental Canada: Exploring the Tensions. *Canadian Federalism: Performance, Effectiveness, and Legitimacy*, 3rd Ed. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press, 59-78.

Banting, Keith G. et. al. 2006. *Open Federalism: Interpretations, Significance*. Kingston: Institute of Intergovernmental Affairs. Chapters 3 and 5.

November 8 - The Courts and the Charter

Ajzenstat, Janet. 1997. "Reconciling Parliament and Rights: A.V. Dicey Reads the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms." *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 30 (4): 645-662 (available online from UW Library).

Whyte, John. 1990. On not standing for notwithstanding. *Alberta Law Review* (28): 347-57 (available online from UW library).

Russell, Peter H. 1991. Standing up for notwithstanding. *Alberta Law Review* 29(2): 293-309 (available online from UW library).

Peter Hogg & Allison Thornton. 1997. "The Charter Dialogue between Courts and Legislatures (or Perhaps the Charter of Rights Isn't Such a Bad Thing After All)." *Osgoode Hall Law Journal*, 35: 75-124 (available online from UW Library).

Morton, F.L. and Rainer Knopff. 2000. "Judges, the Court Party, and the Charter Revolution." *Policy Options* (April): 55-60 (available online from UW Library).

November 15 - Political Parties

Malcomson, Patrick and Richard Myers. 2005. "Political Parties." (Chapter 10) *The Canadian Regime* (3rd Ed.). Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press.

Young, Lisa & Bill Cross. 2002. "Incentives to Membership in Canadian Political Parties." *Political Research Quarterly*, 55 (3): 547-569 (available as an online resource at UW Library).

Flynn, Greg. 2011. "Rethinking policy capacity in Canada: The role of parties and election

platforms in government policy-making." *Canadian Public Administration*, 54(2): 235-253.

Young, Lisa. 2009. "Women (Not) in Politics: Women's Electoral Participation." In *Canadian Politics*, 5th Ed., James Bickerton and Alain-G. Gagnon (eds.). Toronto: University of Toronto Press (available on reserve from UW Library).

Cross, William & Lisa Young. 2008. "Factors Influencing the Decision of the Young Politically Engaged to join a Political Party: An Investigation of the Canadian Case." *Party Politics*, 14 (3): 345-369 (available as an online resource from UW library).

Leduc, Lawrence and Jon H. Pammett. 2010. "Voter Turnout." In *Election*, Heather MacIvor (ed.). Toronto: Emond Montgomery.

November 22 – Elections and Electoral Reform

Aucoin et al. *Democratizing the constitution*. Chapter 5.

Cairns, Alan. 1968. The Electoral System and Party System in Canada: 1921-1965. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 1(1): 55-80 (available online from UW Library).

Mendelsohn, Matthew and Andrew Parkin. 2005. "Getting from here to there: a process for electoral reform in Canada. In *Strengthening Canadian Democracy*, Paul Howe, Richard Johnston, and André Blais (eds.). Montreal: IRPP (available online from UW Library).

Courtney, John. 2005. "Is talk of Electoral Reform Just Whistling in the Wind?". In *Strengthening Canadian Democracy*, Paul Howe, Richard Johnston, and André Blais (eds.). Montreal: IRPP (available online from UW Library).

Scarrow, Susan. 2003. "Making Elections more Direct? Reducing the Role of Parties in Elections." In *Democracy Transformed? Expanding Political Opportunities in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 44-58.

November 29 – Direct Democracy (*Research Papers Due!*)

Dalton, Russell J., Susan Scarrow, and Bruce Cain. 2003. "New Forms of Democracy? Reform and Transformation of Democratic Institutions." In *Democracy Transformed? Expanding political opportunities in advanced industrial democracies*. Oxford: University of Oxford Press: 1-22.

Mendelsohn, Matthew and Andrew Parkin. 2005. "Introducing Direct Democracy in Canada." In *Strengthening Canadian Democracy*, Paul Howe, André Blais and R. Johnston (eds.). Montreal: IRPP (available online from UW Library).

Tanguay, Brian. 2007. "The Paradoxes of Direct Democracy." In *Canadian Parties in Transition* (3rd ed.), Alain-G. Gagnon and Brian Tanguay (eds.). Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview (on reserve at UW library).

Aucoin et al. *Democratizing the constitution*. Chapter 6.

