Book Proposal to Oxford University Press, 2020

Successful Public Policy: Lessons from Canada

Editors:
Michael Howlett, Evert Lindquist, Grace Skogstad, Genevieve Tellier, Paul 't Hart

14 May 2020 Draft

Abstract
In Canada many public projects, programs, and services perform well, and many are very successful. However, these cases are consistently underexposed and understudied in the policy literature which, for various reasons, tends to focus on policy mistakes and learning from failures rather than successes. In fact, studies of public policy successes are rare not just in Canada, but the world over, although this has started to change (McConnell, 2010, 2017 and forthcoming; Compton & 't Hart, 2019; Luetjens, Mintrom & 't Hart, 2019). Like those publications, the aims of the book are to see, describe, acknowledge, and promote learning from past and present instances of highly effective and highly valued public policymaking. This exercise will be done through detailed examination of selected case studies of policy success in different eras, governments and policy domains in Canada. This book project is embedded in a broader project led by 't Hart and OUP exploring policy successes globally and regionally. It is envisaged as a companion volume to OUP's 2019 offering *Great Policy Successes* (Compton and 't Hart, 2019) and to a concurrent volume project on policy successes in the Nordic countries that will also be submitted to OUP. The Canadian volume provides an opportunity to analyze what is similar and distinctive about introducing and implementing successful public policy in one of the world's most politically decentralized and regionally diverse federation and oldest democratic polities.

Introduction
Through public policies, governments have enormous potential to shape the lives of their citizens. Actions taken at any given time can affect both present conditions and future trajectories. Much is at stake when new public policies are forged or when established ones are reformed and it behooves governments to learn from past experiences and both avoid earlier errors and well as emulate past successes.

Since its nineteenth century development as an outpost of the British Empire, successive national and provincial governments in Canada have progressively carved out independent identities and policies for their jurisdictions and their populations and attained a high level of social and economic development alongside and enviable set of governing institutions and practices. Canada has long been regarded as among the world's most stable and progressive countries. Although not seen as a 'radical innovator', it often has been rated as one of the best places to live in the world, with strong governance traditions and public service institutions

and a commitment to steady progress in public service delivery and social and economic development. Canadian political leaders and public service institutions are regularly consulted and asked to trade insights with other governments in the developing world and elsewhere due to the country's rich experience in public policy development and implementation.

To a certain extent, the academic policy literature has lagged behind these developments, in Canada and elsewhere. In the 1970s scholars produced classic accounts of public policy, now ensconced in the canon of academic research worldwide and academic curricula in universities everywhere, but which focussed attention on policy failures rather than successes. Among two best-known works from this foundational set of policy studies in the US, for example, are Pressman and Wildavsky's (1984) *Implementation* and Peter Hall's (1982) *Great Planning Disasters*, which showcased and explored public policy failures. These studies showed that although having seized a much more prominent role in public life following World War II, Western governments had internal complexities which combined with the vagaries of democratic political decision to often thwart their ambitions.

Somewhat unintentionally, generations of public policy and public administration students were steeped in such pessimistic diagnoses from similar studies which followed them (Butler et al, 1994; 't Hart and Bovens, 1996; Gray and 't Hart, 1998) and the 2010s (Allern and Pollack, 2012; Crewe and King, 2013; Light, 2014; Schuck, 2014; Opperman and Spencer, 2016). Although this did provide a firm analytical grounding of the institutional, behavioural, political, and media dynamics contributing to the occurrence, framing, and escalation of public policy failure, it largely ignored or downplayed policy success. In Canada too, high profile failures such as the cost overruns of the Montreal Olympic Games (1976); the ill-advised Mirabel Airport; the Sponsorship Affair which led to the Gomery Commission; the demise of Canada's national gun registry; the contaminated blood tragedy; the appalling treatment of Indigenous children in residential school care; deep scandals in Canadian peacekeeping in Somalia and in the Royal Canadian Mountain Police; and more recently the implementation of the Government of Canada's Phoenix payroll system and Newfoundland and Labrador's investment in the Muskrat Falls dam have been widely debated and studied. Taken together such examples and the body of studies cited above has contributed to the idea that governments, the Canadian ones not excepted, are chronically incompetent, overambitious, overly politicised, lacking in capacity to deliver, and tending towards avoiding accountability (e.g. Scott, 1998; Schuck, 2014; and for Canada Savoie, 2015).

This discourse has been quite influential. Day in, day out, media reports and social media discussions about alleged government failures continue exacerbating this negative frame, with significant implications for public perceptions and appreciation of government institutions. Though significant, however, the story of endemic government failure ignores the fact that in Canada, as in several parts of the world, many public projects, programs and services have performed well, sometimes exceptionally well, and sometimes for decades (see Bovens, 't Hart and Peters, 2001; McConnell, 2010; Moore, 2013; Goderie, 2015; Roberts, 2018). Yet so far, most academic students of public policy in Canada have had little to say

about instances where governmental steering efforts have been remarkably effective, generate benefits to all, remain popular and have stood the test of time from healthcare to pensions, banking and infrastructure development. The net impact of the lack of focus on the 'up' side of government performance is that many cannot properly 'see' and recall, let alone recognise and explain successful public policies and programs.

This book is designed to help to turn that tide. It aims to help reset agendas for teaching, research and dialogue on public policy performance within and beyond Canada by systematically examining outstanding cases of policy success, providing a foil to those who focus only upon errors and mistakes. It offers a series of close-up, in-depth case study accounts of the genesis and evolution of stand-out public policy achievements, across a range of sectors, jurisdictions and time periods in Canada. By constructing these case narratives while systematically engaging with the conceptual, methodological and analytical challenges of researching and debating success and failure in Canadian public policy, we hope to inspire a generation of teachers and researchers in policy analysis. What our field needs is a more balanced focus on both the 'light' and the 'dark' sides of the performance of our political and public sector institutions.

In this volume, we will adopt as our working definition the description of a successful public policy used by 't Hart and his colleagues in the prior volumes, which asserts that a policy is a broadly agreed success to the extent that it: (a) demonstrably achieves highly valued social outcomes and a broad base of public and political support for these achievements and the associated processes and costs; (b) manages to sustain this performance for a considerable period of time even in the face of changing circumstances.

Of course, like 'failure', success is not a matter of indisputable fact. We can monetize or otherwise standardize costs and benefits of policy processes and outcomes, we can set time frames and construct comparators across time and space to document our assessments. But there are also the lived realities and situated perceptions ('where you stand depends on where you sit') of different actors and stakeholders to be taken into account. Also, helicopter (e.g. 'net benefits to society') and granular ('inequitable distribution of costs and benefits to different groups in society') vantage points may lead to stark differences in assessment and interpretation of policies and programs.

Labelling a policy or an agency as successful depends on which stakeholders are involved, the positions they take, and the political environment. Public perceptions, political support, program legitimacy, and institutional reputations all come into play in shaping whether a new government initiative or entity is considered successful or not. As McConnell, Grealy, and Lea (forthcoming) remind us, case studies of policy outcomes should go beyond ascertaining whether a particular program successful from the point of view of the government that undertook it; they should also probe the extent to key actors within and outside government have been successful in shaping the program and reaping its benefits. In that sense, all policies and programs harbor particular configurations of success and failure depending on which and whose vantage points one uses in assessment.

Questions thus abound for each case study author: Successful in what regard, for whom, at which point in time, relative to what benchmark? Successful in actually 'doing better' to achieve public purposes, or primarily in making the public 'feel better' through more effective framing and dramaturgy? How do luck (context, zeitgeist, chance events, crises) or skill (political and public service craftsmanship in design, timing, political management, public relations) each play their part, and how do they affect one another?

In structuring the case study narratives and analyses, we provide case authors with a framework adapted from Compton and 't Hart (2019) and Luetjens et al. (2019) that requires them to attend to a number of factors and employ certain analytical perspectives in designing and reporting their case studies (see Table 1). Two assumptions underpin it, building on Bovens and 't Hart (1996) and McConnell (2010). First, it presupposes that balanced policy evaluation requires a multi-dimensional, multi-perspectivist, multi-criteria approach to assessment. Second, and inspired by Sabatier's (1988) now classic Advocacy Coalition Framework, it presumes that the success or failure of a public policy program or project cannot be properly assessed unless one looks at its evolution and impact across a decade or more from its inception.

Table 1: Dimensions of Policy Success: A Map for Case Assessment

Programmatic success: Purposeful and valued action	Process success: Thoughtful and effective policy making practices	Political success: Many winners, firm support and reputational benefits
• A well-developed *public value proposition* and *theory of change* underpin the policy • *Achievement* of (or, considerable momentum towards) the policy's intended and/or of other *beneficial social outcomes* • The pleasure and pain resulting from the policy are *distributed fairly* across the field of institutional and community stakeholders	• The design process ensures carefully considered *choice of policy instruments appropriate to context* and in a manner perceived to be correct and fair • The policymaking process offers reasonable opportunities for *different stakeholders to exercise influence* and *different forms of expertise* to be heard, as well as for *innovative practices and solutions* to be attempted before key policy choices are made • The policy-making process results in *adequate levels of funding, realistic timelines, and administrative capacity* • The delivery process effectively and adaptively deploys (mix of) policy instrument(s) to *achieve*	• A *wide array of stakeholders* feel they could advance their interests through the *process and/or outcomes* of the policy • The policy enjoys relatively high levels of *social, political and administrative support* • Being associated with the policy *enhances the reputations* of the actors driving it (both inside and outside government).

	intended outcomes with acceptable costs, and with limited unintended negative consequences	

Success over time:
Consolidation and endurance

- *High levels of programmatic, process, and political efficacy are maintained* over time

- Stable or growing *strength of social, political and administrative coalitions favoring continuation* of the policy over time

- Emerging narratives about the policy's success *confer legitimacy on the broader political system*

Case selection and volume outline

Methodologically, the volume proposed here follows in the footsteps of the classics noted earlier; the works of Hall and Pressman and Wildavsky in that it presents a series of up-close, case studies of highly successful public policymaking in Canada. The cases have been carefully chosen, after canvassing dozens of public policy experts and former officials across the country, including discussions and calls for topics and authors from members of the Canadian Public Policy Network. Experts in the Network were asked to identify cases they considered exemplary examples of successful public policy and were provided with the definition of what constituted a successful policy and shown the lists of cases from Compton & 't Hart (2019) and Luetjens, Mintrom & 't Hart (2019).

Following this process, the editorial team compiled a long list of well over a hundred suggestions for cases. The case selection process that ensued was first of all geared to picking policies which at face value (in the opinion of the experts we consulted) seemed to clearly 'make the cut' in terms of the four sets of success criteria specified in Table 1. Secondly, on the consolidation and endurance dimension of assessment in particular, we sought to get variation between: cases where public policies persisted seemingly effortlessly over long periods of time; policies which were considered successes but nevertheless were contested, frayed, and required significant adjustments over time; and cases where seemingly successful policies were nevertheless terminated over time. Thirdly, we sought to reflect the variation in policies along jurisdictional, sectoral, regional, linguistic and cultural differences in what is one of the world's most decentralized federations. Finally, we had to find experts on these topics willing to author a chapter.

In all, we believe we have a salient mix of examples of successful public policy in Canada over the past few decades. Each in their own right offers powerful stories about governments getting things right most of the time, and the authors will analyze how this happened. As such, each case study presents an instance of actors, institutions and processes of public policy-making coalescing to positive effect that can be dissected and debated in classrooms

across Canada. From an analytical perspective, the suite of cases presented will allow policy researchers multiple lines of comparative, pattern-finding and process–tracing inquiry.

The final selection of cases and authors – and thus the chapter outline of the volume – looks as follows.

1. Introduction: Studying Policy Successes in Canada. *Eds*

2. Canada's Pension System as a Successful Policy Mix. *Patrik Marier (Concordia University) and Daniel Béland (McGill University)*

3. Canada's K-12 Public Education System. *Jennifer Wallner (University of Ottawa)*

4. Quebec's Centres de la petite enfance (CPE). *Nathalie Burlone (University of Ottawa)*

5. Early Years Policy Innovation Across Canada. *Adrienne Davidson (McMaster University, starting July 1, 2020) and Linda White (University of Toronto)*

6. Driving a New Agenda: Federal Policies for University Research During the Chretien Years, 1993-2000. *Allan Tupper (University of British Columbia)*

7. Multiculturalism Policy as a Canadian Success. *Keith Banting (Queen's University)*

8. Canada's Immigration and Refugee System. *Phil Triadafilopoulos (University of Toronto)*

9. Canada's Medicare System. *Greg Marchildon (University of Toronto)*

10. BC's Inside/Harm Reduction Program. *Carey Doberstein (University of British Columbia)*

11. Canada's Long March Against Tobacco. *Cynthia Callard (Physicians for a Smoke-Free Canada)*

12. Regulating Canada's Banking System – Seeking Stability in a Turbulent World. *Russ Alan Williams (Memorial University)*

13. Canada's Response to the Global Financial Crisis: From Reluctance to Proroguing to the Successful Economic Action Plan. *Evert Lindquist (University of Victoria)*

14. Agriculture Marketing Boards: Wheat and Milk Products. *Grace Skogstad (University of Toronto)*

15. From R&D to Export: Canola as an Agricultural Success. *Matt Wilder (University of Toronto)*

16. Canada's Post-FTA Wine Industry. *Andrea Migone (Ryerson University)*

17. Canada's National Park System. *Robert Shepherd (Carleton University) and Alan Latourelle (Former CEO Parks Canada)*

18. Protecting the Great Lakes. *Carolyn Johns (Ryerson University)*

19. Canada's Model Forests: Policy Innovation Pioneers? *Adam Wellstead (Michigan Technological University), Tom Beckley (Univ. of New Brunswick), Peter Boxall*

(Cornell University), John Parkins (Univ.of Alberta), and Richard Stedman (Cornell University)

20. Ontario's Phase-Out of Coal. *Mark Winfield (York University)*

21. The Federal Equalization Program: An Untold and Misunderstood Canadian Success. *André Lecours (University of Ottawa), Daniel Béland (McGill University), and Trevor Tombe (University of Calgary)*

22. The Golden Years of Canada's Peacekeeping Missions. *Titilayo Soremi (Seneca College)*

23. Canada's Programme Review 1994-96. *Geneviève Tellier (University of Ottawa)*

24. Canada's Airport Authorities. *David Langlois (Rideau Consultants)*

25. How Indigenous People Transformed Public Policy through the Courts. *Satsan Herb George (Wet'suwet'en), Frances Abele (Carleton Univ.), and Kent McNeil (York Univ.)*

26. Learning From Policy Success: Implications for Policy Design & Implementation. *Eds*

More details can be found in Annex 1 which contains abstracts of each chapter, Annex 2 which provides the bios of the editorial team, and Annex 3 has the short bios of contributors.

Common structure and focusing questions for case study chapters

To increase the book's accessibility and use for teaching purposes and to facilitate thematic comparisons across cases we ask case authors *to address the following analytical questions* derived from the above framework, and broadly use the following section structure and word limits in crafting their case studies:

A policy success? (2000 words)

1. What is this case about and why is this policy (or program, project) included in this volume? What, in other words, is its fundamental 'claim to success' in terms of the definition and the four assessment dimensions of Table 1 above?
2. What if any 'counternarratives' to the success assessment have been offered? If so by whom, and how are these to be interpreted in the ongoing politics of the policy and polity in question ?

Contexts, challenges, agents (2000 words)

3. What social, political, and institutional contexts are relevant to understand the framing, design and execution of the policy? What history, fault lines, alliances and opportunities played into the origins and evolution of the policy in which the policy (program, project, initiative) was developed?
4. What specific challenges was the policy seeking to tackle, what if any specific aims did it seek to achieve? For which –and whose – problems was the policy a solution?
5. Which actors were principally involved in the policy process, and which were most affected by its enactment and implementation?
6. Who were the policy's main advocates, entrepreneurs and stewards? What drove them to take up these roles? How did they raise and maintain support for the policy?

7. Which actors were opposed to it, skeptical about it, or trying to get it amended or terminated? What tactics did these actors/coalitions use?

Design and choice (2000 words)

8. How did the policy design process – the progression from ambitions and ideas to plans and instruments – unfold? What role did evidence/analyses play in this process? What if any innovative practices were employed and to what effect?
9. How did the political decision-making process leading up to its adoption – the progression from proposals (bills, proposals) to commitments (laws, budgets) – unfold?
10. In this constellation of actors, interests, design practices, political moves and countermoves, when and how did a supporting coalition that helped carry the policy forward come into being?

Delivery and endurance (1500 words)

11. How did the implementation process unfold, and how did it shape the eventual reception and impact of the policy?
12. How did the political and public support for the policy evolve over time unfold? To what extent did the original coalition driving its adoption remain intact (or expand/contract)?
13. Did the policy's key components (goals, objectives, instruments, delivery mechanisms) remain intact over time? If not, what level of change (or abandonment) ensued, and how did it come about (see Howlett and Cashore, 2009 for a usable framework)?

Analysis and conclusions (1000 words)

14. To what extent can this case be seen as emblematic (or atypical) of Canadian policy style, sectoral policy regimes, or administrative traditions (e.g. Painter, 2010; Bayerlein and Knill, 2019)?
15. What unique factors may limit how broadly the lessons from this case can be applied (in terms of political, social, or economic context, or policy domain, etc.)?

Maximum chapter length: 8500 words (including figures and tables, exclusive maximum 500-word reference lists)

Target market

This edited volume is expected to be of high interest to students of public policy and public management, as well as practitioners working in all levels of government. The primary market comprises university students and public-sector practitioners in Canada. This market extends to ten provincial and three territorial governments, a national government, and over 25 public policy and public administration programs and scores of political science and government programs across 80 universities across the country. Given the prominence of the editors within the discipline and their representative nature across gender, geographical and

linguistic lines, we expect the book will be adopted in the graduate schools of public policy and public administration as well as executive education programs.

Beyond this 'domestic' market, and because of the previous ground-breaking collections of Compton & 't Hart (2019) and Luetjens, Mintrom & 't Hart (2019), we also anticipate that the whole volume and individual chapters will be of interest to other scholars and practitioners in many other countries around the world. Canadian public service practitioners and scholars are regularly called upon to advise governments in developing countries around the world, and we anticipate this collection will find its way into the hands of international delegations to other countries providing advice on how to better design, launch, and implement public policy.

Timeline

Chapter authors have been asked to meet the following deadlines, to ensure completion of the volume by the end of 2020 and publication in mid-2021:

- January 15, 2021   *First full draft* to editorial team

- Late February 2021   Editorial feedback to all case authors

- March 31, 2021   Authors submit *final draft* to editors

- Mid-May, 2021   Manuscript sent to OUP

- Winter 2021-22   Publication

References

Allern, S. and, Pollack, E. (2012), *Scandalous! The Mediated Construction of Political Scandals in Four Nordic Countries*, Gothenburg, SE.

Bayerlein, L. and Knill, C. (2019), Administrative styles and policy styles. In: *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bovens M and t'Hart P (1996), *Understanding Policy Fiascos*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Bovens, M., 't Hart, P. and Peters, B.G. (eds) (2001), *Success and Failure in Public Governance: A Comparative Analysis*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Butler, D., Adonis, A., and Travers, T. (1994), *Failure in British Government: Politics of the Poll Tax*. Oxford:Oxford University Press.

Compton, M. and 't Hart, P. (eds)(2019), *Great Policy Successes*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Crewe, I. and King, A. (2013), *The Blunders of Our Governments*, London: Oneworld.

Goderis, B. (2015) Public Sector Achievement in 36 Countries. Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau: The Netherlands Institute for Social Research. Accessible here.

Gray, P. and 't Hart, P. (eds) (1998), *Public Policy Disasters in Europe*, London: Routledge.

Hall, P. (1982), *Great Planning Disaster*s, new Intro. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Howlett, M. and Cashore, B. (2009), The Dependent Variable Problem in the Study of Policy Change: Understanding Policy Change as a Methodological Problem, *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 11:1, 33-46

Light, P. (2014), *A Cascade of Failures: Why Government Fails, and How to Stop It*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, Centre for Effective Public Management.

Luetjens, J., Mintrom, M. and 't Hart, P. (eds)(2019), *Successful Public Policy: Lessons from Australia and New Zealand*. ANU Press and Australian and New Zealand School of Government (ANZSOG).

McConnell, A. (2010), Policy Success, Policy Failure and Grey Areas In-Between. *Journal of Public Policy*, 30(20), 345-362.

McConnell, A. (2017), Policy Success and Failure. In William R. Thompson (Eds.), *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McConnell, A., Grealy, L., and Lea, T. (forthcoming), Policy analysis for whom? A Framework for analysis (under review at *Policy Sciences*).

Moore, M. (2013), *Recognizing Public Value*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Oppermann, K. and Spencer, A. (2016), Telling stories of failure: narrative constructions of foreign policy fiascos, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 23:5, 685-701

Painter, M., Peters, B.G.(eds)(2010), *Tradition and Public Administration*. New York: Springer.

Pressman, J.L. and Wildavsky, A. (1984), *Implementation*, 3rd Ed. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Roberts, A. (2018), *Can Government Do Anything Right?* Oxford: Polity Press

Sabatier, Paul. (1988), An advocacy coalition framework of policy change and the role of policy-oriented learning therein. *Policy Sciences*, 21: 129–168.

Savoie, D. (2015), *What Government Is Good At: A Canadian Perspective* (Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.

Schuck, P. (2014), *Why government fails so often: and how it can do better*, Princeton University Press.

Scott, J.C. (1998), *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Annex 1: Chapter Abstracts

Chapter 1-- Introduction: Studying Policy Successes in Canada
Editors

This chapter will be an elaborated version of the book proposal text, as above. It sets the context, highlights the relevance of the exercise, defines key terms, presents the common conceptual framework and focusing questions for the case studies, and ends with a brief overview of what is to come.

Chapter 2 -- Canada's Pension System as a Successful Policy Mix
Patrik Marier and Daniel Béland

Canada's pension system is among the best in the world in reducing poverty in old age and providing a high replacement rate for low income retirees. To this day, this continues to puzzle policy analysts and scholars, who routinely link our pension system to the likes of the United States and the United Kingdom when, in fact, it should be compared to countries providing generous and universal pensions, such as Norway. For instance, Canada's low score on pensions in Esping-Andersen's Three World of Capitalism, consistent with a liberal welfare regime, has been contested by numerous authors and even our own pension authorities, who quickly point out that our pension policy mix actually produces surprisingly, not to say unexpected, positive results.

In this chapter, we analyse the primary root of this policy success: the "failure" to dismantle a temporary program, the Guaranteed Income Supplement (GIS). The GIS was introduced in 1967, as a transitory measure to tackle expediently the prevalent poverty amongst Canadian seniors while expected to disappear with the maturation of the Canada Pension Plan/Québec Pension Plan. Not only was this program never abolished, it failed to generate the kind of stigma associated with social assistance benefits by virtue of linking the program to taxable income. As a result of this policy instrument design, it is an income-test program where older adults feel as entitled to the quasi-universal Old Age Security (OAS) program. The combination of OAS and GIS provides a relatively generous floor for retirees with limited resources. This points to the close and complementary relationship of key elements of the public pension policy mix in Canada.

In the last section, this chapter discusses some of the weaknesses of the policy mix by, for example, shedding light on why poverty alleviation gradually becomes less effective as one gets older. We also stress disadvantages facing immigrants and older single women within Canada's public pension policy mix. We conclude with some of the key challenges facing this policy mix moving forward and with a discussion about how success in poverty reduction does not mean that other key objectives of Canada's public pension system, namely providing a high replacement rate for middle income retirees and rising inequalities in retirement income, are addressed. This means that it is possible to improve further our relatively successful public pension policy mix.

Chapter 3 -- Elementary and Secondary Education Policy in Canada
Jennifer Wallner

This chapter examines the case of elementary and secondary education in Canada, arguably one of the strongest examples of 'policy success' in the country. Along with health and income maintenance programs, public education constitutes a key component of the Canadian

social policy system, absorbing a significant proportion of government expenditures. This massive commitment, moreover, is undertaken and managed by the 13 constituent members of the federation – namely, the provinces and territories – largely without the direct intervention of the federal government. Despite their independence and lack of hierarchical coordinating mechanisms, the provinces (and now the territories) have fashioned 13 elementary and secondary education systems that (for the most part) demonstrate marked comparability, compatibility, and equity.

To determine the success of Canadian public elementary and secondary education, this chapter assesses the sector through the following four dimensions. First, using results from both the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), run by the OECD, and the Pan Canadian Assessment Program, run by the Council of Ministers of Education Canada (CMEC), I document the relatively high achievements secured by the schooling systems from coast to coast to coast. Second, the chapter tracks the ways in which the processes of education policymaking in the country are regarded as legitimate by stakeholders and citizens alike. Third, due in large part to the programmatic success and the procedural legitimacy that characterizes the sector, public elementary and secondary education records significant political success with strong support from political leaders and the population at large. Fourth and finally, as one of the oldest policy sectors in the country, elementary and secondary education without a doubt exhibits the long-time horizons confirming the durability of these vital policy arrangements.

Success, as the editors of this volume underscore, does not require perfection nor does it imply that improvements to a system should not be made. While generating remarkable achievements for many in Canada, challenges in elementary and secondary education persist with inequitable achievements particularly for Indigenous children educated on reserves, some increasing trends towards the privatization of schooling in certain provinces, and increasing inequalities within certain cities between richer and poorer communities. Such challenges must be addressed to assure the continuing success of public schooling throughout the federation into the future.

Chapter 4 -- Québec's Centres de la petite enfance (CPE)
Nathalie Burlone

This case study focuses on the Centres de la petite enfance (CPE) or childcare centres, an important component of Québec's family policy. Introduced by Lucien Bouchard's government in 1997, this policy is grounded in the then budgetary constraints (zero deficit objective) and social, economic and labour market changes. With this policy, the provincial government aimed at aligning the fight against poverty, equality of opportunity, development of social economy and integration of social assistance clients into the workplace with an important basic principle: recognizing the primary responsibility of parents to provide for their children and the supporting role of the state. The development of the 1997 family policy was also consistent with the education and income security reforms then under way.

Among several provisions contained in the policy, the long-term creation of 200,000 affordable daily single rate ($5 in 1997) daycare spots available to all Québec children under the age of five was the most important. These services, delivered in facilities or in a family setting, are coordinated by the CPEs.Though the creation and evolution of daycare services have been the subject of criticisms, particularly because of problems of accessibility and, more recently, of its gradual move away from universality, the fact remains that the creation and implementation of the CPEs, which have been in place for more than 20 years, is a public

policy success. From a programmatic point of view, the implementation of CPEs, rooted in a philosophy of social investment and collectivization of care work, has undoubtedly provided incentives for working parents (mothers especially) by offering a necessary support to families and an increased assistance to low-income families. It has also facilitated family-work balance, promoted child development, and fostered equal opportunities.

With respect to process, the creation of the CPEs is part of a set of complementary measures (educational services, parental insurance and allowances) proved to be appropriate instruments for achieving initial objectives. The development of these measures also led to a transformation in the organizational structure of Québec's public administration with the creation of the Ministère de la Famille et de l'Enfance (now the Ministère de la Famille), the body responsible for implementing the policy. Finally, at the political level, the CPEs benefit from very strong public support and maintained (albeit transformed) under the three successive governments since the Parti Québécois's defeat in 2003.

Chapter 5 -- Early Years Policy Innovation Across Canada.
Adrienne Davidson and Linda White

In Canada, early years policy primarily falls to provincial governments; provincial authority has meant that a variety of provincial policies have emerged throughout Canada to address early childhood education and care, parental and family income supports, and primary and pre-primary education. However, the policy space is not uncontested, as the federal government has – on occasion – sought entrance into early years policy through program development or aimed to influence provincial action through its spending power. This chapter examines early years policy innovations across both orders of government: the federal Canada Child Benefit (CCB); Ontario's full-day kindergarten (FDK) model; Quebec's maternity and parental leave benefits; and Quebec's subsidized child care model. We argue that the CCB and FDK policies are examples of programmatic, process and political success that have endured over time and, in the case of FDK, diffused to a number of other provinces and territories with varying "dosage". The Quebec maternity and parental leave benefits and subsidized child care model demonstrate more partial and conflicted successes (McConnell, 2010). While purposefully and thoughtfully designed at the outset, both programs have not diffused to other jurisdictions. In the case of subsidized child care, the Quebec model has proved to be less resilient programmatically, with the original policy goals and instruments proving difficult to preserve in light of partisan shifts in government. This chapter examines the political and policy design features that explain these varied policy successes.

Chapter 6 -- Driving a New Agenda: Federal Policies for University Research During the Chretien Years, 1993-2000
Allan Tupper

This chapter examines the Government of Canada's research infrastructure policies and its strong support for a modern framework for university research funding as well as access to higher education. Its precise focus is the various important and costly research policies that were put in place by Prime Minister Jean Chretien's governments between 1993 and 2000. Early in his string of three successive majority governments, Chretien was obliged to deal with Canada's burgeoning deficits and public sector debts. Through the combined weight of government cutbacks, notably in federal transfers to provincial governments, and stronger Canadian economic growth, Canada's fiscal position improved dramatically and new spending was again permissible.

With backing especially from Canada's large "research intensive" universities, notably University of British Columbia, McGill University, Universite de Montreal and University of Toronto, the federal government put in place policies that established Ottawa at the heart of a new paradigm of university research. Major new initiatives included the Canada Foundation for Innovation that provided substantial funding for the rebuilding of research infrastructure at Canadian universities. Ottawa also entered directly into the funding of strong research professors through its establishment of the Canada Research Chairs (CRCs). The CRC program in its first phases drew considerable attention for its successes in bringing back Canadians, at federal government expense, who had distinguished themselves as outstanding researchers abroad. Canada was seen as a winner of an international struggle for research talent that had "repatriated" Canadian talent from abroad. More money was also placed into funding for the federal research granting agencies and the former Medical Research Council of Canada was remade into the Canadian Institutes for Health Research (CIHR). Equally, Ottawa promoted Networks of Research excellence that provided universities funding to promote inter-university centres of advanced centres of research. The government also established the Millennium Scholarship Foundation which provided bursaries and excellence awards for students, and support for research on access to higher education.

In short, Ottawa's policies were a remarkable success story. They established the federal government and the Liberal Party as lead forces in the creation of a research framework for the modern era. Among other things, Ottawa laid a new framework that would allow university research to fill gaps in Canada's chronically weak industrial research framework. Moreover, the new federal research framework was achieved with broad university support, with provincial governments sometimes muted support and with the government of Quebec's buy in. Ottawa's program of achievement made it a lead force in a major area of national endeavor, established universities as strong supporters of the Liberals initiatives and put in place new infrastructure and stronger funding for universities for the longer term. Universities became new stars in the federal government's universe.

Chapter 7 -- Multiculturalism Policy as a Canadian Success
Keith Banting

Canadian multiculturalism policies have been widely heralded as a success. However, debates over the policy are rife with misunderstanding about the basic nature of the policy and its social consequences. This article will examine the nature of the multiculturalism policy, its evolution over time, the factors that have shaped the policy, the impact of the policy on social outcomes, and the strengths and limits of its apparent political legitimacy and resilience. Multiculturalism represents a policy response to ethno-racial diversity. It goes beyond the guarantee of basic liberal rights to also recognize, accommodate and support ethnic minorities, especially immigrant minorities. Some analysts make the mistake of equating multiculturalism policy with the grants given by the federal government to ethnic groups, which is now a tiny initiative. Rather, Canadian multiculturalism is a whole-of-government approach to diversity, embedded formally in a wide range of policy domains.

The first section will document the scale, form and evolution of multiculturalism policies in Canada.The second section will examine the sources of political support and opposition to the policy. Although the launch of the program in 1971 was facilitated by supportive public servants, the policy has been primarily shaped and reshaped by partisan and electoral politics rather than pluralist/bureaucratic politics. This section will examine the politics that shaped the introduction of the program and its evolution, including the more recent partisan divide over the issue. The section will also examine the resiliency and political legitimacy of the

policy, using public opinion data to track the emergence of multiculturalism as an iconic part of Canadian identity in English-speaking Canada and the emergence of an alternative model in Quebec. The third section will discuss the social outcomes of the multiculturalism program, focusing on the endless debate over whether multiculturalism contributes to social segmentation or social integration. This section will draw on Canadian evidence about the integration of immigrants in Canada, as well as the sophisticated cross-national literature about social outcomes in countries like Canada that have adopted a multicultural approach compared with countries that have resisted that approach.The final section will draw on the proceeding analysis to reflect on stability of the policy approach over time, and its capacity to manage the challenges Canada is likely to face.

Chapter 8 -- Canada's Immigration and Refugee System
Triadafilos Triadafilopoulos

Canada's success in the area of immigration and refugee policy is widely acknowledged. Canada has emerged as a "model" of successful immigration policymaking, studied carefully by countries around the world. Canada's approach to resettling refugees is also considered a "best practice" internationally. In contrast to other countries, public opinion remains squarely supportive of immigration in Canada. Canada has developed a system that attracts large numbers of highly skilled immigrants, who integrate successfully, while meeting its humanitarian obligations through its family reunification and refugee resettlement policies. It does all this with the support of the Canadian public.

Canada's success in immigration and refugee policy has usually pointed to the importance of geography and enlightened public policy, but this chapter will also stress two typically overlooked institutional features: the concentration of power over immigration policy in the federal executive, and the interplay of settlement patterns, citizenship policy and Canada's electoral system. The concentration of power in the federal executive allows Canadian governments to respond to emerging challenges quickly. The dynamic interplay of settlement patterns, citizenship policy and the electoral system amplify the political efficacy of newcomers, weakening appeals to anti-immigrant populism and strengthening cross-party political consensus on the fundamental features of Canada's immigration policy.

The chapter traces the development of Canada's current approach to immigration from the adoption of the "points system" for immigrant selection in 1967, to the passage of the Immigration Act of 1976 and the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act of 2001. While executive dominance has allowed Canadian governments to pivot quickly in the face of new challenges, electoral considerations have diminished the influence of anti-immigration actors. Canadian policy has therefore been dynamic and efficient but also predictable; core elements of the policy, such as the maintenance of relatively high levels of economic immigration, have not been subject to partisan contestation.

The chapter concludes by considering the transferability of the Canadian immigration and refugee system. While some elements of the Canadian approach, such as its focus on recruiting highly skilled economic immigrants and settling privately-sponsored refugees, have been adopted, the institutional features that enable Canadian governments to act quickly and benefit from cross-party political consensus cannot be replicated. This suggests that too great a focus on policy design may hinder efforts to understand the success of the Canadian model of immigration and refugee policy-making. Canadian policymakers have been good, but they've also been lucky.

Chapter 9 – Canada's Medicare System.
Greg Marchildon

This chapter examines the policy success of Medicare in Canada based on McConnell's (2010) process, program and politics framework. Since the policy-program of universal health coverage (UHC), commonly known as Medicare in Canada, operates, simultaneously, at two levels of governments, success must be evaluated at both the strategic federal level and the programmatic provincial level. Although Medicare is a program that gradually emerged in Canada in the decades following the Second World War, this contemporary evaluation of the federal government's success begins with the *Canada Health Act* of 1984. Overall, Medicare must be judged a success based on the evaluative dimensions of process and politics. Medicare's success from a federal program perspective has been more limited. Although national standards for extra-billing and user charges have been upheld consistently, there has been a limited departure from two of the five national criteria in the *Canada Health Act*.

Each of the 10 provincial governments are responsible for the governance and management of their single-payer Medicare programs. They must also raise most of the revenue needed to UHC expenditures although they receive some an average of roughly 30-35% of the needed revenues through the Canada Health Transfer in return for adhering to the requirements of the *Canada Health Act*. Medicare's success at this level of government has become more contested with time. Overall, Medicare has been implemented and managed consistent with the original objectives of governments. As a statement of principle and general policy, Medicare remains supported by a majority of Canadians and sustained by an enduring coalition of civil society advocacy groups, trade unions, and non-physician provider groups. In recent years, it has lost some of program support due to the deteriorating performance of delivery and the inability to expand UHC beyond inpatient and outpatient medical care. In addition, anti-Medicare interest groups are more regularly using the Charter of Right and Freedoms to challenge the regulatory architecture of provincial Medicare programs in the courts.

Despite these changes, the majority of Canadians remain loyal to the original objectives of the policy. In addition, members of anti-Medicare coalitions in Canada have avoided challenging the redistributive ethos of Medicare and have tended to posit their policy recommendations as improving, rather than replacing, Medicare. Finally, no provincial government has redesigned its policy to replace single-payer and single-tier Medicare with a multi-payer or two-tier alternative despite the occasional threat to do so.

Chapter 10 – Insite in Vancouver: North America's First Supervised Injection Site
Carey Doberstein

In 2003, the first legal supervised safe injection site opened in Vancouver—the epicenter of the heroin epidemic in Canada—and is operated by a non-profit organization and funded by the government. The creation of the service was the culmination of an extraordinary political struggle initiated by an activist movement of drug users, pioneering local elected leadership, and a delicate multi-level governance negotiation with legal, health, and public safety dimensions. Insite has been an unqualified success in its core objective: saving lives through a harm reduction model of treating drug use as a health issue rather than as a criminal one.

Insite, and the subsequent additional sites created in Vancouver, enjoy enormously high public support in Vancouver, as well as the province and the country, representing a robust

policy success that has survived several government turnovers at all three levels of government, and appears firmly institutionalized (and the model has since diffused to other cities in Canada). Insite was conceived primarily as a response to high rates of HIV and Hepatitis C transmission from needle sharing, and while the more recent fentanyl crisis represents a distinct problem of a "dirty supply" of drugs leading to overdose fatalities, the philosophy of harm reduction that undergirds Insite has successfully primed elites and the public to the next pioneering phase: safe supply of drugs provided by government.

Thus in March 2020, the Province of British Columbia, in partnership with the local and federal government, announced a program to begin to offer safe supply of opioid users more broadly, a decision for which Insite and its policy success—and gaps—laid the foundation.

Chapter 11 -- Canada's Long March Against Tobacco
Cynthia Callard

After toying with the idea of restrictions in the early 20th century, Canadian governments only began developing policies to reduce smoking in the 1960s after the link between smoking and cancer was firmly established. A half century later, they are still at it. The comprehensive set of tobacco control policies implemented in Canada, and now embraced by a global tobacco treaty, has focused on reducing the demand for tobacco products. Early approaches in the 1960s and 1970s relied on public education about the health risks and encouraging smokers to quit. By the mid 1980s, the insufficiency of this programmatic approach was recognized, and governments moved to impose and progressively tighten regulatory controls on marketing. Once ubiquitous promotions, like billboards, retail displays, sponsored events and colourful packages were removed from the Canadian social environment. Measures to protect citizens from the harms of second-hand smoke began in the mid 1970s and by 2010 to clean the air of workplaces and public venues, decreasing the social acceptability of smoking. Tobacco taxes, once used purely to generate revenues for the government, became recognized as a powerful public health tool to deter use with higher prices.

The success of this set of demand-reduction policies can be measured in the reduction in the percentage of Canadians who smoke -- from one-half of adults in the mid-1960s to about one-sixth today. The failure of this approach is reflected in the industry's continued ability to recruit new smokers to replace those who quit and die. The vast majority of smokers were born long after the health harms were known to government and after these policies were initiated. For many years Canada was seen as a global leader in tobacco control, an early adopter of many key policies and the innovator of several, like large graphic health warnings and disclosure of toxic emissions. Over the past decade, the consensus in the public health community for sustained incremental expansion of tobacco-control programs and regulations has been challenged by the promotion (by some) of a harm reduction approach based on a liberalized market for alternative nicotine delivery systems like vaping products and also by the call (by some) for complementary controls on the suppliers of tobacco and nicotine products. The evolution of policies to reduce tobacco use – and the successes and failures of this experience – hold lessons for managing other chronic disease risk factors.

Chapter 12 – Regulating Canada's Banking System: Seeking Stability in a Turbulent World
Russell Alan Williams

While judging policy success is often complicated by the limitations of the values policy-making participants place on preferred outcomes, in the case of Canadian banking regulation,

success is easy to see for all involved. Policymakers have achieved both "highly valued" public goods enjoying broad political support, a key standard for defining success (Compton and 't Hart, 2019), and have managed to sustain this over a considerable period of time (Sabatier 1988) – indeed they have managed to do so during a period of intense volatility for the financial services industry, broadly.

Responding to new market and technological developments, and the increasing competitiveness of global markets that fundamentally altered both how finance "worked" and the role of government authorities in those markets, in the 1990s the Canadian government embraced a managed process of deregulation in which Canadian-owned firms were allowed to compete across financial sectors, to offer a more diverse array of products and to engage in the increasingly complex financial products being offered in global markets. Throughout this process the government regularly recommitted to core policy goals – ensuring the basic prudential soundness of the Canadian financial industry, ensuring some level of internal competition in the Canadian market (given the risks of the rapid industry concentration occurring elsewhere) and, protecting a range of policy concerns radiating from the users of the financial services (including consumer protection, service fees and uniquely, local branch presence). Concurrent with deregulation, the federal government also developed new institutional arrangements to ensure these broad policy goals would be met; an acceleration of the regular, periodic reviews of the *Bank Act*, a clarified framework for the role of all regulatory agencies in overseeing the sector, and an informal but coordinated network system for oversizing the prudential soundness of Canadian firms.

Since the process of deregulation, there have been two (and now three) major global financial crises, severely straining policy goals in other jurisdictions. At the same time, Canadian governments have had to manage significant interjurisdictional disputes over the regulation of the securities sector and sustained political pressure to allow increased industry concentration after deregulation. Despite the turbulence of these challenges, the Canadian financial sector has remained sound, internally competitive (at least as competitive as it was prior to deregulation) and a variety of smaller public interest goals have been successfully pursued – unlike elsewhere the politics of Canadian banking have been boring, and that in itself is a success story.

Chapter 13 -- Canada's Response to the Global Financial Crisis: From Reluctance to Proroguing to the Successful Economic Action Plan
Evert Lindquist

When government responses to the Global Financial Crisis are compared (Wanna, Lindquist, and de Vries, 2015), Canada's approach is often lauded in part because of a more prudently regulated banking and financial sector (see Williams, Ch. 12), its relatively well-managed budget and public finances, and a concerted and quickly rolled-out Economic Action Plan (EAP) comprised of significant infrastructure funding available to all levels of government (federal, provincial and municipal). Led by Prime Minister Stephen Harper and Minister of Finance Jim Flaherty, and delivered under a Conservative minority government, this response was rewarded with a majority government in the next federal election, thus making the policy intervention a program and political success. What is interesting about these outcomes is that they defied early reactions of the government to the emerging crisis: the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance were not inclined to respond with pre-emptive actions, the Harper government almost fell as the three Opposition parties joined forces for an imminent vote of non-confidence, and the proroguing of Parliament by Prime Minister Harper to buy time was

extremely controversial, since it was already viewed as a government led by a Prime Minister not inclined to consult and collaborate.

This case shows that even reluctant political leaders can shift and retreat on positions in the face of political and fiscal realities, and then produce a credible, well-designed policy package in response to a major crisis. However, this case also shows that such a retreat is not sufficient: many other political, policy and administrative skills and ingredients are necessary to produce good outcomes. This chapter reviews how the government used the prorogation of Parliament not only to buy time, but also to seek out advice from expert Finance officials and international institutions, consult widely with experts across Canada and beyond, sent important signals to the public service and ancillary institutions about what constituted priorities, worked with the leaders of central agencies to find ways to streamline approvals for infrastructure projects, secured pre-guidance from the Auditor-General of Canada about how audits would proceed, levered well-established federal-provincial-territorial repertoires for eliciting proposals for infrastructure projects; and developed an effective communications strategy to accompany the outlay of funds designed to build trust in the midst of a crisis and lay the groundwork for its election strategy. This case shows that, despite considerable early reluctance to address an emerging crisis, a successful intervention can materialize from political shrewdness and public-service competence.

Chapter 14 -- Regulated Marketing Institutions in Canadian Agriculture
Grace Skogstad

Institutions with the authority to regulate sales and prices of agricultural commodities have historically been an important instrument of Canadian agricultural policy. For over six decades, and until it was disbanded in 2011, the Canadian Wheat Board exercised exclusive authority to purchase wheat and barley grown in the prairie region of Canada and sell these commodities into export markets. The marketing boards that continue to regulate the domestic supply and pricing of milk and dairy products in the dairy sector are almost as old, being established in the early 1970s. The divergent fates of the two long-established regulatory institutions provide an opportunity to weigh the relative importance of features of program design, the policy-making process, and politics in the success of public policies.

To assess the merits of each of these three criteria for assessing policy longevity/resilience, the chapter relies on diverse sources of economic and political data. Economic data to assess programmatic success indicate that agricultural marketing boards in the grains and dairy sectors both succeeded in their shared goal of enhancing the collective bargaining power of producers vis-à-vis purchasers of their commodities. Secondary and primary data sources (analyses of media reports and parliamentary debates) are relied upon to differentiate the plausibility of the 'politics' and 'policy making process' accounts of policy success.

These analyses demonstrate the primacy of a 'politics' account argument of policy success in the case of regulated marketing institutions in Canadian agriculture.

Chapter 15 -- From R&D to export: Canola as an agricultural success
Matt Wilder

Canola is Canada's second largest agricultural export, contributing an estimated $30 billion to Canada's economy annually. To become the boon canola is today, a litany of public and private investments had to be made in research and development throughout the latter half of the twentieth century. This chapter considers the development of canola to be a case of

governance success in the industrial policy domain. The chapter chronicles the ways in which good governance practices permitted policymakers to harness advantages germane to liberal institutions while curbing pathologies associated with them by implementing "beneficial constraints." Regarding advantages, institutions that permit expeditious decisionmaking allowed business and government to undertake risky investments in novel biotechnology applications and streamline the regulatory process. With respect to avoiding pitfalls, the institutionalization of beneficial constraints encouraged cost internalization within the beneficiary group and thus blunted tendencies toward moral hazard that usually coincide with government assistance.

The chapter begins with a discussion of the metrics upon which policy success is based. While the economic benefits of canola speak for themselves, two counternarratives warrant consideration. One is that groups opposed to genetically-modified (GM) crops were given short shrift by policymakers, which followed from the unrepresentativeness of Canadian political institutions. In countries with more representative political institutions, governments have been hesitant to embrace GM technology, preferring instead to exercise the precautionary principle. The other counter-narrative is that monopolistic consolidation within the canola industry, which follows from comparatively unregulated corporate policy, has negatively impacted society. Consistent with the theoretical framework, both counternarratives speak to ills associated with liberal institutions. The second section covers the social and environmental context surrounding canola development; it highlights the decades-long investment cycle, important policy entrepreneurs, and technological and regulatory developments. The third section centres on policy design, and focuses on beneficial constraints on cost externalities established by arms-length mechanisms that placed significant responsibilities on non-profit industry associations. The fourth section discusses the endurance of industrial policy toward canola, which persists despite the maturation of the technology. Ongoing research pertains to achieving greater yield and tolerance (to heat, drought, insects and cold, for instance), and realizing economies of scope with respect to novel applications (e.g., plastics, detergents, cosmetics, plant-based meat substitutes). The fifth and final section summarizes the salient features of the case in terms of governance theory. The main contention is that the case constitutes an exemplar of good governance for industrial policy in liberal systems.

Chapter 16 -- Canada's Post-FTA Wine Industry
Andrea Migone

While the Canadian wine industry has roots that go back to the 19th century, its most evident successes date to the late 20th century history, when a mix of policy learning from the Australian and Californian experience and targeted policy measures from Canadian jurisdictions allowed the industry to develop into its current shape. Hinging mostly around the British Columbia and Ontario clusters, the Canadian wine industry has developed over time products that have enjoyed both commercial and critical success. Its economic impact by 2017 was estimated at over $9 billion, of which wines are but a facet, since the industry provides important direct and indirect inputs to tourism revenues and the government's tax base. Unlike other sectors, the industry is also relatively compact: while the number of grape growers and wineries increased over time, the numbers still allow for efficient associational representation.

This case study argues that the success of the Canadian wine industry has three pillars: the first has been the capacity of the industry, both in terms of the small, local producers, and of the large international corporations that intervened early in the national market to take some

core lessons from other new world producers and adapt them to the Canadian situation centered on cool climate products, this has included a very specific strategy that was mostly focused on satisfying the domestic market while targeting very specific niches such as ice wine. The second has been the Canadian policy style of punctuated gradualism and the process of executive negotiation that is typical of Canadian federalism has favored the creation of a policy environment that, while not perfect, can be credited with fostering the industry's growth. Finally, both of these pillars have been supported by the fact that wine making escapes at least in part the 'distributive' nature of Canadian economic development: the terroir and the climate of a region are critical to the quality of the final product and this enabled government support to be much less disputed and this has effectively led to a relatively cooperative policy trajectory. This was certainly helped by the fact that, while there is room for improvement, the wine industry has a particularly positive image from an environmental perspective.

Chapter 17 -- Canada's National Park System
Robert Shepherd and Alan Latourelle

Management of Canada's national parks was at a crossroads in the early 1990s with increased pressure to expand commercial interests in parks, while at the same time preserving citizen accessibility and ensuring environmental sustainability and conservation. Such a balance was tested with increased commercial pressure to develop Banff National Park – a situation either being experienced or looming in other parks across the country. The challenge in Banff was the lack of a national parks policy to guide federal government decisions. Then Heritage Minister, Sheila Copps, was under pressure from Banff City Council to expand commercial retail and accommodations development by 24 percent, while environmental groups, including the Bow Valley Taskforce advocated to protect the natural environment. As minister responsible for parks, Sheila Copps had to approve or reject the city's plan, without a clear roadmap on federal decision-making (Eisler, 1997).

The increasing intersection of interests in Banff spearheaded a federal conversation about poor and uncoordinated management of national parks at the centre of government with institutional and legislative arrangements locked into a regime going back to the creation of the Dominion Parks Branch under the Department of the Interior in 1911. There was appetite for the federal government to protect and expand parks under Chretien, but few means to provide rational and coherent policy management of parks as a system rather than as individual entities under the stewardship of different ministers. The Chretien government was committed to effective national management but led by public officials who would be responsible for execution of various legislation, including the *Species at Risk Act*, and the *Environmental Protection Act*. The Special Operating Agency initiative of the mid-1990s provided a vehicle for converting political leadership around these issues of policy coherence into effective operational leadership and management.

Parks Canada has since enjoyed a positive track record of effective policy performance. Policy performance is understood in four ways. First, it must manage commercial, environmental, Indigenous, residential and user/public relationships toward a common vision with significant public consultation. Second, it must manage the complex regulatory regime for parks that balances various interests while ensuring regulatory compliance. Third, it must provide effective leadership in scientific management of parks' ecosystems. And finally, it must maintain a system of effective public service responsibility against a management performance system. The *Parks Canada Act*, for example, ensures that the Auditor General maintains a firm hand on the Agency's management regime.

This chapter will trace the evolution of the policy and management approach to managing national parks pre- and post-Parks Canada regime, and provide lessons learned for more effective parks management in the future. It will track this evolution of national parks management in Canada, using the four areas of performance noted as guides to policy success using various examples of agency initiatives over time.

Chapter 18 -- Protecting the Great Lakes
Carolyn Johns

The North American Great Lakes region is an excellent policy laboratory to examine the complexity of policy success. Some 50 years ago environmental governance of the Great Lakes was viewed as a policy failure. However, decades of concerted efforts by two federal countries through a complex transboundary policy regime resulted in policy success not solely measured in terms of programmatic, process and political success but also ecosystem outcomes. This chapter reviews policy successes related to acid rain, biodiversity, invasive species, and toxic substances, but also outlines how policy success can be followed by set-backs, re-emerging issues, enduring challenges and new threats.

This case highlights how policy success can be followed by a period of inaction and complacency and how successful policies and institutions need to adapt. It is an excellent case to examine how stable coalitions of government-led, multi-level, multi-actor, multi-issue policy efforts and a general narrative of success has contributed to the political and public perception that past policy success means that significant policy challenges no longer require concerted policy effort or attention. It also highlights how policy scholars and practitioners are increasingly embracing complexity, adaptive management, and the use of more sophisticated indicators to improve evaluations of policy and governance over time.

Chapter 19 -- Canada's Model Forests: Policy Innovation Pioneers?
Adam Wellstead, Tom Beckley, Peter Boxall, John Parkins, and Richard Stedman

Recently, there has been a global trend of policy innovation labs (PILs) emerging across a number of different sectors addressing a wide variety of issues. Generally seen as a new phenomenon created in the public sector to cope with external complexity and internal learning, PILs embrace experimentation and meaningful stakeholder engagement. McGann et al (2016) found that while policy innovation labs fall under the "auspices of government departments or agencies, what distinguishes a 'public policy' from a 'public sector innovation' team is not at all clear. It is possible to imagine examples of public sector innovation that are not specifically about policy, but in practice the two terms seem to be used interchangeably" (p.19). Furthermore, they point out that "while labs are generally regarded as experimental in some sense, they vary significantly in their proximity to executive power" in terms of their level of funding and their autonomy.

While PILs and innovation thinking are very much in vogue within today's Canadian federal government, we argue that over its 20 year history (1992-2012), the Model Forest Program created, sponsored, and fostered a number (10-12) of Model Forests across Canada which took on the characteristics of what we see in today's PILs. The Model Forest program which was established by Natural Resources Canada's Canadian Forest Service found its origins as a recommendation in the Mulroney government's "Green Plan for a Healthy Environment" and came into fruition after the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro. From the beginning, it was presented as an experiment to develop innovative approaches to sustainable forest management to integrate economic, environmental and social goals. Model Forests were

developed at a management level scale (ranging from 100,000 hectares to more than two million hectares) and represented the diversity of Canada's forest regions. New methods were tested and impacts were assessed with respect to biodiversity, forest management, economic development, and community development region of Canada.

By conceptualizing Model Forests as PILs, we can better understand and analyze their success according to the McConnell "process, policy, and politics" criteria used in this volume. More importantly, this approach can shed light on role Model Forests and how the larger program played in Canadian forestry policy-making. This chapter will focus on both the Model Forest Program and individual Model Forests, in particular the Foothills Model Forest, the Manitoba Model Forest, and the Fundy Model Forest.

Chapter 20 -- Phasing-Out Coal-Fired Electricity in Ontario
Mark Winfield

The phase-out of coal-fired electricity production in the Canadian Province of Ontario has been widely described as one of the most significant measures taken by any government in the world to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The phase-out of coal, which in the early 2000s constituted a quarter of the province's electricity supply, was completed in 2014. The phase-out was associated with dramatic improvements in air quality in southern part of the province. As such, it is regarded as a core environmental legacy of the 2003-2018 Liberal governments of Premiers Dalton McGuinty and Kathleen Wynne.

Although an undeniable success in terms of emissions of GHGs, smog and acid rain precursors, and heavy metals, like mercury, the province's approach to the phase-out did involve significant trade-offs in terms of the environmental and economic sustainability of the province's electricity system. The phase-out was associated with a substantial re-expansion of the role of nuclear energy in the system, and the period over which the phase-out took place characterized by major increases in electricity costs for residential consumers. The phase-out was also a product of a wider politicization of decision-making around the system, the consequences of which continue to affect the province's politics profoundly.

The chapter will explore the evolution of the role of coal-fired electricity in Ontario, the environmental, health and political drivers of the concept of a coal-fired electricity phase-out, and the processes through which the phase-out was completed. The chapter will examine the environmental health benefits and trade-offs associated with the phase-out, as well as the impacts of the phase-out on electricity costs, and the configuration of the province's electricity system, including the rise and demise of the 2009 *Green Energy and Green Economy Act*. The chapter will assess the impact of the phase-out process on the province's overall approach to decision-making around the electricity system, and the long-term political impacts of the phase-out.

Chapter 21 – The Federal Equalization Program: An Untold and Misunderstood Canadian Success
Daniel Béland, André Lecours, and Trevor Tombe

Created in 1957, the federal equalization program addresses the issue of horizontal fiscal imbalance and, more specifically, seeks to reduce interprovincial disparities in fiscal capacity. Excluding the three territories, which fall under Territorial Formula Financing, the equalization program allocates payments to the provinces whose fiscal capacity falls under a national average. This means that, in contrast to the two other large federal transfers, the

Canada Health Transfer and the Canada Social Transfer, equalization does not make annual payments to all the provinces. Simultaneously, since the creation of the program, all the provinces have received equalization payments for at least a few years. In 2019-2020, equalization payments to the five recipient provinces (Manitoba, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Quebec) totaled nearly 20 billion dollars. In comparison, that fiscal year, the Canada Health Transfer and the Canada Social Transfer allocated about 40 and 15 billion dollars respectively to provinces and territories.

In this chapter, we argue that equalization policy has been successful in reducing interprovincial inequalities while preserving the autonomy of the provinces, as equalization payments have no strings attached. This capacity to reconcile provincial autonomy with egalitarian goals rooted in shared social citizenship is featured in section 36(2) of the 1982 Constitutional Act: "Parliament and the government of Canada are committed to the principle of making equalization payments to ensure that provincial governments have sufficient revenues to provide reasonably comparable levels of public services at reasonably comparable levels of taxation." A comparison with the United States, which does not have a stand-alone equalization program, allows us to show why this program makes a difference in the life of Canadians and in the proper functioning of the federation.

It may sound surprising to praise equalization policy in a time where strong voices, especially those coming from Alberta and Saskatchewan, are criticizing the program. In our chapter, we review these criticisms and show that many of them are grounded in basic misunderstandings about how equalization works. This gap between the negative discourse about equalization and the effective functioning of the program is a key political challenge our chapter addresses. Simultaneously, we recognize that some criticisms of equalization policy are legitimate, which is why we offer potential policy solutions to address them and improve this effective and important program Canadians should learn more about.

Chapter 22 -- The Golden Years of Canada's Peacekeeping Missions
Titilayo Soremi

This chapter examines the policy success of Canada's involvement in international peacekeeping from 1947 to 1989. In line with McConnell's (2010) framework for gauging policy success, the chapter assesses the policy discourse that ensued within the country after WWII, and how it aligned with the call for international intervention in budding and full-blown conflicts across the world. Importantly, it shows that the emergence of United Nations (UN) Peacekeeping and the founding of its modus operandi of armed peacekeeping, are credited to the ingenuities and initiatives of a past Canadian Prime Minister, Lester B. Pearson. In addition, the chapter elaborates on Canada's consistency, dedication, and gallantry, in its response to peacekeeping missions initiated by the UN.

With reference to Canada's devoted efforts, the chapter shows that the success of the UN peacekeeping missions over the stipulated period, also signifies a success story of Canada's peace and security policy. Using the parameters of policy coherence, program effectiveness, and political success, we examine the success of the policy during the identified period. The coherence of the policy underpinning Canada's peacekeeping missions is demonstrated through the clarity of objectives, consistency of commitment, and constancy of implied meanings, across the government departments that facilitate Canada's involvement in UN peacekeeping missions, including Global Affairs and Armed Forces. The calculated synergy of action across these departments resulted in commissions free from distractions and timely intervention of the UN in the interruption of an escalating crisis. The program effectiveness

of Canada's peacekeeping missions hinged on the resulting effectiveness of the UN's peacekeeping interventions and the willingness of the Canadian armed forces to answer the call to duty. UN's interventions restored lasting peace in conflict zones, and stalled warring factions from reigniting tensions that could escalate into violent events.

Within Canada, national and cross-partisan commendation of peacekeeping efforts emphasize the political success of Canada's peacekeeping efforts. The shared pride in the achievements of Canadian peacekeepers is commemorated with the erection of a monument in the nation's capital and international appreciation is demonstrated in the award of an exclusive Nobel Peace Prize to Lester B. Pearson in 1957. While the reputation of UN peacekeeping and Canada's participation has sometimes been fraught with misconduct by few members of the peacekeeping armed forces, Canada's peace and security policy nonetheless remained dedicated to ending fighting and making peace, by enabling the sustained contribution of funds, gears, and equipment towards upholding an international peace force.

Chapter 23 -- Canada's Program Review 1994-96
Geneviève Tellier

When the Conservatives came to power in 2006, one of their main priorities was to "restore fiscal balance" by reducing the growth of public spending "to a rate that is sustainable", among other things (The Budget Plan 2006). This was certainly not the first Canadian government to commit itself to fiscal responsibility. Yet, almost all previous governments failed to achieve this objective. There was, however, one notable exception: the "Program Review" initiative launched by the Liberal government in 1994. This initiative established a formal mechanism to assess every federal program and determine which ones should be continued, modified, and terminated. In only a few years, the federal deficit was eliminated and, most importantly, the federal government was able to redefine the role and mission of public services.

The temptation was therefore high for the subsequent Conservative government to launch its own program review initiative, in 2006. This initiative mostly failed, however. Why did the Liberals succeed, yet not the Conservatives? They were some elements of luck (or bad luck). The Liberals, for instance, benefited from a long period of economic prosperity while the Conservatives faced the most severe economic downturn since the Great Depression (at the time). But they were also other factors that contributed to the success of the Liberal Program Review. *First*, the context was different. There was a sense of urgency about the deficit and the debt in the 1990, that did not exist later on. It was therefore easier for the Liberals to ask Canadians to make some "sacrifices". *Second*, the top-ranking decision makers were strongly committed to the reform. A minister was appointed specifically to oversee the review, and all central agencies (Treasury Board Secretariat, the Finance Department, Privy Council, Cabinet) were called on to work together. Discussions between the government and stakeholders were also established. Furthermore, all departments, agencies and Crown Corporations were asked to assess their respective programs using a common set of "tests" or "questions". Therefore, program managers were not just asked to find savings; they were shown how to find them. *Finally*, the Canadian political landscape changed significantly with the 1993 election. Although the Progressive Conservative Party almost completely disappeared, ideas about fiscal restraint remained popular. The Liberal Party won two subsequent majority governments, thus providing at least some legitimacy to their Program Review.

Twenty-five years later, the Program Review of 1994-96 still continues to be cited as an exemplary initiative in and outside Canada. The question remains why following governments were not able to successfully replicate this initiative.

Chapter 24 -- Canada's Airport Authorities
David Langlois

Transport Canada is a federal government department charged with the regulation of transport modes: air, sea, road and rail. The "air" mode regulates fixed and rotary wing airplanes, drones and airports. The Department of Transport (DOT), as Transport Canada was originally known, became responsible for airports in the 1920's. After World War 2 the volume of passengers carried by airlines began to grow dramatically, and the DOT's plans for development and re-development of airports under its control never seemed to get ahead of the demand. By the early 1970's it was apparent that a large bill faced the Canadian federal government to respond to this increased demand. Such a bill was politically unacceptable and in 1984 the Conservative Government began looking at how to address the cost. By 1991 Transport Canada had, in conjunction with four interested private sector parties, developed the policy by which ownership of all airport assets, excepting the land, could be transferred from the public to the private sector. The decision to create the Airports Authorities was made by two governments – Conservative and Liberal. The decision to keep them has been continued for almost 30 years by successive Liberal and Conservative Governments.

It is a Canadian public policy success story. The Airport Authorities have shown that a locally managed airport can be responsive to the needs of its community; and that it contributes to that community's economic health to a great extent.In forming the Airports Authorities as non-share capital corporations, Canada has created something unique. They are not like the British Airports Authority, nor are they like the American airports. In Canada the Airport Authority's Boards of Directors are nominated by municipal, regional, provincial and federal governments, by local socio-economic groups such as the Board of Trade or the Chamber of Commerce, by various labour or professional organizations, or by the Airport Authority Boards themselves. The Board is the Airport Authority's governor, with a single link to staff through the CEO. In 1991 the airports operated by Transport Canada cost the Canadian taxpayer more than $700 million annually to operate ($1.4 billion in 2018 dollars). In 2018 alone that cost had been reduced to less than $35 million annually, and the 21 Airports Authorities contributed more than $400 million to the federal treasury in rent, and more than $2.5 billion to the economy.

Chapter 25 -- How Indigenous People Transformed Public Policy through the Courts
Satsan Herb George , Frances Abele, and Kent McNeil

Since the early 1970s, a series of Supreme Court of Canada and other court decisions have shifted public policy on Indigenous-Canada relations, particularly concerning land rights, self-government, and jurisdiction over Indigenous territories. The first such decision by the Supreme Court was *Calder v. Attorney General of British Columbia* (1973), which led to the federal government's Comprehensive Land Claims policy for negotiating modern-day treaties.

Since 1982, almost all the decisions impacting on Indigenous rights and policy have involved interpretation and application of section 35 of the *Constitution Act, 1982*, which recognized and affirmed existing Aboriginal and treaty rights, providing them with constitutional protection. Key decisions include *Guerin v. The Queen* (1984); *R. v. Sparrow* (1990); *R. v.*

Van der Peet (1996); *R. v. Gladstone* (1996); *R. v. Pamajewon* (1996); *Delgamuukw v. British Columbia* (1997); *R. v. Marshall* (1999*); R. v. Powley* (2003); *Haida Nation v. British Columbia* (2004); *Mikisew Cree v. Canada (Minister of Canadian Heritage)* (2005); *Tsilhqot'in Nation v. British Columbia* (2014); and *Grassy Narrows First Nation v. Ontario (Natural Resources)* (2014). These decisions have resulted from litigation, usually involving Indigenous people and the Crown, in a long march through the judicial system remarkable for its consistency and duration. The judicial rulings have forced the federal and provincial governments to reassess and change their policies to bring them more into line with Indigenous peoples' constitutional rights, as declared by the courts. With the possible exception of issues of federal-provincial jurisdiction arbitrated since Confederation, there is no other area of Canadian political development that has been led to this degree by action through the courts.

In this chapter, we will explore the impact of key decisions on Indigenous rights on public policy and assess the extent to which policy changes have led to changes in actual behaviour of federal and provincial governments in Canada. We will look at the constraints that remain in order to develop a clear picture of the kinds of policy changes that are needed to help the transition to a new Indigenous-Canada relationship under section 35.

Chapter 26 -- Learning From Policy Success: Implications for Design and Implementation
Editors

In this final chapter, the editors will take stock of the findings of the case studies. We will use the list of focusing questions presented in the introductory chapter as the main vehicle for doing so. We will compare/contrast and ultimately extract recurrent patterns and critical antecedents of policy success in the Canadian context. In the second part of the chapter, we will 'convert' those empirical findings into principles of policy and institutional design as well as process and political management. Finally, we will reflect on what looking at Canadian public policymaking through the positive lens of 'success' has brought us and may bring us in future.

Annex 2: Editorial Team

In addition to Paul 't Hart, internationally recognized for his scholarship on crisis leadership and management, political and public leadership, and policy success and failure, the editorial team for this collection includes four well-known Canadian scholars from across the country in the fields of public policy and public administration, each with international reputations and substantial involvement in scholarly and practitioner networks inside and outside Canada.

Michael Howlett is Burnaby Mountain Professor and Canada Research Chair (Tier 1) in the Department of Political Science at Simon Fraser University. He specializes in public policy analysis, political economy, and resource and environmental policy. He was Visiting Professor (2009–2010) and Yong Pung How Chair Professor (2013–2017) at the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy at the National University of Singapore, Visiting Professor at the Universita degli studi di Cagliari (2012), Visiting Research Fellow at the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (2018) and Visiting Researcher at the Centre for Advanced Studies of the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universitat Munchen (2020). His most recent books are *Designing Public Policies* (2019), *Policy Consultancy in Comparative Perspective*; (2020), *Studying Public Policy* (2020); *Collaboration in Public Service Delivery* (2019); *Making Policies Work* (2019); *Routledge Handbook of Policy Design* (2019); *Policy Styles and Policy Making* (2019).

Evert Lindquist is Professor of Public Administration at the University of Victoria and Editor, *Canadian Public Administration*, the flagship journal of the Institute of Public Administration of Canada (2012–2020). He served as Director of the University of Victoria's School of Public Administration (1998–2015), professor at the University of Toronto (1988–1998), the first Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat Visiting Fellow (1992–94), and the ANZSOG–ANU Chair in Public Management Research (2010–11). Lindquist has served on IPAC's Board of Directors, as President of the Victoria Regional Group, chair of IPAC's Research Committee, and President of the Canadian Association of Programs in Public Administration. He has published on topics relating to public sector reform, governance and decision-making, central agencies, policy capability and recruitment strategies, think tanks, consultation, horizontal management, government and non-profit relations, budgeting, leadership and competing values, and visualization and policymaking.

Grace Skogstad is a Professor of Political Science at the University of Toronto. She served as chair of the Department of Political Science at the University of Toronto Scarborough from 2012 to 20202, as President of the Canadian Political Science Association in 2002–2003, and is President of the International Public Policy Association. She specializes in Canadian Politics, especially Canadian federalism, and the comparative public policies of agriculture, food, and renewable fuels in North America and the European Union Her most recent books are *The Global Promise of Federalism* (2013); *Canadian Federalism: Performance, Effectiveness and Legitimacy* (4th edition, 2020); *Policy Paradigms, Transnationalism, and Domestic Politics* (2011); *The Common Agricultural Policy: Continuity and Change* (2010); and *Internationalization and Canadian Agriculture: Policy and Governing Paradigms (*2008). Her most recent articles have appeared in *Policy Sciences*, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, *Journal of European Public Policy*, *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, *Journal of International Law and International Relations*, the *Journal of Public Policy* and the *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis*.

Geneviève Tellier is Professor of Public Administration at the School of Political Studies at the University of Ottawa, where she has served as assistant director of the School and director

of graduate programs from 2011 to 2014, among other things. She is currently the *Politics and Public Policy* series editor at the *University of Ottawa Press* and serves as the treasurer of the *Canadian Study of Parliament Group*. She was President of the *Société Québécoise de science politique* (Quebec Political Science Society) in 2011–2012. Her research focuses on public budgeting, public finances and parliamentarism. She has published on the topic of public budget participation, parliamentary institutions, budget decisions and elections, balanced-budget legislation, taxation, and more recently gender-budgeting. She recent book was published by the University of Toronto Press: *Canadian Public Finances. Explaining Budgetary Institutions and the Budget Process in Canada (2019)*. She frequently shares her expertise through the media, for which she has received the Award for Activities in the Media or the Community of the Social Science Faculty in 2019.

Paul 't Hart is professor of public administration at Utrecht University, where he currently leads an EU-funded large research project into successful public policies, organizations and networks. Early fruits of that work include the co-edited volumes *Great Policy Successes* (Oxford UP 2019), *Successful Public Policy: Lessons From Australia and New Zealand* (ANU Press 2019) and *Guardians of Public Value: How Public Organizations Become and Remain Institutions* (Palgrave, forthcoming). His previous works of policy analysis included *Understanding Policy Fiascoes* (Transaction 1996) and *Success and Failure in Public Governance* (2001). His other main areas of research include crisis management (e.g. The *Politics of Crisis Management: Public Leadership Under Pressure*, Cambridge UP 2016) and political and public sector leadership (e.g. *Understanding Prime-Ministerial Performance*, Oxford UP 2013; *Oxford Handbook of Political Leadership*, Oxford UP 2014; *The Leadership Capital Index*, Oxford UP 2017; and *Understanding Public Leadership*, Red Globe 2019).

Annex 3: Contributors to Chapters

Frances Abele is Chancellor's Professor of Public Policy and Administration, Research Fellow at the Carleton Centre for Community Innovation, and Research Fellow at the Institute for Research on Public Policy. During 1992-96, she was seconded to the research directorate at the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, where she was responsible for research and policy on the North and governance. A political scientist born in Alberta, Dr. Abele has worked with Indigenous peoples all over Canada for most of her career. Her research has focused on northern economic and political development, self-government, policy and programs important to Aboriginal people living in cities, policy and program evaluation, qualitative research and citizen engagement.

Keith Banting is the Stauffer-Dunning Fellow in the School of Policy Studies and Professor Emeritus in the Department of Political Studies at Queen's University. His current research focuses on the politics of multiculturalism in Canada and elsewhere. Recent publications include *The Strains of Commitment: The Political Sources of Solidarity in Diverse Societies* (Oxford University Press 2017), co-edited with Will Kymlicka. In addition, Professor Banting is co-director of the Multiculturalism Policy Index, which provides a ranking of multiculturalism policies across 23 democratic countries. Dr. Banting is a member of the Order of Canada and a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada, and holds an honorary doctorate from Stockholm University.

Tom Beckley is an environmental/natural resource sociologist in the Faculty of Forestry and Environmental Management at the University of New Brunswick. His areas of scholarship and teaching include environmental values and ethics, public engagement in natural resource management, sense of place, stewardship ethics, forest-dependent communities, and social dimensions of sustainable forest management. For the first seven years of his professional career. Dr. Beckley worked at the Canadian Forest Service and was involved in social research in three Model Forests and with social aspects of Criteria and Indicators of Sustainable Forest Management and Forest Stewardship Council social measures.

Daniel Béland is Director of the McGill Institute for the Study of Canada and James McGill Professor in the Department of Political Science at McGill University. A student of social and fiscal policy, he has published more than 140 articles in peer-reviewed journals like Canadian Journal of Political Science, Governance, Policy Sciences, and Policy Studies Journal. He has also published more than 15 books, including Fiscal Federalism and Equalization Policy in Canada (University of Toronto Press, 2017; with Daniel Béland, Gregory Marchildon, Haizhen Mou and Rose Olfert).

Peter Boxall is Professor of Environmental and Resource Economics at the University of Alberta. His areas of scholarship and teaching include environmental policy and economics; including public engagement in natural resource management, non-market valuation, and market-based instruments. For ten years of his professional career, Dr. Boxall led a research group at the Canadian Forest Service involved in research projects across four Model Forests, including the "flagship" social science project at Foothills Model Forest near Hinton Alberta.

Nathalie Burlone is an Associate Professor of Public Administration at the School of Political Studies, and Director of Social Policy Research Network at the Center on Governance at the University of Ottawa. She is co-editor of *Revue Gouvernance/Governance Revie*w. She specializes on problem construction of sensitive and complex issues (medical assistance in dying and COVID-19), on emotions and public policy and on governance and

family policy development, and has published in *Social Policy and Administration*, *Policy Sciences*, *Canadian Public Administration* and *Healthcare Policy*, among others. Recent book contributions include *Le Canada dans le monde* (2019), *Repenser les familles et ses transitions. Repenser les politiques publiques* (2013) and *L'administration contemporaine de l'État: une perspective canadienne et québécoise* (2012).

Cynthia Callard has been Executive Director of Physicians for a Smoke-Free Canada since the mid 1990s. She has participated in the development of Canada's national tobacco control laws since the mid-1980s. From 2012, she has documented the hearings and progress of the Blais-Létourneau class action lawsuits, the world's longest trial of tobacco industry behaviour. She has written numerous articles on tobacco control, and co-authored the book *Curing the Addiction to Profits: A Supply-Side Approach to Phasing out Tobacco*.

Adrienne M. Davidson is an Assistant Professor of Comparative Public Policy in the Department of Political Science at McMaster University. Her research focuses on the politics of policy change in federal systems, including in areas of social policy, Indigenous-state relations, and nascent policy spaces. She has published in several national and international journals including Public Policy and Administration, Regional & Federal Studies, Canadian Journal of Political Science, and Policy Sciences. She completed her PhD in Political Science at the University of Toronto, and most recently, was the Skelton-Clark Postdoctoral Fellow at Queen's University. In 2016-2017, Adrienne was a Fulbright Visiting Researcher at the Center for Canadian Studies at Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies in Washington, DC.

Carey Doberstein is Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver. He received his PhD in Political Science from the University of Toronto in 2014. His research traverses the disciplines of political science, public policy, and public administration in a Canadian context, but is united by a focus on both the democratic and policy implications of forms of governance that include citizens and civil society actors in decision-making, with a particular focus on urban and local government issues.

Carolyn Johns is Professor in the Department of Politics and Public Administration at Ryerson University. She is the Director of the Great Lakes Policy Research Network; Chair of the Geoffrey Bruce Fellowship Program in Canadian Freshwater Policy; and a member of the International Joint Commission's Great Lakes Water Quality Board. Dr. Johns is currently the Principal Investigator on a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) Insight Grant for the project "Embracing Complexity and Adaptability: Comparative Analysis and Key Indicators for Improving Transboundary Water Governance in the Great Lakes and Rio Grande/Bravo Regions".

David Langlois specializes in evaluation and performance measurement. He has consulted with many Canadian federal and provincial organizations, the World Meteorological Organization, and the World Bank. He was co-founder of Unmanned Vehicle Systems Canada. He has conducted more than 45 Ground Lease Reviews of Canadian Airport Authorities. He was Co-chair of the Global Earth Observation System of Systems Evaluation Team. He was a contributing author to the Airport Development Reference Manual, IATA, 9th Edition, 2004. His play (Till We Meet Again) toured Ontario and Quebec. His book *Courage and Innovation – The Story of the Men and Women Who Created Canada's Airport Authorities* was published in 2019.

André Lecours is Professor in the School of Political Studies at the University of Ottawa. His main research interests are nationalism and federalism. He is the editor of *New Institutionalism. Theory and Analysis* (University of Toronto Press, 2005), author of *Basque Nationalism and the Spanish State* (University of Nevada Press, 2007), co-author (with Daniel Béland) of *Nationalism and Social Policy. The Politics of Territorial Solidarity* (Oxford University Press, 2008); and co-author (with Daniel Béland, Gregory Marchildon, Haizhen Mou and Rose Olfert) of *Fiscal Federalism and Equalization Policy in Canada. Political and Economic Dimensions* (University of Toronto Press, 2017).

Gregory P. Marchildon is Professor and Ontario Research Chair in Health Policy and System Design at the Institute of Health Policy, Management & Evaluation at the University of Toronto's Dalla Lana School of Public Health and the Munk School of Global Affairs and Public Policy. He is the founding director of the North American Observatory on Health Systems and Policies. He is the author of numerous books, articles and think tank pieces on federalism, health policy, comparative policy and policy history. He has worked as a provincial deputy minister and directed a federal Royal Commission in Canada.

Patrik Marier is Professor of Political Science at Concordia University and Research Chair in Aging and Public Policy. He is also Scientific Director of the Center for Research and Expertise in Social Gerontology (CREGÉS) of the West-Central Montreal CIUSSS, as well as Lead researcher, Public Policy axis of the *Vieillissements, exclusions sociales et solidarités* (VIES), partnership research team. Patrik Marier's research focuses primarily on aging and social policy. He has published in a variety of peer-reviewed journals such as the *American Journal of Political Science*, *Governance* and *Policy Sciences*. His forthcoming book studies how Canadian provinces plan for an aging population.

Kent McNeil is a Distinguished Research Professor (Emeritus) at York University's Osgoode Hall Law School. His research focusses on the rights of Indigenous peoples in Canada, the United States, Australia, and New Zealand. He is the author of numerous monographs, articles, and book chapters on Indigenous rights, as well as three books: *Common Law Aboriginal Title* (1989), *Emerging Justice? Essays on Indigenous Rights in Canada and Australia* (2001), and *Flawed Precedent: The St. Catherine's Case and Aboriginal Title* (2019). His work has been relied upon by the Supreme Court of Canada and the High Court of Australia in leading cases on Indigenous rights.

Andrea Migone is Assistant Professor at the Department of Public Administration and Politics of Ryerson University. Prior to joining the Department, he was the Director of Research and Outreach at the Institute of Public Administration of Canada. There he worked closely with both Canadian and international public servants from many jurisdictional and functional backgrounds. He was also a consultant with the federal Office of Indian Residential Schools Resolution Canada and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. His research interests lie in government innovation, public sector renewal, political economy, procurement, Indigenous governance and policy advisory systems. He has published widely both in Canada and abroad in these and other areas. He holds a PhD in political science from Simon Fraser University specializing in public administration and public policy.

John Parkins is Professor and Chair of the Department of Resource Economics and Environmental Sociology at the University of Alberta. After a 10 year stint at the Canadian Forest Service, he joined the university in 2007 with teaching and research interests in rural development, impact assessment, forestry, agriculture, renewable energy, and environmental politics. His current research addresses contemporary challenges of transition to renewable

energy systems in Canada. Recent papers on this topic are published in the journals Energy Policy, Society & Natural Resources, and Energy Research & Social Science.

Satsan (Herb George) is a Wet'suwet'en Hereditary Chief of the Frog Clan and a long-time Speaker for the Wet'suwet'en Nation. He has over 40 years of experience working towards recognition and respect for the inherent right of self-government in the courts, classrooms, and communities. Today, Satsan is leading a collaboration between the Centre for First Nations Governance, the Institute of Public Administration of Canada (IPAC), and Carleton University's School of Public Policy and Administration – the Transitional Governance Project. The Project provides strategic direction and applied research and analysis to support First Nations governments who are working to leave *Indian Act* administration behind.

Titilayo Soremi is a faculty member for the non-profit and social sector management program at Seneca College of Applied Arts and Technology, Toronto. She is a public policy and international development researcher, and her research cuts across policy narratives, policy transfer, refugee studies, and disaster risk reduction. She served as a country manager for Masterpeace, a UN-recognized peacebuilding movement. Titilayo is an alumnus of the International Development Institute (IDS), Sussex, and holds a doctorate in political science from the University of Exeter, United Kingdom. She is a member of the International Public Policy Association and the Canadian Public Policy Network.

Richard Stedman is Professor and Associate Chair of the Department of Natural Resources at Cornell University. He received his PhD in Sociology from the University of Wisconsin, and prior to coming to Cornell he was a Senior Sociologist at the Canadian Forest Service, and then a faculty member in Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology at Penn State University. His research, teaching, and mentoring interests are in social-ecological systems, sense of place, and the well-being of resource dependent communities. Much of his current work explores these issues in the context of rapid transitions to the energy landscape.

Trevor Tombe is an Associate Professor of Economics at the University of Calgary and a Research Fellow at The School of Public Policy. He has an MA and a Ph.D. in Economics from the University of Toronto and the BBA in Finance from Simon Fraser University. He has published in top economics journals, including the *American Economic Review*, *Journal of Monetary Economics*, *Review of Economic Dynamics*, *Canadian Journal of Economics*, among many others, on topics including economic and fiscal integration, internal trade, and fiscal federalism. He serves as an editorial advisor for the *Canadian Journal of Economics*.

Triadafilos Triadafilopoulos is an Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Toronto Scarborough and the Munk School of Global Affairs and Public Policy. He is the author of *Becoming Multicultural: Immigration and the Politics of Membership in Canada and Germany* and the editor of *Wanted and Welcome? Policies for Highly Skilled Immigrants in Comparative Perspective*. His current research examines the extension of publicly funded religious education to Muslims in Germany; the dynamics of school choice debates in liberal-democratic states; and the origins, extent and future of Canadian "exceptionalism" in the areas of immigration, citizenship and multiculturalism policies.

Allan Tupper is Professor of Political Science at the University of British Columbia. He has written extensively on federal-provincial relations, on higher education policy and on government ethics. He is working on a textbook on comparative public management. He is a member of the UBC's SSHRC Major Research Partnership Grant on the emergence of "green seaports". Tupper has served as Editor of Canadian Public Administration and President of

the Canadian Association of Programs of Public Management and Public Policy. He is also a frequent media commentator about political matters.

Jenn Wallner is an Associate Professor with the School of Political Studies at the University of Ottawa. She is a specialist of federalism, comparative politics, and the politics of education systems. She is currently completing a comparative study of Canada-US education systems and is starting new research on the politics of fiscal federalism and national communities in Canada. She is the author of *Learning to School: Federalism and Public Schooling in Canada* published by the University of Toronto Press in 2014.

Adam Wellstead is a professor of public policy at Michigan Technological University in Houghton, Michigan. His research interests included policy capacity, policy innovation labs, theories of the policy process, and environmental policy. He was a co-editor (along with Michael Howlett and Jonathan Craft) of the book *Policy Work in Canada: Professional Practices and Analytical Capacities*. Prior to his academic career, Wellstead worked for the Canadian Forest Service (Natural Resources Canada) from 1995 to 2011. There, he undertook social science research with the Foothills Model Forest and as program manager was on the Manitoba Model Forest Board of Directors.

Linda A. White is the RBC Chair in Economic and Public Policy and a Professor of Political Science and the Munk School of Global Affairs and Public Policy at the University of Toronto. Her areas of research include comparative welfare states, comparative social and family policy, particularly education, early childhood education and care, and maternity and parental leave; gender and public policy; ideas, norms, and public policy development; and federalism, law and public policy. She has published extensively on comparative social policy in journals such as *Comparative Political Studies*, *Governance*, *Journal of European Public Policy*, *Publius*, and *Social Politics*. She is the author, most recently, of *Constructing Policy Change: Early Childhood Education and Care in Liberal Welfare States* (UTP, 2017), among other co-authored and co-edited books. She is currently the Principal Investigator of a SSHRC Insight Grant on school choice and education policy; a Co-investigator on a project on education and training responses to the new world of work; and a Co-investigator on a project on the regulatory implications of parents' perceptions of risk in child care.

Mark Winfield is a Professor of Environmental Studies at York University. He is also Co-Chair of the Faculty's Sustainable Energy Initiative, Coordinator of the Joint Master of Environmental Studies/Juris Doctor program offered in conjunction with Osgoode Hall Law School. He has published articles, book chapters and reports on a wide range of climate change, environment and energy law and policy topics. Professor Winfield has acted as an advisor to the Environmental Commissioner of Ontario and federal Commissioner for Environment and Development. He is a member of the Conseil d'administration (board of directors) of Transitions energetique Quebec, a Crown corporation established in 2017 to implement a low-carbon energy transition strategy for Quebec.

Matt Wilder is a postdoctoral researcher at the University of Toronto. Matt is a political economist and public policy specialist whose research is focused on industrial policy, innovation, public finance, and methodology. Matt has published articles in the Canadian Journal of Political Science, Policy Studies Journal, the Journal of European Public Policy, Policy Sciences and Critical Policy Studies. Matt is currently working on two books: one on industrial policy in Canada and the United States, and another on institutions and technological innovation in industrialized countries.

Russell Alan Williams is an associate professor of political science at Memorial University. His research focuses on the intersection between international political economy and public policy in the areas of financial services regulation, the management of trade disputes, and climate change policy. He is a coauthor of *Making Governance Work: Policymaking in the Era of Polarized* Politics (2017) and has numerous publications, including articles in the *Journal of Public Policy*, *Review of Policy Research*, the *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, *Canadian Foreign Policy*, and *Global Social Policy*.