After providing the student with a basic familiarity with Canadian constitutional history, the course reviews outstanding contemporary political debates. The course provides a firm basis for further study in Canadian Politics, should the student wish to take other more advanced courses. Students will be also expected to keep up-to-date on current events in Canada.

REQUIRED TEXTS


John Pepall, *Against Reform* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010)

Nominal subscription for course clicker technology for smart phone, tablets or laptops.

**RECOMMENDED TEXTS:**


Nelson, a publishing house, has a great site for sources at [http://polisci.nelson.com/canpol.html](http://polisci.nelson.com/canpol.html)

**MARKS AND ASSIGNMENTS**

A variety of evaluation techniques characterize this course. There will be (1) a midterm test, (2) book reviews, and (3) participation (attendance, doing outlines, and actual participation of various kinds in class discussions). Lists of important terms in Canadian Government and potential long-answer questions may be distributed as study guides for the test. Tutorials will be timed to correspond on your book reviews so that our discussions will be well-informed. There will not be a final, so it is imperative that students work through the term on a consistent basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSIGNMENTS*</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>WEIGHT (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Midterm Test</td>
<td>June 6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Reviews (3)</td>
<td>As outlined</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The philosophy behind this marking scheme is to spread the weight of the grade relatively evenly between tests, and book reviews and discussions based on readings, in order to balance student strengths. Late assignments will not be accepted.

**READINGS:** Students are expected to supplement lecture notes with readings and outlines. In general, the test will cover the "topics" of the course outline covered until that date. (You may of course be assigned specific ones to study.)

**ASSIGNMENT GUIDELINE:** Students are responsible for keeping a duplicate copy of the assignments, to protect against the possibility of the original being mislaid. This is the case whether the paper is handwritten or typed. There will be absolutely no special arrangements made if the original is mislaid and there is no duplicate available.

Marks will be deducted, or papers returned without marking, if the student (1) falls markedly short or radically exceeds the stated page/word limit (2) violates standard academic form with regard to footnotes and bibliography (3) misses the deadline for submitting the assignment. Students are reminded of the importance of avoiding academic offences, including plagiarism. See the attached university and departmental position papers.

**STYLE GUIDES:** You may be interested in this University of Toronto site which gives us leads about how to handle academic work at the University level. Various types of assignments are covered, including book reviews.
http://www.writing.utoronto.ca/advice

It is also recommended of course that you get a general reference text for academic writing. Some are available at the bookstore, if you are on campus. For those with deep pockets, the "Chicago Manual of Style" is the Rolls-Royce of this genre. However, some are available on the Web:
http://www.library.mun.ca/internet/termpapers.php

**PARTICIPATION:** There is a participation mark. Participation is a combination of attendance and participation in class discussions and in the tutorials.

**CITATIONS:** Citations are the bugbear of many university students. An easy way is just to find a source with multiple examples, like the following. Check out the Turabian, Chicago, Traditional or Humanities examples, which are essentially the same thing and which are the required format for the course.
http://www.library.mun.ca/guides/howto/turabian.php
http://www.mta.ca/library/govt&politics/chap7/chap7-intro.html
http://www.bedfordstmartins.com/online/citex.html

Book reviews don’t always have to have citations. However, in some instances they are needed. If you are going to cite another source other than the book you are
using, and especially if you are going to use a specific quote from it, you should cite. And if you are going to cite, it should be done correctly. The above sources will give you an ideal how to cite correctly, as does the guide at the end of this course outline.

**PART I: THE CONCEPT OF THE COURSE**

General approaches in the course: opposing viewpoints and the historical approach to Canadian politics

**PART II: POLITICAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL RENEWAL**

Bayard Reesor, *The Canadian Constitution in Historical Perspective*, chapters 1 and 2, and parts of 3 and 4 as assigned.

For Web versions of all of the Constitutions of Canada discussed in the following:

1. Go to the ITP Nelson Canada Political Science site, “The Constitution of Canada” for a complete list:
   

2. Or, go to William Maton’s constitutional site:
   
   [http://www.solon.org/Constitutions/Canada/English/index.html](http://www.solon.org/Constitutions/Canada/English/index.html)

   The Constitution Acts of 1867 and 1982 are found on this page. For the earlier constitutions, (The Royal Proclamation, 1763, The Quebec Act, 1774, The Constitutional Act, 1791, The Union Act, 1840), go to the section on this page entitled “The Documents” and click on the hotlink called “predating.”

1. **Details of the Royal Proclamation of 1763**

   **Assignment:** Read Sections 1 and 2 (pp. 1-9) in Chapter 1 in the Reesor textbook.

   For a Web version of the Proclamation, go to William Maton’s site
   
   [http://www.solon.org/Constitutions/Canada/English/index.html](http://www.solon.org/Constitutions/Canada/English/index.html)

   Go to the section on this page entitled “The Documents” and click on the hotlink called “predating.” Look up the Royal Proclamation.

2. **Details of the Quebec Act, 1774**

   **Assignment:** Read Part 3 of Chapter 1 of Reesor, pp. 9-13.

   For the Web versions of the Quebec Act, go the Nelson site or to “predating” (above on Maton’s site)

   or go to the National Library of Canada site
   
   [http://www.nlc-bnc.ca/confed/lowercan/equebact.htm](http://www.nlc-bnc.ca/confed/lowercan/equebact.htm)

   for a summary of it.
3. Details of the Constitutional Act, 1791

Assignment: Read Part 4 of Chapter 1 of Reesor, pp. 14-22.

For Web versions, look up Nelson, or Maton sites.

Also go the to the National Library site for an explanation of the Constitutional Act in relation to other events, before it and subsequent to it:

http://www.nlc-bnc.ca/confed/lowercan/elowrcan.htm

4. Details of the Act of Union, 1840

Assignment: Read Parts 1 and 2 in Chapter 2 in Reesor, pp. 23-29.

Go the the Web site (through Nelson or Maton).

For a summary of the Act, go the Library of Canada site:

http://www.nlc-bnc.ca/confed/lowercan/eunionct.htm

At this point it is useful to give some details about the two latter constitutions, because many of the debates we will be dealing with involve controversies which arise directly from both the contents of these acts, and the way in which they came into being.

5. Details of the Constitution Act, 1867

Assignment: In addition to the following course material, read Part 1 closely in the Reesor textbook. You can ignore Part 2 unless you are interested in it. Skim Parts 3 and 4. Read the introduction to Part 5, pp. 52-53 closely, and then memorize the “events” from 1926 to 1982, that is, # 15-22. [Jump ahead to p. 102 when you are reading the Statute of Westminster.] Also read pp. 78-86 in chapter 4 and Part 1 A in Chapter 5, pp. 90-94.

Be sure to refer often to - that is, actually look at - “sections” (parts of the Act) in the Reesor text. You can find the Constitution Act, 1867, as amended to 1991, on pp. 422 to 436 in Reesor. Don’t be afraid to look at it - it is less complicated than it may first appear!

You will also find a Web version of the British North America Act, 1867 (the original name for the Constitution Act, 1867), plus much other related Confederation-related material - if you are interested - at the NLC site on “Canadian Confederation”:

http://www.nlc-bnc.ca/confed/e-1867.htm

The Meech Lake Accord, 1987. (See P.W. Hogg, The Meech Lake Accord Annotated. On reserve. This is an expert overview of the Accord. Or see http://www.solon.org/Constitutions/Canada/English/Proposals/ and scroll down.)

An Act respecting constitutional amendments (Bill C-110, 1995). On reserve, or see http://www.solon.org/Constitutions/Canada/English/Misc/ and scroll down.


PART III: CANADIAN POLITICAL PROBLEMS

Topics and assigned readings:

1. Is the Monarchy outmoded in Canada?


An Act respecting the Royal Style and Titles 1-2 Elizabeth II. And the Proclamation of 1953.
http://www.pch.gc.ca/eng/1286991613632/1298040071369

Doug Saunders, Britain’s crisis of succession: Charles and the story behind the royal wedding” Globe and Mail, April 22, 2011.

2. Is “Aboriginal Self-Government” a Beneficial and Realistic Goal?


3. What is better for Canada: Centralized or Decentralized Federalism?


4. Quebec: The case for and against Separation

Jacques Parizeau, *An Independent Quebec: The past, the present and the future* (Montreal: Baraka Books, 2010). The sovereignist case by one of the major founders of the movement.


**Supplemental Readings:** (links) Parti Québécois, *Pourquoi faire la souveraineté?*

[http://pq.org/souverainete/pourquoi](http://pq.org/souverainete/pourquoi): Documents d'information, de promotion et d'argumentation:

on the WWW at [http://pq.org/parti/publications#souverainete](http://pq.org/parti/publications#souverainete)


Argumentaire pour un Québec souverain et Manifeste pour la souveraineté (2008)


5. Is Canada’s Electoral System Ruining It?

Law Commission of Canada, Voting Counts: Electoral Reform for Canada (Ottawa: The Commission, 2004). A définitive review of all the options for proportional représentation and a case for each of them. Copy available from instructor, or on web or reserve.


John Pepall, Against Reform (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), Chapter 3 reviews the case against proportional representation, and chapters 4-7 offers critical reviews of experiments which sought to put it in place democratically.

6. The Charter: Benefit or Bane?

F.L. Morton & Rainer Knopff The Charter Revolution and the Court party (Peterborough, Ont. : Broadview Press, 2000). If you wondered why Stephen Harper didn’t celebrate the 30th anniversary of the adoption of the Charter, the answer’s in here.


7. Are Coalitions and Minority Governments Bad for Canada?

Peter H. Russell, Two Cheers for Minority Government: The Evolution of Canadian Parliamentary Democracy (Toronto: Emond Montgomery, 2008). Why not to believe politicians when they say that minority governments are bad for the country.

R. Kenneth Carty, William Cross, and Lisa Young, Rebuilding Canadian Party Politics (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2000). One of the most masterful summaries of the history of party politics in Canada, and why parties often get it wrong.


8. Does Canada have a Democratic Deficit? Governance in the 21st Century
John Pepall, Against Reform (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), chapters 1, 9, 10, 11 especially.

Matthew Mendelsohn and Andrew Parkin, "Introducing Direct Democracy in Canada," IRPP Choices (June 2001). Downloadable from the IRPP website (www.irpp.org) - just execute a search in the search box.


9. Which way Canada - Multiculturalism or Melting Pot?

Phil Ryan, Multicultiphobia (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010).


Note: there are also chapters in my book Canadian Political Debates that relate to several of these topics, but they are a little dated. (I’m rewriting the book!)
The book review assignment is due on the date assigned. The reviews should be about 1250 words long, and typed, preferably. A cover page would help.

General guidance on doing a book review is found on the Elizabeth II Library Website at http://www.mun.ca/library/research_help/qeii/ (Go down to “write book review” on the list and click on it.)

This is the same information which is available in handout form at the kiosk near the QE II reference desk.

The following is information which you may also find useful.

• The purpose of a book review is to help the student develop analytical skills in reading. This means something more than merely summarizing the book; instead it involves being able to discern the message, structure, strengths and weaknesses of works you read.

• The format at the beginning of the review should include basic information like the book’s title, author(s) name(s), place of publication, publisher’s name, and date, and the length of the book. A typical heading for a review in the Canadian Journal of Political Science, for example, reads as follows:

The Political Economy of Dictatorship
Ronald Wintrobe
New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998, pp. x, 390

(The last numbers refer to total length: the preface, for example, goes from pages i to x [1-10 in Roman numerals], and the book is 390 pages long, including the index.)

Now for the fun part: the analysis. The thing to remember is that a review is a very personal thing: it is your view of a piece of literature. You are matching wits with the author or authors. If you like the work in question, you should be able to enunciate clearly your reasons why. If you do not like it, you should be able to say why not. Much of the rest of this box consists of hints about how to verbalize this like/dislike.

Another quick note: the following can seem a bit dry to some, but reviews can actually be very exciting to writer and reader. To get a sense of how interesting reviews can be, the next time you are in the MUN Library, or other academic library, go to the periodicals on display, and look up some standard political science journals like, for example:
• Canadian Journal of Political Science
• Canadian Public Administration
• Canadian Public Policy

These reviews are basically doing the same job you are being asked to do; see how the pros do it before you do your own. One often learns by example. Read several of the reviews in a row; by the end of this process, the following material will make more sense.

There is no standard way to do a review. However, successful reviews often involve many of the following elements:
1. The review should outline the **purpose or objective of the book**. In other words, what is the problem the authors have identified and how do they propose to deal with it? Note that there may be more than one purpose, or more than one problem, as well.

2. Identify the **thesis of the book**.

3. **Summarize the evidence** the author(s) show to prove the thesis.

4. At this point, the student might also what to review, briefly, what are the **critical concepts and definitions** used, and what is the basic methodology used.

5. Briefly outline the **conclusion** to the book.

6. **Critically analyse the argument.** – **Is it logical?** (That is, are there fallacies in argument? See *Canadian Political Debates*, pages 17-18 for a brief descriptions of some common fallacies in argument. (There are other sources to check, for further detail: refer to David Hackett Fischer’s *Historians’ Fallacies*, or Ruggerio D. Aldisert’s *Logic for Lawyers*, for example)

   - **Is it balanced?** (That is, are opposing viewpoints considered, or overlooked?)

7. **Critically analyse the evidence.** - Does the book balance opinion and fact?
   - Are respectable, unbiased sources used, or do the authors either overlook the major works in the area, and concentrate merely on writers who think the same way they do?
   - Is the evidence substantive, or is it light and sporadically presented?

8. **Critically analyse the conclusion.** - Does it refer to the thesis and maintain that it is proved?
   - Does the conclusion follow from the evidence, or does the evidence point to another conclusion or set of conclusions?

9. Comment on the **significance of the book**. - Do the authors contribute significantly to a certain “school” of thought? - Are they starting a new approach? - How favourably does this school (or approach) compare to others in the same field? - Will the authors contribute something valuable or harmful to national political dialogue? - What is the significance of the work in question to the larger field of political science?

10. Remember that all book reviews are not the same. Some are of **one book, by one or more author, on one topic**. In that case, the above format would hold relatively closely.

    In some cases, you will be asked to review a “**collection**,” an edited book that contains a variety of articles, usually dealing with the same theme. Here you would employ some of the above techniques, but you would add additional aspects, like answers to these questions: Can one think of a template one could use to indicate what a successful book in this genre would cover, and does this particular collection do that? Are the various articles of the same quality? Which are more satisfactory or unsatisfactory, and why? Are there gaps in the overall collection, in the sense of important areas that are not covered? Do the arguments in the various articles complement each other or negate each other? Are they meant to? Are there areas for future research suggested by the book? You may think of other avenues of analysis.

    In other cases, you may be asked to review more than book. In this case, you take elements of the two types of review just covered, above, as you think appropriate
ASSIGNMENT GUIDELINES

Students are responsible for keeping a duplicate copy of the assignment, to protect against the possibility of the original being mislaid. This is the case whether the paper is handwritten or typed. There will be absolutely no special arrangements made if the original is mislaid and there is no duplicate available.

Marks will be deducted, or papers returned without marking, if the student (1) exceeds the stated page/word limit (2) violates standard academic form with regard to footnotes and bibliography (3) misses the deadline for submitting the essay. Students are reminded of the importance of avoiding academic offences, including plagiarism. See the attached university and departmental position papers.

ACADEMIC OFFENCES

Academic offences shall be deemed to include, but shall not be limited to, the following:

1 Cheating on examinations, theses, assignments, work term reports, projects, internship reports, or any other tests.

Cheating includes copying from another student’s work or allowing another student to copy from one’s own work, consulting with any unauthorized person during an examination or test, or using unauthorized aids; or knowingly recording or reporting false empirical or statistical data. The work referred to includes examinations, theses, assignments, work term reports, projects, internship reports, or any other tests which are to be used in judging the student’s performance in a course or programme of study, or on any special tests which the University may offer.

2 Impersonating another student or allowing oneself to be impersonated.

By impersonation is meant the imitation of a student or entrance into an arrangement with another person to be impersonated for purposes of taking examinations or test or carrying out laboratory or other assignments.

3 Plagiarism.

Plagiarism is the act of presenting the ideas or works of another as one’s own. This applies to all material such as essays, laboratory reports, work term reports, design projects, seminar presentations, statistical data, computer programmes and research results. The properly acknowledged use of sources is an accepted and important part of scholarship. Use of such material without acknowledgement, however, is contrary to accepted norms of academic behaviour.

4 Theft of examination papers or other material.
By theft is meant obtaining by any improper means examination papers, tests, or any other such material.

5 Use and/or distribution of stolen material.

The use of material which the student knows to have been improperly obtained and/or the distribution of such material is considered to be an academic offence.

6 Submitting false information.

This offence includes falsifying academic forms or records, submitting false credentials, medical or other certificates, or making a false, misleading or incomplete declaration to the University.

7 Submitting work for one course which has been or is being submitted for another course without express permission to do so.

This includes the presentation of an essay, report or assignment to satisfy some or all of the requirements of a course when that essay, report, or assignment has been previously submitted or is concurrently being submitted for another course without the express permission of the professor(s) involved.

NOTE: Procedures to be followed and penalties to be assessed in cases of academic dishonesty are outlined in the University Calendar.
"Plagiarism means taking material written by another and offering it as one's own... Copying others' work is the most complete failure possible," (Perrin, Writer's Guide and Index to English, Third edition).

The material copied may consist of a few phrases or sentences, or an entire passage of paper written by someone else. The source may be a published book or article, or the work of another student. It applies equally to "research papers" and to "thought or opinion essays." Whatever its form (and the rules of scholarship do not generally recognize degrees) plagiarism constitutes two kinds of failure: (1) Failure to perform the basic tasks expected in any paper--original mental effort and expression. (2) Potentially, the moral failure of dishonesty. Although it is conceivable that a person might copy another's words without attribution out of ignorance of proper practices, this is not an acceptable excuse in university work. Objective evidence of plagiarism carries with it the presumption of dishonest motives.

In short, it is better to try to do one's work, even if this results in an apparently poor product, than it is not to try at all, substituting someone else's efforts for one's own.

Memorial University Calendar regulations (Procedures Governing Academic Dishonesty - Undergraduate Students) specify that the penalty for plagiarism is at least a reduction of grade for the work (assignment) concerned, and in the case of repeat offenses may be probation, suspension or expulsion in addition to the grade reduction (General Regulation V). The Political Science Department will apply this regulation to its full extent and regards plagiarism as a far more serious failing than non-completion of assigned work. Students are expected to familiarize themselves with the General Regulations.

Complicity in plagiarism (e.g., knowingly allowing one's work to be copied or doing work to be submitted in another student's name) is considered equivalent to plagiarism.

If there is any question as to what constitutes plagiarism and what constitutes proper attribution and documentation of facts, ideas, and words obtained from other sources, the student should consult his or her instructor as well as any standard manual on composition and style (for example, James D. Lester, Writing Research Papers, 5th edition, pp 77-81).

Web sources describing what constitutes plagiarism, and related matters, can be found at:

http://www.indiana.edu/~wts/wts/plagiarism.html
http://ec.hku.hk/plagiarism/introduction.htm
Rules for Writeres

1. Verbs HAS to agree with their subjects.
2. Prepositions are not words to end sentences with.
3. And don’t start a sentence with a conjunction.
4. It is wrong to ever split an infinitive.
5. Avoid cliches like the plague. (They’re old hat)
6. Also, always avoid annoying alliteration.
7. Be more or less specific.
8. Parenthetical remarks (however relevant) are (usually) unnecessary.
9. Also too, never, ever use repetitive redundancies.
10. No sentence fragments.
11. Contractions aren’t necessary and shouldn’t be used.
12. Foreign words and phrases are not apropos.
13. Do not be redundant; do not use more words than necessary; it’s highly superfluous.
14. One should NEVER generalize.
15. Comparisons are as bad as cliches.
16. Don’t use no double negatives.
17. Eschew ampersands & abbreviations, etc.
19. Analogies in writing are like feathers on a snake.
20. The passive voice is to be ignored.
21. Eliminate commas, that are, not necessary. Parenthetical words however should be enclosed in commas.
22. Never use a big word when a diminutive one would suffice.
23. Kill all exclamation points!!
24. Use words correctly, irregardless of how others use them.
25. Understatement is always the absolute best way to put forth earth shaking ideas.
26. Use the apostrophe in it’s proper place and omit it when its not needed.
27. Eliminate quotations. As Ralph Waldo Emerson said, “I hate quotations. Tell me what you know.”
28. If you’ve heard it once, you’ve heard it a thousand times: Resist hyperbole; not one writer in a million can use it correctly.
29. Puns are for children, not groan readers.
30. Go around the barn at high noon to avoid colloquialisms.
31. Even IF a mixed metaphor sings, it should be derailed.
32. Who needs rhetorical questions?
33. Exaggeration is a billion times worse than understatement.

And finally...

34. Proofread carefully to see if you any words out.
How to Write Notes and Bibliographies in Turabian (or Chicago)

When information is quoted or referred to in a paper, a footnote or endnote is given to identify the sources of the quotation or information. These notes refer to citations listed in the bibliography at the end of the paper. The bibliography is the list of the full works used to write the paper and is arranged alphabetically.

The format and content of footnotes and endnotes are the same. It is the location of the note in your paper that determines whether it is an endnote or a footnote. Endnotes are at the back of the paper under the heading NOTES. Footnotes appear at the bottom of the page where the information is quoted or referred to. They are separated from the text of the paper by a short line. Footnotes let the reader refer to your citation without having to flip to the back of the paper.

Both types of notes are linked to the quotation(s) or reference(s) by sequential Arabic numbers. The first lines of the notes are indented the same amount as the paragraphs in the paper. Each note is single spaced with a blank line between notes. The numbers used before the notes themselves may be superscripts with no period (e.g. ¹), but regular size with a period (e.g. 1.) is preferred.

Books

**Book, 1 author**

Note:


Bibliography:


**Book, multiple authors**

Note:


Bibliography:

Edited Book  
Note:  

Bibliography  

Chapter, or article, in book  
Note:  

Bibliography:  

Articles  
Journal article, 1 author  
Note:  

Bibliography:  

Journal article, multiple authors  
Note:  

Bibliography:

**Journal article, online**

Note:

Bibliography:

**Newspaper, or magazine article, no author**

Note:

Bibliography:
Newspaper and magazine articles are rarely included in bibliographies, however "you can include an especially important article".

**Newspaper or Magazine article, online**

Note:

Bibliography:
Rarely included.

**Internet & other**

**Web site, entire**

Note:
10. Yale University, History Department home page, http://www.yale.edu/history/.

Bibliography:
Web page, with author

Note:

Bibliography:

Web page, no author

Note:

Bibliography:

Unpublished paper, thesis, or dissertation

Note:

Bibliography:

Personal Communication

Note:

Bibliography:
Personal communications are typically omitted from the bibliography unless they are archived and available to others. For example:

Course lecture, speech, or academic talk

Note:

Bibliography:

Book review

Note:

Bibliography:

Useful Guides
Memorial University Libraries Guides:
http://www.library.mun.ca/guides/howto/index.php (last four)
Owl (online Writing Lab) at Purdue:
http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/

Examples in this guide are taken from these books (which are available at the Information and Research help Desk):


AWARDS FOR UNDERGRADUATES

Scholarships, Bursaries, and Awards Administered By the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Scholarships, Bursaries and Awards for Which Undergraduate Students Already in Attendance at the University May Qualify
http://www.mun.ca/regoff/calendar/sectionNo=SCHO-0110

Scholarships, Bursaries, and Awards Available for Undergraduate Students for Study Outside Newfoundland and Labrador
http://www.mun.ca/regoff/calendar/sectionNo=SCHO-0745 (several for Harlow)

Scholarships, Bursaries, and Awards Administered By Other Authorities
http://www.mun.ca/regoff/calendar/sectionNo=SCHO-0772
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Comment/Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 7</td>
<td>First meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 9</td>
<td>Library session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 21</td>
<td>Book Review Due. Hand in at Tutorial</td>
<td>Tutorial federalism book review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 23</td>
<td>Visit Legislature-meet in the Foyer of Centre Block</td>
<td>Leg. Reform, Democratic Deficit &amp; Role of Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 4</td>
<td>Tutorial on Independent Quebec: book review</td>
<td>Book Review Due. Hand in at Tutorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 13</td>
<td>Tutorial on Against Reform book review</td>
<td>Researched Review Due. Hand in at Tutorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 7</td>
<td>Term test</td>
<td>On everything to date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>