

The Federal Idea and its Contemporary Relevance

R L. W

Institute of Intergovernmental Relations
Queen's University
Kingston, ON. Canada
2007

An earlier version was delivered as
The Centre for Federal Studies Annual Lecture
The University of Kent, Canterbury, England,
12 October 2006

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. The Federal Idea: The Essential Features	3
3. The Varying Popularity of the Federal Solution During the Past Century	7
(1) Prior to 1945	7
(2) The Surge of Popularity Between 1945 and 1970.....	8
(3) A More Cautious Enthusiasm for Federal Solutions, 1970-90	10
(4) The Resurgence in Enthusiasm for Federal Solutions During the Past Decade and a Half.....	12
4. Recent Innovations	15
5. Lessons from the Experience of Federations	17
End Notes.....	19
 A Life Dedicated to Public Service Ronald L. Watts, CC., D. Phil., LL.D., F.R.S.C.	21



The Federal Idea and its Contemporary Relevance

1 2 3 4 5

responsive to the individual citizen, and from the desire to give expression to primary group attachments—linguistic and cultural ties, religious connections, historical traditions, and social prac-

incorporated some federal features, although by no means all the features of a full-fledged federation. Furthermore, the European Union (EU), with the addition of new member states, is in the process of evolving its own unique hybrid of confederal and federal institutions. Thus, everywhere, with changing world conditions, federal political systems have continued to evolve.

2. THE FEDERAL IDEA: THE ESSENTIAL FEATURES

Over the years there has been much scholarly debate about the definition of federalism. Definitions have varied from broad inclusive ones to narrow restrictive ones. The basic essence of federalism, as Daniel Elazar has noted, is the notion of two or more orders of government combining elements of 'shared rule' for some purposes and

their authority from the constituent units and consist of delegates of those units. In a federation, however, each order government derives its authority, not from another order of government, but from the constitution and each relates directly (not through another government) to the citizens.

Consequently, the structural characteristics that distinguish federations as a specific form of federal system are the following:

- Two (or more) orders of government each acting directly on their citizens (rather than indirectly through the other order);
- A formal constitutional distribution of legislative and executive authority, and allocation of revenue resources between the orders of government ensuring some areas of genuine autonomy for each order;
- Provision for the designated representation of distinct regional views within the federal policy-making institutions, usually provided by a federal second chamber composed of representatives of the regional electorates, legislatures or governments;
- A supreme written constitution, not unilaterally amendable by one order of government, and requiring the consent not only of the federal legislature but also of a significance proportion of the constituent units through assent by their legislatures or by referendum majorities;
- An umpire (in the form of courts, or as in Switzerland provision for referendums) to rule on interpretation or a valid application of the constitution; and
- Processes and institutions to facilitate intergovernmental collaboration in those areas where government responsibilities are shared or inevitably overlap.

At the same time it should be noted that some political systems are hybrids combining characteristics of different kinds of political systems. Those that are predominately federations in their constitution and operation, but which include some federal government powers to override governments of constituent units—an arrangement more typical of a unitary system—have sometimes been described as “quasi-federations”. At different stages in their development Canada, India, Pakistan, Malaysia and South Africa have been so described. On the other hand Germany, while predominantly a federation, has a confederal element in the

- The processes and institutions for resolving conflicts and facilitating collaboration between interdependent governments;
- The procedures for formal and informal adaptation and change; and
- The roles of federal and constituent-unit governments in the conduct of international relations; and
- The electoral system and number and character of political parties.

Ultimately federalism is a pragmatic and prudential technique whose applicability in different situations has depended upon the different forms in which it has been adopted or adapted, and even upon the development of new innovations in its application.

One further point about federal systems. Federal systems are a function not only of constitutions, but also of governments, and fundamentally of societies. It is important, therefore, to distinguish between federal societies, governments and constitutions in order to understand the dynamic interaction of these elements with each other. The motivations and interests within a society—which generate pressures both for political diversity and autonomy, on the one hand, and for common action on the other—the legal constitutional structure, and the actual operations, processes and practices of government, are all important considerations for understanding the operation of federations.

At one time, the study of federations tended to concentrate primarily on their legal frameworks. Scholars have come to realise, however, that a merely legalistic study of constitutions cannot adequately explain political patterns within federations. Indeed, the actual operation and practices of governments within federations have, in response to the play of social and political pressures, frequently diverged significantly from the formal relationships specified in the written legal documents. Scholars writing about federal systems have, therefore, become conscious of the importance of the social forces underlying federal systems.

But the view that federal institutions are merely the instrumentalities or expressions of federal societies, while an important corrective to purely legal and institutional analyses, is also too one-sided and oversimplifies the causal relationships. Constitutions and institutions, once created, themselves channel and shape societies.³ For example, in both the United States in 1789 and

Switzerland in 1848, the replacement of confederal structures by federal constitutions marked turning points enabling the more effective political reconciliation of pressures for diversity and unity within their societies.

The causal relationships among a federal society, its political institutions, and its political behaviours and processes are complex and dynamic. The causal impact is not simply unidirectional; rather, it involves two-way interactions with each factor influencing the other two. The pressures within a society may force a particular expression in its political institutions, processes and behaviour; but, in turn, these institutions and processes, once established, usually shape the society. They do this both by determining the channels in which the social pressures and political activities flow, and by establishing policies that modify the shape of society.

Thus, the relationships between a society, its constitution, and its political institutions and processes are dynamic and involve continual mutual interaction. It is not sufficient, in considering the experience of different federations, to review only the influence of social forces upon the adoption, design, modification, and subsequent operation of federal constitutional structures. Rather, it is also necessary to consider the influence those federal political structures—and the related political processes and practices—have had upon social loyalties, feelings and diversities. It is thus necessary to assess both how well the institutions in each federation reflect the particular social and political balance of forces within that society, and how effectively these institutions, once established, have channelled and influenced the articulation of

Switzerland (1848), Canada (1867), Australia (1901), Germany (1871-1918) and also in Latin America in Venezuela (1811), Mexico (1824), Argentina (1853) and Brazil (1891). Nevertheless, prior to 1945, the general attitude, particularly in Europe and in Britain, appeared to be one of benign contempt for federal forms of government. Indeed, this attitude still prevails in some quarters in Britain today. Many viewed federation as simply an incomplete form of national government and a transitional mode of political organization, and, where adopted, to be a necessary concession made in exceptional cases to accommodate political divisiveness. The more ideologically inclined considered federalism to be a product of human prejudices or false consciousness preventing the realization of unity through such more compelling ideologies as radical individualism, classless solidarity or the General Will.

For example, writing in 1939, Harold Laski declared: "I infer in a word that the epoch of federalism is over" (*The Obsolescence of Federalism*, 48 [London, 1939]: 367). Federation in its traditional form, with its compartmentalization of functions, legalism, rigidity and conservatism, was, he argued, unable to keep pace with the tempo of modern economic and political life that giant capitalism had evolved. He further suggested that federal systems were based on an outmoded economic philosophy, and were a severe handicap in an era when positive government action was required. Decentralized unitary government, he concluded was much more appropriate in the new conditions of the Twentieth Century. Even Sir Ivor Jennings, a noted British constitutionalist, who was an advisor in the establishment of several new federations within the Commonwealth during the immediate post-war period, did not hesitate to write that "nobody would have a federal constitution if he could possibly avoid it".⁴

(2) *Journal of the American Political Science Association*, 15 (1910)

While up to 1945 the federal idea appeared to be on the defensive, the following two decades and a half saw a remarkable array of governments created or in the process of creation that claimed the designation 'federal'. Indeed, only eight years after 1945, Max Beloff was able to assert that the federal idea was enjoying "a popularity such as it had never known before."⁵ With this occurred a

burgeoning of comparative federal studies. This was the period when my own interest in the comparative study of federations was aroused during my studies at Oxford with K.C. Wheare, and led to my first book, *Federalism: A Theory of Government* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966).

Three factors contributed to this post-war surge in the popularity of federal solutions. One was the wartime success and post-war prosperity of the long-established federations such as the United States, Switzerland, Canada and Australia, coupled with their development into modern welfare states.

A second factor stemmed from the conditions accompanying the break-up of the European colonial empires in Asia, Africa and the Caribbean. The colonial political boundaries rarely coincided with the distribution of racial, linguistic, ethnic and religious communities or with the locus of economic, geographic and historic interests. In the resulting clashes between the forces for integration and for disintegration, political leaders of independence movements and colonial administrators alike saw in federal solutions a common ground for centralizers and provincialists. The result was a proliferation of federal experiments in these colonies or former colonies. These included India (1950), Pakistan (1956), Malaya (1948) and then Malaysia (1963), Nigeria (1954), Rhodesia and Nyasaland (1953), the West Indies (1958), Indochina (1945-7), French West Africa and its successor, the Mali Federation (1959), and Indonesia (1945-9). In the same period, in South America where the federal structure of the United States had often been imitated, at least in form, new ostensibly federal constitutions were adopted (some short-lived) in Brazil (1946), Venezuela (1947) and Argentina (1949).

A third factor was the revival of interest in federal solutions in post-war Europe. World War II had shown the devastation that ultra-nationalism could cause, gaining salience for the federal idea, and progress in that direction began with the creation of the European Communities. At the same time, in 1945 in Austria the federal constitution of 1920 was reinstated making Austria once more a federation, Yugoslavia established a federal constitution in 1946, and in 1949 West Germany adopted a federal constitution.

Thus, the two decades and a half after 1945 proved to be the heyday of the federal idea. In both developed and developing

shining examples for others to follow. In the United States, the centralization of power through federal pre-emption of state and local authority, and the shifting of costs to state and local governments through unfunded or underfunded mandates, had created an apparent trend towards what became widely described as “coercive federalism”.⁶ Furthermore, the apparent abdication in 1985 by the Supreme Court of its role as an umpire within the federal system (*California v. Arizona*, 469 US 528 (1985)) raised questions, at least for a time, about the judicial protection of federalism within the American system.

Switzerland had remained relatively stable, but the long-drawn crisis over the Jura problem prior to its resolution, the problems of defining Switzerland’s future relationship with the European Community, and the prolonged unresolved debate for three decades over the renewal of the Swiss constitution raised concerns within the Swiss federation.

In Canada, the Quiet Revolution in Quebec during the 1960s, and the ensuing four rounds of mega-constitutional politics in 1963-71, 1976-82, 1987-90 and 1991-2 had produced three decades of severe internal tension. Aboriginal land claims, crises in federal-provincial financial relations, and the problems of defining the relative federal and provincial roles under the free-trade agreements with the United States, and later Mexico, created additional stresses.

In 1975, Australia experienced a constitutional crisis that raised questions about the fundamental compatibility of federal and of parliamentary responsible cabinet institutions. The result was a revival in some quarters in Australia of the debate about the value of federation.

Through most of this period West Germany remained relatively prosperous. Nevertheless, increasing attention was being drawn to the problems of revenue sharing and of the “joint decisions trap” entailed by its unique form of “interlocked federalism” requiring a high degree of co-decision making.⁷ Furthermore, the impact of membership in the European Union upon the relative roles of the Bund and the Länder was also a cause of concern.

At the end of this period, the disintegration of the former authoritarian centralized federations in the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia exposed the limitations of these federal façades.

In such a context, one strand in the comparative studies of federations focused on the pathology of federal systems, examples being Thomas Franck, Ursula Hicks and some of my own writing. Nevertheless, others such as Ivo Duchacek, Preston King and especially Daniel Elazar provided perceptive insights into the character and variety of federal arrangements. Furthermore, the establishment of an International Association of Centers of Federal Studies in 1977 linking ten multidisciplinary centres, and shortly after of *Federalism*, a journal specializing in federal studies, contributed during this period to intensified research on the operation of federal systems. In 1984, a second body for collaborative federal studies, the International Political Science Association Research Committee on Comparative Federalism, was established linking individual political scientists working in this area.

()

In the 1990s, there developed a revival in the enthusiasm for federal political solutions. Outside the academic realm, political leaders and leading intellectuals have come increasingly to refer to federal systems as providing a liberating and positive form of political organization. Indeed, as I have already noted, by the turn of the century, it could be said that some 40 percent of the world's population lived in some two dozen federations or countries that claimed to be federal. Furthermore, in a number of other countries some consideration was being given to the efficacy of incorporating some federal features, although not necessarily all the characteristics of a full-fledged federation. In Latin America, the restoration of federal regimes has occurred in a number of countries after periods of autocratic rule. In Asia, the economic progress of India showed that coalition-based federalism was a workable

World and especially Africa, the failure of "strong leaders" to resolve persistent social and political problems, and the realization by such international bodies as the World Bank that decentralization was the preferred strategy for economic development, have contributed to a widespread renewal of interest in federal or at least devolutionary political solutions.

A number of other factors contributed to this trend. One was the widespread recognition that an increasingly global economy had unleashed centrifugal economic and political forces, weakening the traditional nation-state and strengthening both international and local pressures—a combined trend that Tom Courchene has called “glocalization”.⁸ Another was the changes in technology that were generating new, more federal, models of industrial organization with decentralized and flattened hierarchies involving non-centralized interactive networks. These developments have influenced the attitudes of people in favour of non-centralized political organization.

Developments in three political areas also appeared to have an impact. One was the resurgence of the classical federations which, despite the problems they had experienced in the preceding two decades, had nevertheless displayed a degree of flexibility and adaptability in responding to changing conditions. Another was the collapse of the totalitarian regimes in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. These developments undermined the appeal of transformative ideologies and exposed the corruption, poverty and inefficiency characteristic of systematic and authoritarian centralization. A third was the progress made during this period in Europe’s apparent federal evolution with the Single European Act and the Maastricht Treaty and the broadening of the European Union to incorporate a much widened membership.

All of these factors have contributed to the renewed general interest in federal methods of organizing political relationships and distributing political powers in a way that would enable the common needs of people to be achieved while accommodating the diversity of their circumstance and preferences. It must be noted that this revival of interest in federal political systems beginning in the 1990s has differed, however, from the excessively enthusiastic proliferation of federations that occurred in the early decades after 1945. Experience since that period has led generally to a more cautious and sanguine approach.⁹

There is one distinctive feature of this period, however. In previous eras federation was characterized as the result of political communities freely joining together or devolving to build something better. But in a number of cases today, federal systems are being proposed as a solution for warring communities. In countries

like Iraq, Sri Lanka, Sudan and Cyprus, instead of federation being advocated on grounds of providing mutual benefits, it is being advocated as a way of ending acute civil ethno-cultural conflict and of avoiding utter political collapse. The problem in these cases has been a lack of what previous experience has suggested are the prerequisites for an effective federal system: respect for constitutionalism, and a prevailing spirit of tolerance and compromise. Until these necessary underlying conditions are created, efforts to create sustainable federal systems are likely to prove simply futile. Much more effort to establish first the prerequisite conditions will be required in these cases.

A new development at the turn of the century has been the establishment, on the initiative of the Canadian federal government, of the international Forum of Federations. The Canadian government was convinced that there would be real value, particularly for practitioners in federations—statesmen, politicians and public servants—in organizing an opportunity to exchange information and learn from each other's experience. Accordingly, it arranged a major international conference on federalism at Mont Tremblant in the autumn of 1999. Over 500 representatives from twenty-five countries, including the Presidents of the United States and Mexico and the Prime Minister of Canada, participated. Major presentations and papers of the conference were subsequently published in the *Journal of Democracy*, special issue 167, 2001. Among the themes upon which the conference focused were social diversity and federation, economic and fiscal arrangements in federation, intergovernmental relations, and provision for the welfare state in federations. Such was the success of this conference, that it was decided to put the Forum of Federations on a permanent basis with its own international board (a board on which I was privileged to serve from its inception until 2006). Initially, the funding for the Forum came totally from the Canadian federal government. Although it still contributes the largest share, the Forum has now evolved to the point where governments in seven federations (Australia, Austria, Germany, India, Nigeria, Mexico and Switzerland) are sustaining members. A number of others are contemplating membership, and the current chairman of the Board is a former President of Switzerland.

Among the major activities of the Forum have been building international networks fostering the exchange of experience and information on best practices among practitioners in existing federations or countries with some federal features, and the sponsorship at three-yearly intervals of major international conferences of practitioners and academics on federalism. The second international conference was held at St. Gallen, Switzerland in 2002 with over 600 participants from more than 60 countries. The third was held in Brussels in 2005 with over 1000 participants from some 80 countries, and the fourth (for which I am the international advisor for the Indian government) is scheduled for November 2007 in New Delhi.

4. RECENT INNOVATIONS

Three recent innovations in the application of the federal idea require special comment. One is the creation of the hybrids. The hybrid character of the post-Maastricht institutional structure of the European Union combines, in an interesting way, features of both a confederation and of a federation. Among the confederal features are the intergovernmental character of the Council of Ministers; the distribution of Commissioners among the constituent nation-states and the role of the latter in nominating commissioners; the almost total reliance upon the constituent national governments for the implementation and administration of Union law; and the derivation of Union citizenship from citizenship in a member state.

Among the elements more typical of a federation, on the other hand, are the role of the Commission in proposing legislation; the use of qualified majorities rather than unanimity for many categories of legislation generated by the Council of Ministers; the role of the Council's secretariat in developing more cohesive policy consideration than is typical of most international or confederal intergovernmental bodies; the expanding role of the European Parliament, which, under the new co-decision procedure introduced by the Maastricht Treaty, has a veto power over about fifty percent of Community legislation; and the supremacy of Community law over the law of the member states.

The net effect of this hybrid of confederal and federal features is that, while member states have “pooled” their sovereignty and accepted increasing limitations on their power of independent

Union of the Maastricht Treaty, whereby the European Union has taken significant steps towards becoming a Union of “variable speeds” and “variable geometry”. From its beginning as a federation, Canada has included, in relation to Quebec, some modest asymmetrical arrangements, and the debate over the Meech Lake Accord and Charlottetown Consensus during the period 1978-92 turned to a significant degree on whether and how far this asymmetry should be increased. Perhaps the most complex current example of asymmetry in practice was displayed in Russia, in the Yeltsin period, by the then eighty-nine subjects of the Russian Federation, and this in spite of the formal symmetry set out in the new Russian Constitution. Constitutional asymmetry in the powers of constituent units, however, is not unique to federations: Italy

multi-ethnic or multi-national countries as Switzerland, Canada, India and Malaysia, in my view indicates that, with appropriately designed institutions, federal systems can be sustained and prosper in such countries. In a number of significant cases where ethnic nationalism has been a crucial issue, federal devolution has in fact reduced tension by giving distinct groups a sense of security through their own self-government, thereby paradoxically contributing to greater harmony and unity.

While federal political systems are not universally appropriate,

¹¹ Arendt Lijphart, *Democracy in Plural Societies* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984); Arendt Lijphart, *Plural Democracy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999); Ute Wachendorfer-Schmidt, ed., *Democracy in Plural Societies* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000); John Kincaid, "Federalism and Democracy: Comparative Empirical and Theoretical Perspectives," paper at the International Work Shop on Federalism and Democracy, University of Kent, Canterbury, 2006.

¹² D.J. Elazar, "International and Comparative Federalism," *Journal of Federalism*, 26(2), 1993, pp. 190-95.

D. Phil., Oxford University:
Political Studies 1963
(Supervisor: K.C. Wheare)

Married: Donna Paisley (1954)

Current Appointment:

1994-present: Principal Emeritus and Professor Emeritus of Political Studies, Queen's University
1993-present: Fellow, Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University

Principal Academic Appointments:

1989-1993: Director, Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University
1988-1989: Acting Director, Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University
1974-84: Principal and Vice-Chancellor of Queen's University
1969-74: Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science, Queen's University
1964-69: Assistant Dean then Associate Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science, Queen's University
1965-94: Professor of Political Studies, Queen's University
1963-65: Associate Professor, Political Studies, Queen's University
1961-63: Assistant Professor, Political Studies, Queen's University
1955-61: Lecturer, Philosophy (political philosophy), Queen's University

Other Academic and Public Appointments:

2006-present: Fellow of the international Forum of Federations
2006-7: Academic Advisor to the Organizing Committee, Government of India, for the Fourth International Conference on Federalism, New Delhi, November 2007.
2004: Faculty member, Summer University on Federalism, Institut du Fédéralisme à l'université de Fribourg, Switzerland
2003: Visiting Senior Research Fellow at the Constitution Unit, School of Public Policy, University College London, United Kingdom.
2002-2006: Member of Advisory Board on Devolution Studies of Economic and Social Research Council, United Kingdom.
2002-present: Member of Editorial Sub-committee for Global Dialogue Project (joint IACFS/Forum of Federations project)
2002: Consultant to the National Reconstruction Bureau of the Government of Pakistan regarding constitutional reform.
2001-2002: Academic Advisor to Board of Directors, International Federalism Conference 2002, sponsored by the Federal and Cantonal Governments, Switzerland.

- 2001 and 2002: Consultant to the Constitution of Kenya Reform Commission, regarding devolution.
- 2001: Member of delegation of Canadian Centre for Foreign Policy Development, Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade to the Republic of Cyprus and the Turkish Republic of North Cyprus (June).
- 2001: Speaker at New South Wales Centenary of Australian Federalism Forum, Sydney (July).
- 2001: Member of expert group of three academics (from Canada, Germany and Switzerland) to advise the President of Yugoslavia and the governments of Serbia and Montenegro on the restructuring of the Federation of Yugoslavia (October-November).
- 2000-2006: Member of the Board, international Forum of Federations and Chairman of its Program Committee.
- 2000-present: Member of Editorial Advisory Board of *Journal of Federalism*.
- 2000-present: Member of Editorial Advisory Board of *Journal of Democracy*.
- 2000-2001: Editorial Advisor for *Journal of Democracy*, vol. 167, special issue on federalism.
- 2000: Faculty member, Summer University on Federalism, Institut du Fédéralisme de l'Université de Fribourg
- 1999: Associate Editor: *Journal of Democracy*, Annual Global Review.
- 1998-present: Chairman of the Scientific Council of the International Research and Consulting Centre of the Institut du Fédéralisme de l'Université de Fribourg, Switzerland.
- 1998-1999: Member of the Board, Committee for a Forum of Federations.
- 1997: Consultant on intergovernmental relations to the Department of Provincial Affairs and Constitutional Development, South Africa, sponsored by the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs.
- March-April 1996: Member of Team of Experts for Component V (Federalism: Structures and Practices) of Canada-Russia Collaborative Federalism Project, March: Ottawa, April: Novgorod.
- 1996 (Feb.-March): Visiting Fellow, Centre for Constitutional Analysis, Human Sciences Research Council, Pretoria, South Africa (as consultant for constitutional negotiations).
- 1995: Faculty member, Summer University on Federalism, Institut du Fédéralisme de l'université de Fribourg, Switzerland.
- 1994-1995: Visiting Professor of Canadian Studies, Kwansai Gakuin University, Nishinomiya, Japan.
- 1994-present: Member of International Advisory Committee, Summer University on Federalism, Institut du Fédéralisme de l'université de Fribourg, Switzerland.

- 1993 (Sept-Oct): Member of Canadian Mission visiting Russia to plan Canada-Russia Collaborative Federalism Project.
- 1993: Organizer of International Seminar Course on Federalism for Salzburg Seminars, Austria.
- 1991 (April)-1992 (Sept.): Assistant Secretary to the Cabinet for Constitutional Development, (Federal-Provincial Relations Office), Government of Canada.
- 1991-1998: President, International Association of Centres for the Study of Federalism (IACFS).
- 1991-1993: President, Canadian Association of Rhodes Scholars.
- 1990-1993: Member of Executive Council of American Political Science Association Organized Section on Federalism and Intergovernmental Relations.
- 1990 (June) Member of team of advisors to Premier Peterson (Ontario) for constitutional deliberations regarding ratification of the Meech Lake Accord.
- 1989-1996: Member of Advisory Council, Centre for Federal Studies, Leicester University, U.K.
- 1989-1991, and 1992- 2000: Board Member and Chairman of the Research Committee, Institute for Research on Public Policy (Canada).
- 1988-present: Member, Editorial Board, *Journal of Federalism*.
- 1987-89: Chairman of Council, Institute for Research on Public Policy (Canada).
- 1987-1991: Board Member, Canadian Educational Standards Institute.
- 1987: Member of Steering Committee and Theme Secretary, National Forum on Post-Secondary Education.
- 1986-7: Chairman, New Zealand Universities Review Committee.
- 1986-7: Member, Commonwealth Secretariat Advisory Committee on Distance Education.
- 1986-1991: Member, Selection Committee for Ontario Rhodes Scholarships
- 1985-1993: Board Member, Advisory Board of Canadian Studies Program, University of California, Berkeley.
- 1985-present: Member, International Political Science Association Research Committee on Comparative Federalism and Federation.
- 1985: Visitor, Institute of Governmental Studies and Centre for Studies in Higher Education, U. of California, Berkeley (Jan. - May).
- 1985: Visitor, Nuffield College, Oxford (May - Dec.).
- 1983-7: Board Member, Canadian Association of Rhodes Scholars.
- 1983-84: Commissioner, Commission on Future Development of Universities of Ontario (Bovey).
- 1982-84: Council Member, Association of Commonwealth Universities.

- 1981: Member of Committee on the Future Role of Universities in Ontario (Fisher).
- 1980-1990: Executive Committee, Council for Canadian Unity; President 1983.
- 1980-88: Board Member, Donner Canadian Foundation.
- 1980-81: Consultant, Federal-Provincial Relations Office Government of Canada, for federal-provincial constitutional negotiations.
- 1978-79: Commissioner, Task Force on Canadian Unity (Pepin-Robarts).
- 1974-84: Member (Chairman 1979-81), Council of Ontario Universities.
- 1974-84: Member of Executive Committee, Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada.
- 1974 & 75: Consultant, Constitutional Planning Committee, Papua New Guinea.

- 1997 Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada.
- 2000 Promotion to Companion of the Order of Canada
- 2003 Queen Elizabeth II Jubilee Commemorative Medal.
- 2003 First recipient of the Distinguished Federalism Scholar Award of the International Political Science Association Research Committee on Comparative Federalism and Federation.

PUBLICATIONS:

A. Books, Monographs and Reports

- Le fédéralisme canadien* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1966, reprinted 1968 with revisions), pp. 417. Translated into Malay and published as *Federalisme dan Kesatuan* (Kuala Lumpur, 1979), pp. 588.
- Le bilinguisme et le biculturalisme* (Study No. 8 published by the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, Ottawa, 1970), pp. 203. (Also published in French translation.)
- Le fédéralisme canadien* (Hutchinson Educational, London, 1970), pp. 150.
- Le fédéralisme canadien* (Kingston: Queen's University), pp. 52 and 21.
- With Donald V. Smiley, *Le fédéralisme canadien* (University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1985, Volume 39 of published research studies of Royal Commission on the Economic Union and Development Prospects for Canada), pp. 170. (Also published in French translation as *Le fédéralisme canadien* (Ottawa: Ministre des Approvisionnement et Services Canada 1986), pp. 188).
- Le fédéralisme canadien* (National Forum on Post-Secondary Education, Ottawa, 1987), pp. 12. (French translation, pp. 13).
- With Peter M. Leslie, ed., *Le fédéralisme canadien* (Kingston, Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University, 1988), pp. 249.
- With Douglas M. Brown, ed., *Le fédéralisme canadien* (Kingston, Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University, 1989), pp. 284.
- Le fédéralisme canadien* Research Paper 26 (Kingston, Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University, 1989), pp. 24.
- With Darrel R. Reid and Dwight Herperger, *Le fédéralisme canadien* (Kingston, Institute of Intergovernmental Relations Queen's University, 1990), pp. 70.
- With Dwight Herperger, *Le fédéralisme canadien* (Montreal: Council for Canadian Unity, 1990), pp. 27.

With Peter Russell, Richard Simeon, Jeremy Webber and Wade MacLauchlan, *Canada's Federalism: A New Vision* (Ottawa: Canadians for a Unifying Constitution, 1990), pp. 27.

With Douglas M. Brown, ed., *Intergovernmental Relations in Canada* (Kingston, Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University, 1990), pp. 289.

Intergovernmental Relations in Canada, edited with Douglas M. Brown, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991), three printings, pp. 341.

With Douglas M. Brown, ed., *Intergovernmental Relations in Canada* (Kingston, Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University, 1993), pp. 256.

Intergovernmental Relations in Canada (Fribourg: Institute of Federalism, Euroregions, vol. 6, cahier 1, 1996), pp. 36.

Intergovernmental Relations in Canada (Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council: Federalism Theory and Application, Vol. 2, 1997), pp. 123.

Intergovernmental Relations in Canada (Kingston: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations and McGill-Queen's Press, 1996, released in 1997, pp. xv, 126) published in French as *Relations Intergouvernementales au Canada* (Kingston, 1997), pp. xv, 130.

Intergovernmental Relations in Canada (Pretoria: Department of Constitutional Development, 1997) (a report for the Dept. of Constitutional Development, Government of South Africa), pp. 28.

Intergovernmental Relations in Canada (Kingston: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations and McGill-Queen's University Press, 1999), pp. ix, 78. Also published in French as *Étude Comparative du Pouvoir de Dépenser dans d'autres Régimes Fédéraux* (Institut des relations intergouvernementales, 1999).

Intergovernmental Relations in Canada, second edition (Montreal and Kingston, London, Ithaca: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1999), pp. xvii, 138. Also published in French as *Relations Intergouvernementales au Canada*, deuxième édition (Montreal and Kingston, London, Ithaca: McGill-Queen's Press, pp. xvii, 142). Also published in Spanish as *Relaciones Intergubernamentales en Canadá* (translation and introduction by Ester Seijas villadanos), (Madrid: Marcial Pons, Ediciones Jurídicas, Y Souàles, S.A. Politopías, 2006, pp. 265).

Intergovernmental Relations in Canada (published in Ukrainian in Democratic Education Series) (Xapkib: UEHTP OCBITHIX IHUIATEB, 2002), pp. 187.

With Harvey Lazar and Hamish Telford, ed., *Intergovernmental Relations in Canada* (Kingston: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations and McGill-Queen's Press, 2003), pp. viii, 373.

With Akhtar Majeed and Douglas M. Brown, eds., *Intergovernmental Relations in Canada*, Volume 2, (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2006, pp. xi, 373).

Intergovernmental Relations in Canada (published in Arabic) (Ottawa: Forum of Federations, 2006) 186 pp., adaptation in Arabic of *Intergovernmental Relations in Canada*, 2nd ed. 1999.

Intergovernmental Relations in Canada, third edition (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, forthcoming late 2007).

B. Published Special Lectures:

- “The Future of the Canadian Confederation” (Canadian Ambassador’s Lecture, Washington, D.C., 24 February 1992).
- “The Future of the Canadian Confederation” (The Asale E. and Maydell C. Palmer Lectures, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, March 9 & 10, 1993).
- “The Future of the Canadian Confederation” (Centre for Federal Studies Annual Lecture, University of Kent, Canterbury, England, 12 October 2006, publication forthcoming 2007).

C. Reports of Commissions Served on:

- The Task Force on Canadian Unity (Pepin-Robarts), *Report on the Future of the Canadian Confederation* (Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services, Canada, January, 1979).
- The Task Force on Canadian Unity (Pepin-Robarts), *Report on the Future of the Canadian Confederation* (Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services, Canada, February, 1979).
- The Task Force on Canadian Unity (Pepin-Robarts), *Report on the Future of the Canadian Confederation* (Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services, Canada, March, 1979).
- Committee on the Future Role of Universities in Ontario (Fisher), *Report on the Future Role of Universities in Ontario* (Toronto: Ministry of Colleges and Universities, Ontario, 1981).
- Commission on the Future Development of the Universities of Ontario (Bovey), *Report on the Future Development of the Universities of Ontario* (Toronto: Government of Ontario, June, 1984).
- Commission on the Future Development of the Universities of Ontario (Bovey), *Report on the Future Development of the Universities of Ontario* (Toronto: Government of Ontario, December, 1984).
- New Zealand Universities Review Committee (Watts), *Report on the Future of the New Zealand Universities* (Report) (Wellington, N.Z.: New Zealand Vice-Chancellor’s Committee, 1987), pp.165.
- Report of the Expert Group (with Thomas Fleiner and Hans-Peter Schneider), *Report of the Expert Group on the Future of the Yugoslav Federation* (Belgrade: Center for Liberal-Democratic Studies, 2002), pp. 91 (also published in Serbian).

D. Chapters in Books:

- “Intergovernmental Financial Relations in New Federations: Comment”, in U.K. Hicks et al., *Intergovernmental Financial Relations in New Federations* (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1961) pp. 137-146.
- “Recent Trends in Federal Economic Policy and Finance in the Commonwealth”, in J.D. Montgomery & A. Smithies, eds., *Recent Trends in Federal Economic Policy and Finance in the Commonwealth*, vol. xiv (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1965), pp. 380-402.
- “Second Chambers in Federal Political Systems” in *Second Chambers in Federal Political Systems*, the Ontario Advisory Committee on Confederation (Toronto, 1970), Vol. II, pp. 315-355.
- “The Survival or Disintegration of Federations” in R.M. Burns, ed., *The Survival or Disintegration of Federations* (McGill-Queen’s University Press, Montreal and London, 1971). pp. 41-72.

- "Survival or Disintegration" in Richard Simeon, ed., *Canadian Federalism: A Study in the History and Theory of the Federation* (McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal and London, 1977), pp. 42-60.
- "Federalism, Regionalism and Political Integration" in David Cameron, ed., *Canadian Federalism: A Study in the History and Theory of the Federation*, Institute for Research on Public Policy, Montreal, and Policy Studies Institute, London, 1981, pp. 3-19.
- "The Historical Development of Canadian Federalism" in R.L. Mathews, ed., *Canadian Federalism: A Study in the History and Theory of the Federation*, Centre for Research on Federal Financial Relations, Australian National University, Canberra, 1982, pp. 13-26.
- "Financing Post-Secondary Education and Research" in Peter M. Leslie, ed., *Canadian Federalism: A Study in the History and Theory of the Federation* (Kingston: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University, 1987), pp. 167-188.
- "The Framework for Managing and Financing Post-Secondary Education," in National Forum on Post-Secondary Education, *Canadian Federalism: A Study in the History and Theory of the Federation* (Halifax: Institute for Research in Public Policy, 1987), pp. 73-79, 99-109.
- "Divergence and Convergence: Canadian and U.S. Federalism" in Harry N. Scheiber, ed., *Canadian Federalism: A Study in the History and Theory of the Federation* (Institute of Governmental Studies, U. of California, Berkeley, 1987), pp. 179-213.
- "The American Constitution in Comparative Perspective: A Comparison of Federalism in the United States and Canada", in D. Thelen, ed., *Canadian Federalism: A Study in the History and Theory of the Federation* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988), pp.109-131.
- "Executive Federalism: The Comparative Context" in R. Whitaker and D. Sugarman, eds., *Canadian Federalism: A Study in the History and Theory of the Federation* (Toronto, Broadview Press LuP5-1.4933 -1. TD5 Tc-0.lna7leygity 8ontrey,

TD[(

"The Soviet federal system and the nationality question in comparative perspective" in A. McAuley, ed., *Comparative Federalism: A Study of the Soviet Union* (Leicester, Leicester University Press, 1991), pp. 196-207.

"The Federal Context for Higher Education", in D. Brown, P. Cazalis and G. Jasmin, eds., *Higher Education in a Federal Context* (London, Falmer Press, 1992), pp. 3-21.

"The Reform of Federal Institutions" in K. McRoberts and P. Monahan, eds.,

- "The Distribution of Powers, Responsibilities and Resources in Federations", in A.L. Griffiths, ed., *Proceedings of the 1999 Conference on Federalism*, 2002 (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2002), pp. 448-71.
- "New meanings, new uses for the federal idea", in Elaine Thompson, ed., *Proceedings of the 1999 Conference on Federalism*, 2001 (Sydney: NSW Centenary of Federation Committee 2001, 2002), pp. 5-8.
- "Processes of Constitutional Restructuring: The Canadian Experience" in Rekha Saxena, ed., *Proceedings of the 1999 Conference on Federalism*, Delhi: Konark Publishers, PVT, Ltd., 2002, pp. 297-317.
- With Raul Blindenbacher, "Federalism in a Changing World – A Conceptual Framework for the Conference," in Raoul Blindenbacher and Arnold Koller, eds., *Proceedings of the 1999 Conference on Federalism*, Montreal and Kingston, McGill-Queen's Press, 2003, pp. 7-25.
- "Managing Interdependence in a Federal Political System," in Thomas J. Courchene and Donald J. Savore, eds., *Proceedings of the 1999 Conference on Federalism*, Montreal; Institute for Research on Public Policy, 2003, pp. 121-151.
- "Bicameralism in Federal Parliamentary Systems" in Serge Joyal, ed., *Proceedings of the 1999 Conference on Federalism*, Montreal & Kingston; McGill-Queen's Press, 2003, pp. 67-104.
- "Processes for Adjusting Federal Financial Relations: Examples from Australia and Canada" in Paul Boothe, ed., *Proceedings of the 1999 Conference on Federalism*, Ottawa: Forum of Federations, 2003, pp. 17-40.
- "Law and the Division of Responsibilities: Canadian Experience in Comparative Context," in Peter H. Solomon, Jr. ed., *Proceedings of the 1999 Conference on Federalism*, Toronto: Centre for Russian and East European Studies, University of Toronto, 2003, pp. 75-85.
- "Lessons from the pathology of multicultural federations," in Peter Hanni, ed., *Proceedings of the 1999 Conference on Federalism*, Fribourg, Suisse: Editions Universitaires, 2003, pp. 221-236.
- "The Interaction of Political Parties and Federal Institutions" in Rudolph Herbek, ed., *Proceedings of the 1999 Conference on Federalism*, Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 2004, pp. 203-207.
- "Participation of federated entities in federal policy-making" in Third International Conference on Federalism (F. Geerkens, ed.), *Proceedings of the 1999 Conference on Federalism*, Brussels: Federal Public Service Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade and Development Corporation, 2005, pp. 464-478.
- "Origins of Cooperative and Competitive Federalism" in Scott L. Greer, ed., *Proceedings of the 1999 Conference on Federalism*, Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006, pp. 201-223.
- "Comparative Conclusions" in Akhtar Majeed, Ronald L. Watts and Douglas M. Brown, eds., *Proceedings of the 1999 Conference on Federalism*, A Global Dialogue on Federalism, Volume 2, Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2006, pp.322-349.

- "Multinational Federations in Comparative Perspective," in M. Burgess, ed., *International Journal of Constitutional Law* (London & New York: Routledge, 2007), pg. 225-247.
- "The UK as a Federal or Regionalized Union" in A Trench, ed., *Journal of Federalism* (due 2007).
- "Federal Second Chambers Compared" in R. Hrbek, ed., *Legislatures in a Federal World* (publication of papers at International Association of Centres of Federal Studies 28 June – 1 July 2006: forthcoming 2007).
- "Basic Issues of the Federal State: Competitive Federalism vs Cooperative Federalism," Konrad Adenauer Stiftung. Forum of Federations Conference 18-20 October 2006: *Journal of Federalism* (due in 2007).
- "Comparative Reflections on Federalism and Democracy" in M. Burgess, ed., *Journal of Federalism* (forthcoming 2008).
- "The Development of Comparative Federal Studies Over Time" in R. Agranoff, ed., *Journal of Federalism* (IPSA Research Committee on Comparative Federalism and Federation Book Project) (forthcoming 2008).

E. Articles (since 1983):

- "The Future of the Universities", *Journal of Federalism* (Series IV, Vol. XX1, 1983), pp. 53-68.
- "Federal Financing of Post-Secondary Education and Research: The Johnson Report" in *Journal of Federalism*, Vol. XV, No. 21985, pp. 1-11.
- "The Macdonald Commission Report and Canadian Federalism", *Journal of Federalism*, Vol. 16, No. 3, 1986, pp. 175-199.
- "The American Constitution in Comparative Perspective: A Comparison of Federalism in the United States and Canada", *Journal of Federalism* special issue on Constitutionalism in American Life, vol. 74, no. 3, Dec. 1987, pp. 769-791.
- "Canadian Federalism in the 1990s: Once More in Question", *Journal of Federalism*, Vol. 21, No. 3, Summer 1991, pp. 169-190.
- "Canada in Question Again", *Journal of Federalism*, vol. 99, no. 4, winter 1992, pp. 793-804.
- "The Relevance of the German Federal System for Other Constitutions", *Journal of Federalism*, Heft 4, October 1994, pp. 53-66.
- "The Contemporary Relevance of the Federal Idea" (Honorary degree lecture), *Journal of Federalism* (Japan), vol. 46, no. 1, 1995, pp. 251-264.
- "The Contemporary Relevance of the Federal Idea," *Journal of Federalism*, vol. 1995, pp. 109-120.
- "What is the Status of the Status Quo?" *Journal of Federalism*, vol. 16, April 1995 special issue on "Souveraineté/Sovereignty", pp. 28-31.
- "Canada, Three Decades of Periodic Crises", *Journal of Federalism*, special issue on "New Trends in Federalism", vol. 17, no. 4, October 1996, pp. 353-371.

- "Federal Systems and Accommodating" Distinct Groups: A Comparative Study of Institutional Arrangements for Aboriginal Peoples (a study prepared for the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (78 pages, 1994: published as Working Paper 1998(3) in Working Paper Series of Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University, 1998).
- "International Examples of Political Partnerships", *Journal of Intergovernmental Relations*, vol. 19, no.2, March 1998, pp. 47-49.
- "The Political Use or Abuse of Courts in Federal Systems", *Journal of Intergovernmental Relations*, vol. 42, no. 2, Spring 1998, pp.509-19.
- "Federalism, Federal Political Systems, and Federations", *Journal of Intergovernmental Relations*, vol. 1, pp.117-137.
- "The Processes of Constitutional Restructuring: The Canadian Experience 1990-92 in Comparative Context" (Delivered at Conference on "Redesigning the State: The Politics of Mega Constitutional Change", Australian National University, Canberra, Australia, 27-29, July 1994: published as Working Paper 1999(1) in Working Paper Series of Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University, 1999).
- "Foreword: States, Provinces, Länder, and Cantons: International Variety among Subnational Constitutions," *Journal of Intergovernmental Relations*, 31(4), Summer 2000, pp.301-319.
- "The Contemporary Relevance of the Federal Idea in Africa," *Journal of Intergovernmental Relations*, 1(1), April 2000, pp.2-18.
- "Asymmetrical decentralization: functional or dysfunctional," (paper delivered at IPSA Congress 2000 to IPSA Research Committee on Comparative Federalism and Federation) (published Ottawa: Forum of Federations, 2000), pp. 1-41, www.forumfed.org).
- "Daniel J. Elazar: Comparative Federalism and Post-Statism," *Journal of Intergovernmental Relations*, 30(4), Fall 2000, pp. 155-168.
- "Models of Federal Power Sharing", (originally presented at Forum of Federations international conference, Mont Tremblant, 5-8 October 1999), published in the *Journal of Intergovernmental Relations*, 167, March 2001, (special issue on federalism), pp. 23-32.
- "Introduction", *Journal of Intergovernmental Relations*, 167, March 2001 (special issue on federalism), pp. 9-12.
- "The International Evolution of Federal Systems in the Twentieth Century" (presentation at International Forum on Federalism in Mexico, Veracruz, November 2001) (published Ottawa: Forum of Federations 2001, www.forumfed.org).
- "Federal Evolution: The Canadian Experience, (in *Föderalismus: Analysen in entwicklungsgeschichtlicher und vergleichender Perspektive*, vol. 32, 2001, pp. 157-76.
- "The Relevance Today of the Federal Idea", *Journal of Intergovernmental Relations*, 3(1), 2002, pp. 1-5.
- "Die Aktualität der Föderalischen Idee", *Journal of Intergovernmental Relations*, 82. Jahr/Heft 718, Juli/August 2002, pp. 29-31.

“Comparing Equalization in Federations,” published Ottawa: Forum of Federations, 2002: www.forumfed.org.

“Les Principales Tendances du Fédéralisme aux XX^e Siècle”, *Revue de la Fédération*, vol. 10, no. 1, 2003, pp. 11-18.

