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This thesis explores the constitutions of Canadian political parties. Thirty-seven constitutions were examined, twelve for both the Liberals and the New Democrats, ten for the Progressive Conservatives, and one each for the Parti Québécois, the federal Reform party, and the Social Credit party in British Columbia. These documents were collected in 1990, and most were last amended in the latter half of the 1980's.

Several charts were drawn up to summarize the contents of every constitution; these charts form a vast pool of data which this study seeks to analyze and interpret. Chapter Two endeavours to realize a sweeping overview of the contents and structure of the documents. Chapters Three and Four focuses on two of the most important and widely studied attributes of political parties, the selection of party candidates and the matter of party leadership.

The patterns that emerged from this exercise were then examined in relation to three analytical perspectives; firstly, on the basis of the left-right position in the political spectrum, secondly, on a regional political culture dimension, and lastly, on an orientation that can be termed the "size" perspective.

The study concludes that in relation to party constitutions three patterns appear to be the most significant. The New Democrats are distinct from the other two national parties. Also, parties in both Quebec and British Columbia stand out as distinct from those of the other provinces.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Canadian political parties have been a major area of study in Canadian political science, yet there still remains much uncharted territory. A comparative study aimed exclusively at party constitutions has yet to be completed. This thesis is a survey study which examines the constitutions of thirty-seven Canadian political parties. These documents were collected in 1990, and most were last amended in the latter half of the 1980’s.

The research focus is on the principal features of these documents. The purpose of this study is to judge the range of contrast and commonality which might exist within and between the different documents. Patterns or trends will emerge which will allow some specific observations about the constitutions and permit some general comments on political parties themselves. The work that follows is based upon original research and utilizes source material of a primary nature.

Why study political parties? The most important reason is the role that political parties have come to play in our society; they have become the primary actors on the stage of representative democracy. They are the socio-political instruments around which the arrangement of representation/input and government/polity are linked. "Since the advent of mass suffrage, political parties have been the intermediaries between the citizenry and the government."¹ Arguably, political parties are the most significant channel to

direct and deflect the demands that individuals and groups make on the polity. At the risk of sounding trite, political parties are important because they are perceived to be important.

Why study party constitutions? Political parties are voluntary, formal organizations and the party constitution is the premier document of the organization. Party constitutions are the blueprints for party activity and serve as guidelines for the internal order of the party. Surprisingly, there appears to be only a limited amount of information on the internal structure and operation of Canadian political parties. Increasingly the party constitutions have become the arena where competing visions do battle.²

No consensus exists on which approach is best suited for the study of political parties and their constitutions. Traditional research into political parties concentrated on the interaction between political parties and elections, concerned with who won or who lost. Moreover, the traditional approach was mostly concerned with the organizational structure of the parties.³ This approach

² The case of Michael Levy and the Social Credit constitution is an excellent example. Mr. Levy, who is Jewish, was a party member and a defeated Social Credit candidate. He proposed at the 1989 annual general meeting that the constitutional clause on Christian principles be dropped. He was booed off the floor and subsequently quit the party. The press gave very critical coverage and the party was roundly condemned as a reactionary body. An account of the above is contained in, Terry Morley, "Politics as Theatre: Paradox and Complexity in British Columbia", Journal of Canadian Studies, 25, 3 (Fall, 1990), p.23.

was criticized for its inability to explain change, for its devaluation of human factors, and for an inability to explain to recognize why the actual situations do not reflect the regulations.

The old approach was superseded by a new paradigm. The hope for this new paradigm was that it would make possible a perspective capable of analyzing the dynamic element present in politics and political behaviour. In the beginning this new perspective drew on behavioural approaches; political parties were viewed in terms of the behavioural context which emphasized human behaviour and human relations. Subsequent research began to explore the links between people, parties, and institutions; now much of the current research into political parties centres on the effects that political parties have on the institutions and processes of both state and society. This can be termed the political context, and it focuses on the interaction between policy/politics and administration. The new social science paradigm succeeded in deepening our understanding political parties, but only up to a point.

No argument is being made here that the above approach needs to be dispensed with, rather it is being argued that in order to create an even deeper understanding of the nature of political

---


5 For example, Peter Aucoin, ed., Party Government and Regional Representation in Canada (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985).
parties, this perspective should be augmented. Much of the research on political parties concentrates on their role or functions within the political system however this emphasis results in the party itself largely being ignored. Political parties are important and they deserve to be examined; they are organizations that have an existence and structure independent of roles or systems.

The approach embraced in this study is to concentrate on one aspect of political parties: their constitutions. The hope is that this approach will provide a more general understanding of the operation of political parties, in particular how constitutions address patterns of activity and behaviour among members of the party, and so reveal something of the nature of political parties. Since this thesis is a survey study, its atheoretical nature is deliberate. It is not grounded in any theoretical perspective around which a hypothesis is formed. However, the work of some theorists do shape and inform the nature of the inquiry. In general, the writings of Michels has provided inspiration; in particular, an article by William Schonfeld has exerted a major influence. This study shares with Michels and Schonfeld the

---


7 W. Schonfeld, "Political Parties: The Functional Approach and the Structural Alternative"; Schonfeld goes to great lengths to attack his bête noire, the "functionalist perspective", an approach to the study of political parties which emphasizes the functions of parties, but ignores their internal operation and structure.
opinion that political parties should be viewed as a structured setting for human activity.

As Schonfeld points out, most definitions of parties relate to the function of the party within the political system. As Schonfeld sees it, the basic axiom of the functionalist perspective is, "the assumption that institutions matter because of the effects they have." These definitions, "do not necessarily ignore activity inside the party. But [the activity] is given importance only in so far as it influences the performance of party roles." Schonfeld makes a strong case against a functional perspective of political parties, primarily because of the serious problems that arise, "by conceiving of the political party partly in terms of its effects on the surrounding environment." To underscore this point Schonfeld makes references to the functional literature of several prominent scholars whose conclusions invariably are that parties do not seem to perform the function(s) being investigated.

While not fully sharing Schonfeld's scorn for inquiries that seek to examine the function of political parties, this study nevertheless agrees that an alternative conception of political parties, the "structural alternative", would be most compatible for this study. While the focus is intentionally non-functional, some functions such as providing candidates and potential government leaders are dealt with but only in so far as it relates to the

---

8 Schonfeld, p.487.
9 Schonfeld, p.479.
10 Schonfeld, p.480.
party constitutions and is based on an understanding of the party as an organization. As stated before, the concentration is on describing, explaining, and comparing the formal rules or written codes of Canadian political parties.

The central conceptualization of this study is the "settings approach" which posits that political parties are institutions which are individually distinct settings in which human activity takes place. "Political parties are first and foremost [particular kinds of] persistent collectivities of people with a more or less extensively shared set of goals."¹¹ Political parties claim that they have the capacity to govern, and that this makes them distinct from other organizations. This begs the question whether political parties need or deserve to have a special theory which explains their structure, organization, or behaviour. Political parties are a specific type of social institution, but "they may be too narrow in scope to serve as a basis for constructing a general theory."¹² The essence of this viewpoint is that although political parties are organizations with distinct roles, they are not so different from other organizations that they require a special theory for their understanding.

In regard to political parties Michels' work is a giant contribution to the field of political inquiry. Michels focused on the management of parties, the nature of which he termed

---

¹¹ Schonfeld, p.489.

¹² Schonfeld, p.491.
Schonfeld declares that the, "importance of Michels' work argues for a perspective of the party as a structured setting for human activity." This study accepts the view that basic policy and important decisions originate with the elite of the party, that party life is based on a bureaucratic model. However, the present study does not attempt to focus on elite dominance, but as an area of further study, an investigation on how party constitutions address the matter of elite dominance in party affairs seems like a natural choice.

Since the party constitutions are a blueprint or framework that is agreed upon by the membership for the management of the party, this study embraces the approach that accepts and recognizes the organizational aspects of party life. This study seeks to draw up a basis for a comparative organizational analysis by utilizing the legalistic framework of Canadian political party constitutions. This study further seeks to discover some aspects of the operation of political parties on the basis of their constitutions. Unlike Michels, this study does not attempt to use these observations to test more general propositions about collective human behaviour.

In many ways this is an exercise that utilizes a Weberian concept: the ideal type. The constitution is the ideal model, an

---

13 Michels, *Political Parties*; indeed the whole of Michels’ book is devoted to exposing the oligarchical tendencies of German socialist parties and extending the findings to a view that, "Every party organization represents an oligarchical power grounded upon a democratic basis."; and, "that the power of the elected leaders over the electing masses is almost unlimited.", p.365.

14 Schonfeld, p.480.
agreed upon institutional arrangement. The constitution may or may not be the working rules, indeed a survey of the available literature indicates that the working rules of the political parties do vary from the constitutional edicts; nevertheless they remain as important guides; indicators of potentiality.

The study uses many of the research tools and methodology of content analysis, but content analysis of the qualitative rather than quantitative sort. The relative simplicity of the study has been determined by the research focus. The path of the study was to read the material, to record impressions or contents, and to make judgements or inferences on the basis of the impressions. Primarily, this study is of a qualitative nature. However, in keeping with the demands of a social science discipline, the research does attempt to be systematic.

The research is directed at one type of document: the constitution of a political party. The primary instrument is the use of charts. Copies of the constitutions were collected, then each constitution was examined. As expected, the extent or scope of

---

15 For the federal Liberals McMenemy et al point out that, "The standing committees which are defined by the constitution as vital are largely defunct, while the truly important committees are not mentioned in the constitution.", p.184 of; John McMenemy, John Redekop, and Conrad Winn, "Party Structures and Decision-Making", pp.167-190, in Political Parties in Canada edited by Conrad Winn and John McMenemy (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1976).

16 Two works on content analysis that this study used as guides in the formulation of its approach deserve special mention; Richard W. Budd and Robert K. Thorp, An Introduction to Content Analysis: Including Annotated Bibliography (Iowa City, Iowa: School of Journalism Publications, 1963); also, Ole R. Holsti, Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities (Don Mills, Ont.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1969).
regulations was wide, some constitutions barely touched upon some subjects while others devoted a large number of articles or clauses to a myriad of matters. This initial reading provided a clearer understanding of the possible relationships to be investigated and it generated the questions answered by the charts.

The charts have each question arranged on the top in columns and each jurisdiction or constitution listed on the left side in rows. There is a choice of several notations, "Y" for yes if the matter was dealt with in the document and "R" for no reference if the matter was not discussed. These two notations formed the bulk of the responses for these charts. However some questions lent themselves to more notations than the above pair; if the category was dealt with in a distinctly negative manner, then "N" was used to indicate no. If there was confusion, contradiction or unclear terms on the category then the notation was "U". An "*" signifies a special or exceptional provision and this discussed in the appropriate appendix. No claim is made here that these categories are an inclusive examination of these constitutions.

Several Tables were compiled using data furnished by the charts. The "yes" references ("Y" notations) for each jurisdiction were tallied. These totals can be viewed as a whole or broken down by party and/or province or region. Taken as an aggregate, this data allows an analyst to project a grand mean or average score on the constitutions as a body. Then it becomes possible to see how each party and/or region or province deviates from the grand
mean. These Tables represent one method of gauging the level of codification of the constitutions for comparative purposes and what is presented in these chapters is only the beginning of this type of analysis.

The approach is not without its problems. A major difficulty lies within some of the terminology. The phrases "number of references" and "positive notations" are loaded terms; instead of their benign intention, they could be misinterpreted by some to carry a beneficial or favourable connotation. These terms are used only in relation to the number of "yes" responses that a constitution has on the questions posed in the charts. No other purpose or design is meant for the phrases; the fact that a constitution has either a lesser or greater number of responses is regarded as neither good nor bad, it simply "is".

Another phrase in need of clarification is "the level of codification". The essence of this term is its relationship with the amount of positive notations in the constitutions; if there are a large number of "Y" notations or references then the document is deemed to have a high level of codification. If the constitution has a large number of rules then it is viewed as having a relatively high level of codification.

---

17 Each reference or "Y" notation in the charts was counted for each constitution; these responses were then tallied for each jurisdiction, and these notations were then divided by the number of constitutions, resulting in a jurisdictional average. There is a general average for all the jurisdictions, the "grand mean", which when added or subtracted to the jurisdictional or party average results in an average range away from the mean, in other words the degree of deviation from the "grand mean".
The analysis is grounded in three common perspectives or dimensions, explained below, which are often used when discussing Canadian politics and political parties. The purpose of this particular approach is to see if there is any correlation between the analytical perspectives and the level of codification in the constitutions as measured by the Tables. This means that some level of codification will have to be chosen as a reference point, logic dictates that the "grand mean(s)" contained in the Tables can adequately serve such a function.

Firstly, the resulting patterns of these Tables will be analyzed using the left-right political continuum, the prism through which Canadian politics is viewed. The conventional view of Canadian politics places the New Democrats to the left of centre, the Liberals closer to the centre, and the Progressive Conservatives to the right of centre. This can be termed the party or left-right perspective.

The next two analytical positions are geographical, rather than ideological, in nature. Although Canada is often viewed on a centre-periphery basis, it may be an, "over-simplification to
consider Canada as divided into a politically dominant resource-consuming centre....and a resource-producing hinterland." There may be more utility in a view which stresses the importance of regionalism in Canadian politics. "The core of regionalism is a persisting, territorially-linked diversity that has actual or potential political implications." Thus it seems logical to examine the Tables on such a basis.

This study proposes to summarily divide the provinces into five regions, Atlantic Canada, Quebec, Ontario, the Prairies, and British Columbia. "Dividing Canada into five regions is common procedure for Canadians." Both the federal parties and the Yukon Territory are exempted from this regional orientation.

Close to and in addition to the regional perspective another possible analytical angle would be to scrutinize any possible relationship between jurisdictional size and the level of constitutional codification. The argument can be made that Canada's three most populous provinces have societies and political systems that are, by virtue of their scale, more complex than the smaller provinces; hence the constitutions of the political parties of these provinces would be more detailed and "bureaucratized" in

---

19 Peter McCormick, "Regionalism in Canada: Disentangling the Threads", Journal of Canadian Studies, 24, 2 (Summer 1989), p.11.

20 McCormick, p.6.

order to deal with this socio-political complexity. We might expect the three provinces, Ontario, Quebec, and British Columbia, that are the largest, by population and economic activity, to have the greatest degree of codification. There is an implicit corollary to this argument, the other provinces have significantly smaller populations and their socio-political situations may be such that informal rules and conventions are accepted and understood, thus it is not necessary that their party constitutions contain highly detailed regulations. This will be referred to as the size perspective.

The two instruments of the study, the charts and the Tables, are quite distinct, yet complementary in that they each reveal different facets about party constitutions. The charts are built on a survey of the contents of the documents, questions are asked and the responses are stored in chart form. These charts are a combination of both qualitative and quantitative approaches to the topic and they are a fairly systematic method of data compilation and presentation. Judgements about the validity of the questions and the constitutions' responses rest with the analyst. These charts contain a great deal of data, they reflect the core of the research effort, and they were essential in generating the second instrument of the study: the Tables.

The Tables and their analysis, with their devotion to numbers,  

22 The inspiration for this analytical dimension is from readings of and about Max Weber, whose works often dealt with the link between societal complexity and bureaucratization; Reinhard Bendix, Max Weber: An Intellectual Portrait (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977).
are easily the most quantitative section. In contrast to the charts, they are not concerned with what the documents may or may not say, rather they focus on the patterns that emerge from the numbers.

Considered together, these two formats broaden the understanding of, illuminate facts about, and reveal patterns concerning political parties and party constitutions.

There are inherent limitations in such an approach and this means that the subsequent interpretation of the data may also be affected. Care must be taken not to draw too wide conclusions about political parties based on this study’s findings, and care must be taken to "be extremely cautious in attributing attitudes, motives or 'states of mind' to the sources."\(^{23}\)

Owing to its very nature, the study is ahistorical and static. No attempt has been made to incorporate data that would allow a long range appraisal of the changes or developments in party constitutions over time; the evolution that these documents have undergone is not within the boundaries of this study. The study is static in the sense that it examines these documents as they exist at the moment of the research and writing of the paper.

Social science inquiries are quests for causality, usually investigating some kind of idea of how societies govern themselves. Party constitutions are the blueprints of party life; they order the relations among the party members, and they structure the relationship between the different levels of party authority,

\(^{23}\) Budd and Thorp, *Content Analysis*, p.2.
intraparty as well as interparty. However one must be guarded about making causal connections concerning political parties and their constitutions. This data may invite more than one interpretation of its meaning.

This study is not concerned with whether the rules laid out in the constitutions were followed or not. The constitutions have the potential of influencing political behaviour; once the rules are recorded they do become or are potential constraints on behaviour. Formal regulations, for such matters as candidate selection and leadership, appear to be increasing. If someone wants to pursue some goal, they usually have to go through the rules; the existing rules become a "channel" for the actions and determine what type of action is taken under certain circumstances.

Much of the political conflict in our societies is based on struggles about symbols, classifications, and institutions. Political conflict is not purely a struggle of self-interest, it is ultimately based on different images of reality. As well as constraining behaviour, constitutions act as conveyors of meaning; they represent a certain type or way that we perceive reality. Party constitutions are a formalized battleground for forces inside political parties. Constitutions are an inventory of the range of behaviour; the more rules that are formalized in constitutional documents, the more strictly defined are the parameters within which this inventory of behaviour is placed.

Constitutions are solely concerned with official party structures. The constitutions are a demonstration that the official
structures are obviously complex. Admittedly, the situation is complicated because of the existence of "non-official" party structures which may duplicate and sometimes supersede the official structures. Yet, for anyone interested in the causes and consequences of party structure a knowledge and an understanding of party constitutions are indispensable.

As mentioned above, thirty-seven party constitutions form the raw material for this study. The Liberals have political parties in all ten provinces, plus the Yukon Territory, as well as at the federal level, making a total of twelve Liberal constitutions. In addition to the federal level, the Progressive Conservatives have functioning parties in the Yukon and eight provinces, Quebec and British Columbia are excepted, which makes a total of ten Tory documents. Although the New Democrats have political parties in all the provinces, a value judgement was made to include such jurisdictions as New Brunswick, Quebec, Newfoundland, and Prince Edward Island even though the New Democrats’ presence in provinces such as these is at best minimal. Those ten provinces plus the Yukon and the federal level makes for a total of twelve New Democrat constitutions. In addition to the three major parties, this study also examines the party constitutions of the Reform party, the Parti Québécois, and British Columbia’s Social Credit party.

The constitutions of other parties were not considered. This decision may seem somewhat arbitrary, but lines had to be drawn. The Reform Party was chosen because although this party is only in
its infancy it already has had an impact: what began as another ephemeral protest group has evolved into an institutionalized entity that is sustained as a reaction to the perceived crises of participation of western Canada in the Canadian federal system. Also, the Northwest Territories were not used as a loci of party activity. "There are no political parties in this legislature, no party whips enforcing discipline, no leader of the opposition feeling duty bound to obstruct the government at every pass." Clearly this jurisdiction should be excluded from the study at hand.

This study is composed of three main chapters. Each main chapter begins with a presentation of the relevant, unrefined chart data and then each chart is explained in brief. Following this the Tables are presented and analyzed with regard to the perspectives outlined above. Chapter Two seeks to give a grand overview of the contents and structure of these documents. Chapters Three and Four aim to examine in greater depth two of the most important and widely studied attributes of political parties: the selection of party candidates and the matter of party leadership. The final chapter combines the data of the previous chapters and then uses the data and its analysis to present some conclusions about political parties and their constitutions.

CHAPTER TWO: MAJOR OVERVIEW

Party constitutions deal with a wide variety of concerns. Chapters Two, Three, and Four seek to examine matters which party constitutions frequently deal with. Chapters Three and Four focus on two specific subjects, candidate selection and party leadership, while this chapter attempts to cover other, less high profile matters. In contrast to the following chapters, this chapter, by virtue of its broad mandate, cannot focus too sharply on any one area.

There are six charts in this chapter with categories ranging from the party's internal structure to the length of the constitution, and each of these general categories is broken down into a number of entries. Charts 2.1 to 2.6 contain the raw information for this chapter. Thus the flow of the data follows the path of these six charts; each chart is accompanied by a key which lays out the chart's questions, then there is a brief discussion and comments on the data in the chart. After the six charts have been displayed, an analysis of the charts takes place; this analysis is based on the three dimensions raised in Chapter One. Chart 2.1 has two categories, which examine different structures and organs within the party.

25 There are 92 separate entries or questions in these six charts and when multiplied by the constitutions, 37, it results in a total of 3404 possible notations. In an effort towards an economy of space, every notation cannot be fully explained; Appendix A contains all the specific information for each of the 92 entries.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INTERNAL ORDER</th>
<th></th>
<th>OTHER PARTY STRUCTURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a b c d e f g h i</td>
<td></td>
<td>a b c d e f g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nfld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y Y R R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Y* Y Y* Y Y Y Y N Y R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y R R R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y Y Y N Y N N N R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y Y R R R Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y Y Y N Y N N N R</td>
<td></td>
<td>R Y R R Y R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y R R R Y R Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y Y Y N Y N N N Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y Y R R Y R Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N N N R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y Y R R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y N N N R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y Y R R Y R Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y N N N R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y Y R R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y* Y Y* Y Y Y Y N N N R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y Y R R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y Y R R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y N Y N Y N N N R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y Y R R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>N X Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y Y Y R R R Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>N X Y Y Y Y Y Y * Y N R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y Y Y R R R Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y Y R R R Y R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>R Y R Y R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y N X N N N Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>R Y R Y R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y N Y N Y N N N R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y Y R R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>R Y R R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y Y R R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y N N N Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y Y R R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sask</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>N X Y Y Y Y Y Y N N N R</td>
<td></td>
<td>R R R R Y R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>R Y R R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y N Y N Y N N N R</td>
<td></td>
<td>R Y R R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>N X Y Y Y Y Y Y N N N R</td>
<td></td>
<td>R R R R Y R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Y Y N X Y N N N R</td>
<td></td>
<td>R Y R R Y R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y N Y N Y N N N R</td>
<td></td>
<td>R Y R R Y R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>R Y Y Y Y Y R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Y N N X N X N X N Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>R Y R R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y N N N Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>R Y R R R Y R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>N X Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y Y R R Y R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Y* Y Y* Y Y Y Y N Y R</td>
<td></td>
<td>R R R R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y N N N Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y R R R Y R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>N X Y Y Y Y N N N R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Y N Y N Y N N N R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y R R R Y R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y N N N Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y R R R Y R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>N X Y Y Y N X N N R</td>
<td></td>
<td>R Y Y R R Y R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGEND:** "Y"- Yes; "R"- No Reference; "N"- No; "U"- Unclear/Confusing; "X"- Not Applicable; "*"- Special Case/Exception
CHART 2.1: INTERNAL ORDER AND OTHER PARTY STRUCTURES

(Chart 2.1 Questions)

Internal Order: Specific Authority Structures
a. Are the party officers or directors presented?
b. Are the duties/roles of the above clearly defined?
c. Is there an "Executive Committee" level (body with authority which is above officers but below "General Council")?
d. Are the duties/roles of the above clearly defined?
e. Is there a "General Council" level (body with penultimate authority, above both officers and "Executive Committee", but below convention's authority)?
f. Are the duties/roles of the above clearly defined?
g. Are there more structures or levels of authority than the above three levels?
h. Are the authority structures and their duties presented without any apparent confusion?
i. Does the document include a reference to a person or group empowered to interpret the constitution?

Category 2: Other Party Structures and Financial Authority
a. Is the party director/staff mentioned or dealt with?
b. Are party committees/commissions mentioned or dealt with?
c. Does the constitution discuss a special electoral campaign body (either a committee or a distinct party organ)?
d. Does the constitution discuss a fund-raising body (either a committee or a distinct party organ)?
e. Is the "signing authority" referred to in the constitution?
f. Does the constitution refer to the "assets and/or liabilities" (of the party not the ridings)?
g. Is the appointment of an auditor mentioned in the constitution?
INTERNAL ORDER

This category deals with specific authority structures within each party. Most parties have three general levels of authority and each level has its own specific responsibilities. As used in this study, the initial level is that of the party officers, the next level is termed the "Executive Committee", and the last level is that of the "General Council". While some constitutions do use this terminology, many utilize different terms; these terms have been chosen for their general descriptive power and their generic applicability. Question h. is of a subjective nature, which uses the preceding data to judge whether or not confusion might exist on the matters of specific authority structures. The final inquiry of this category concerns the important point of interpreting the constitution.

OTHER PARTY STRUCTURES

This category has four entries which deal with party structures not dealt with above. For example, the paid staff of the party are involved in the daily operations of the party and they can have an effect on the overall direction of the party; some constitutions deal with this matter and specify under whose authority the staff functions, while the documents of other parties are silent on the matter. The final three subcategories are concerned with how the constitutions address the matter of financial authority and responsibility; matters such as the "signing authority", the assets or liabilities of the party, and the appointing of an auditor.
## CHART 2.2: MEMBERSHIP

### MEMBERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>h</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>j</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>m</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>o</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nfld</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEI</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ont</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manit</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sask</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alta</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukon</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGEND:**
- "Y" - Yes
- "R" - No Reference
- "N" - No
- "U" - Unclear/Confusing
- "X" - Not Applicable
- "**" - Special Case/Exception
CHART 2.2: MEMBERSHIP

(CHART 2.2 QUESTIONS)

MEMBERSHIP

a.] Is there a membership article in the constitution?
b.] Are memberships for individuals dealt with in the constitution?
c.] Are memberships for groups/affiliates dealt with in the constitution?
d.] Are honourary or life memberships dealt with in the constitution?
e.] Are the rights and duties of the members clearly outlined?
f.] Does the constitution contain an "exclusion" clause (no membership in other political parties is allowed)?
g.] Is the age of admission specified in the constitution?
h.] Is the age of admission fourteen(14) years or older?
i.] Is the age of admission sixteen(16) years or older?
j.] Is the age of admission eighteen(18) years or older?
k.] Does the constitution mention the possibility of the party resorting to the discipline/sanction of members?
l.] Does the member have the right to appeal such action?
m.] Are membership dues or fees included in the constitution?
n.] Is the amount of the dues or fees prescribed in the constitution?
o.] Are the dues or fees set elsewhere than the constitution?
MEMBERSHIP

Regulations on party membership form the basis of the fifteen questions for this category. The queries cover a wide variety of matters, from the type of membership available to the issue of party dues. All thirty-seven constitutions contain some rules on party membership. However, only the N.D.P. constitutions refer to the possibility of group or affiliate membership. Excluding party members from holding a membership in other parties seems to be more of a concern to the Liberals and the N.D.P. than the Conservatives. The age of admission is set in a majority of the party documents, the ages fourteen or sixteen were the norm, the only party to be different was Reform who set their age of admission as eighteen.

Membership in a political party means that rules may have to be followed, if not then the party may have to discipline the transgressors; many parties have such measures, while a lessor number have procedures allowing the member to appeal such action. State regulation of party fundraising may force the party to have a greater reliance on the membership for raising funds. Thus the control of internal party finances may become much more critical in the operation of the party, which could conceivably lead to increased tensions between different levels of the party hierarchy.

26 Reform is most emphatic on the subject, Article 2, Section C of the Reform constitution states that, "Only natural persons may be members of the Party. No corporations, trade unions, society, or other organization shall be eligible for membership." It should be noted that the participation of special groups or members is dealt with in Chart 2.4 below.
# Chart 2.3: Ridings and Conventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RIDINGS</th>
<th>CONVENTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y Y R Y Y R X R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nfld</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y R Y Y Y R X R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y R R R N R X R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y R R Y N R X R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y R R R N R X R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y R X R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y R X Y R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y R Y R N Y Y Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sask</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y R R R R N R X R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y R R R R Y Y Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y Y R Y Y R X R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N* R R R Y* R X R R*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y R Y Y X R X R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ref</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y R Y Y X R X R R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- "Y" - Yes
- "R" - No Reference
- "N" - No
- "U" - Unclear/Confusing
- "X" - Not Applicable
- "*" - Special Case/Exception
CHART 2.3: RIDINGS AND CONVENTIONS

(CHART 2.3 QUESTIONS)

RIDINGS

a.] Does the constitution deal with ridings (constituency associations)?
b.] Is there reference made to the composition of the riding executive in the constitution?
c.] Does the constitution refer to any sort of regional groupings for the ridings?
d.] Does the constitution refer to the subject of candidate selection (please refer to Chapter 3 and Appendix B for greater detail)?
e.] Are federal ridings dealt with in detail (provincial parties only)?
f.] Is there reference made in the constitution regarding a model constituency constitution/bylaws?
g.] Is a model constituency constitution/bylaws included in either the body of the party constitution or in an appendix?
h.] Does the constitution refer to the recognition of party activity in municipal politics?
i.] Is the subject of "redistribution" (electoral boundaries) mentioned in the constitution?

CONVENTIONS

a.] Is the party convention or meeting dealt with in the constitution?
b.] Is this convention/meeting held on an annual basis?
c.] Is this convention/meeting held on a biennial basis?
d.] Are the delegates to the convention/meeting identified?
e.] Does the constitution refer to a leadership convention (please refer to Chapter 4 and Appendix B for greater detail)?
RIDINGS

Constituency associations or ridings are the loci of much party activity. The constitutions provide a potential blueprint to understand the structural relationship between the centre and the periphery of the party. Some constitutions have very explicit instructions that ridings seemingly have to adhere to; however, there probably exists, even in these cases, a relatively high degree of autonomy for ridings as long as they do not antagonize or offend the political values of the centre. One method of control from the centre is the existence of model constituency constitutions or bylaws; whether or not these model constitutions are followed is beyond the parameters of the present study, suffice it to state that such rules have the potentiality and capacity to impact upon the affairs and nature of local riding associations.

Typically, the Liberal and Conservative constitutions are not very specific on the subject of ridings, especially in regards to the composition of the local riding executive; in contrast, all the N.D.P. jurisdictions plus the other three parties discuss the riding executive.

The only exception on the matter of whether the constitution deals with ridings is the Yukon Liberals; their constitution targets only the federal arena and since there is only one riding to be concerned with it is only natural that their constitution does not have a section dealing with ridings.

CONVENTIONS

The party convention is one of the most significant internal
activities that political parties engage in. Conventions are where all elements and levels of the party can interact. These meetings are often the site of backroom deals and symbolic gestures. Bids to overthrow party leaders can materialize in this setting; special interest groups or party factions can attempt to pressure the party, either successfully or not, to adopt new policies; and the convention is the location where the constitution itself can be amended, either in minutia and unimportant details or wholly rewritten. Every one of these party constitutions deal with the party meeting or convention.

Only three Liberal meetings are held biennially; the other nine Liberal constitutions call for the convention or meeting to be held annually. The Tories in eight jurisdictions call for an annual meeting; there are two P.C. documents which specify a biennial convention. There are five N.D.P. constitutions which call for biennial meetings; the other seven specify an annual meeting. Social Credit has an annual meeting, while both P.Q. and Reform call for biennial meetings.

In their sections on party conventions, many constitutions discuss the delegates, how they are chosen, and who is eligible to be a delegate; as well as party conventions, the matter of the leadership conventions is also discussed in a majority of the constitutions.
### Chart 2.4: Constitutional Amendments and Special Roles for Target Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Constitutional Amendments</th>
<th>Special Roles for Target Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nfld</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Que</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ont</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sask</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alta</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yukon</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- "Y" - Yes; "R" - No Reference; "N" - No;
- "U" - Unclear/Confusing; "X" - Not Applicable;
- "*" - Special Case/Exception
CHART 2.4: CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS AND SPECIAL ROLES FOR TARGET GROUPS

(CHAT 2.4 QUESTIONS)

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS
a. Does the constitution make any reference to the possibility of amending the document?
b. Is there a distinct article on constitutional amendments, an article set aside from other constitutional clauses?
c. Can a simple majority (50% plus 1) amend the constitution?
d. Is a two-thirds (2/3's) majority required to amend the constitution?
e. Is some other percentage of votes required in order to amend the constitution (for example seventy-five percent)?
f. Does the constitution refer to a notice of proposed amendments being forwarded to members or constituency associations?

SPECIAL ROLES FOR TARGET GROUPS
a. Does the constitution make any reference to the English/French "fact" (a clause that recognizes the legitimacy of both cultures and languages)?
b. Are both languages in the same document?
c. Does the constitution state that both the French and English versions are equal?
d. Does the constitution refer to an ethnic/multicultural dimension?
e. Is any reference made on a role in the party for Aboriginal peoples?
f. Is a "Youth Section" clearly discussed in the constitution?
g. Is a "Women's Section" clearly discussed in the constitution?
h. Does the constitution either attempt to prescribe gender ratios or refer to plans which promote gender parity?
i. Is there any reference made in the constitution that words employed in the masculine gender shall include the feminine gender?
j. Does the constitution clearly employ "non-sexist" language?
CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

As mentioned above, the constitution can be amended at a party convention. This short category poses a few questions about amending the constitution, but its primary concern is with the rules on the voting majority necessary in order to amend the constitution. Each of the thirty-seven party constitutions makes some sort of reference to amending the document, and only two constitutions do not contain a distinct article on constitutional amendments, Social Credit and Liberals in British Columbia.27

The constitutions in three Liberal jurisdictions can be amended by a simple majority (50% plus 1).28 There are nine Liberal constitutions which have the rule that a two-thirds (2/3's) majority vote is required in order to amend the constitution. Only one P.C. constitution prescribes a simple majority.29 There are four Conservative documents which are unclear on confusing on the issue

27 There are several references to amending the constitution in various sections of the B.C. Liberal document; a part of "Bylaw 2" discusses the amending process, as does sections of "Standing Rule 2". However, due to the highly idiosyncratic nature of this constitution, it becomes a problematical exercise to categorize the contents of this document on measures relating to amending the constitution. For example, Article I, Section A, Subsection 4. of "Standing Rule 2" states that, "All amendments to the Constitution require a two-thirds vote,". However, "Bylaw 12", Article 6, Section C allows these "Standing Rules to be repealed or amended by the party executive.

28 The Alberta Liberal constitution, Article XII, says that if a copy of the proposed amendment has been included in the notice calling the annual convention, then only a simple majority vote is necessary; however if the proposed amendment was not included in the notice, then a two-thirds vote is required.

29 On this point the Alta. P.C. constitution, Article 15, is identical to the rules listed above(fn.28) for the Alta. Liberals.
of amending their constitutions. Five P.C. jurisdictions maintain that a two-thirds vote is necessary. Only one N.D.P. constitution can be amended by a simple majority; the other eleven call for a two-thirds majority vote in order to amend. Only the P.Q. constitution has the rule that an amendment can be passed by a simple majority. Reform calls for a two-thirds majority. Social Credit is the only jurisdiction of the thirty-seven that has neither a simple majority nor a two-thirds rule, they call for amendments to pass by a 75% majority.

Eleven Liberal, seven Conservative, and one N.D.P. document call for proposed amendments to be forwarded prior to the meeting. The constitutions of the three other parties state that the proposed amendments must be forwarded prior to the meeting.

SPECIAL ROLES FOR TARGET GROUPS

The constitution is often a place to make statements and take measures which are meant to appeal to certain segments of society. Whether or not these measures are fully functioning or even viable is not as important as their symbolic dimension. Women, native Canadians, ethnic groups, young people, etc. are some common targets which receive attention in party constitutions. Accompanying this category is a section that focuses on the role of language, as an indicator of sensitivity towards both bilingualism and the presence of "sexist" language.
## Chart 2.5: The "Party" and the Structure of the Document

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Nfld PC</th>
<th>NS PC</th>
<th>PEI PC</th>
<th>NB PC</th>
<th>Que PC</th>
<th>Ont PC</th>
<th>Manit PC</th>
<th>Sask PC</th>
<th>Alta PC</th>
<th>BC PC</th>
<th>Yukon PC</th>
<th>Fed PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>h</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>g</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nfld</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEI</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ont</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manit</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sask</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alta</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukon</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- "Y" - Yes
- "R" - No Reference
- "N" - No
- "U" - Unclear/Confusing
- "X" - Not Applicable
- "*" - Special Case/Exception
CHART 2.5: THE "PARTY" AND THE STRUCTURE
OF THE DOCUMENT

(CHART 2.5 QUESTIONS)

THE "PARTY"

a.] Is the party constitutionally designated as a "Party"? (or)
b.] Is the party constitutionally designated as an "Association"?
c.] Is the "name" of the party or association specifically declared in the constitution?
d.] Does the constitution clearly state the aims/purpose/objectives of the party or association?
e.] Is there a reference in the constitution regarding the party’s or the association’s area of jurisdiction or operation?
f.] Is the location of the party’s or the association’s headquarters or principal office mentioned in the constitution?
g.] Does the constitution refer at all to the authority of the party or association over elected representatives?
h.] Is there any reference in the constitution on policy forums or inputs, this includes policy sessions or resolutions at conventions?
i.] Does the constitution refer to the possibility of polls or referenda of members?

THE STRUCTURE OF THE DOCUMENT

a.] What is the structure of the document? Is it only the constitution, without any accompanying appendices, model constituency constitutions, preambles, extra bylaws, etc.?
b.] What is the structure of the document? Is it composed of a preamble and constitution?
c.] What is the structure of the document? Is it composed of the constitution plus appendix(ices)?
d.] What is the structure of the document? Is it composed of a preamble, constitution, and appendix(ices)?
e.] What is the structure of the document? Is it composed of some other structure than those three listed above?
f.] Is the structure or format largely "conventional"? (or)
g.] Is the structure or format largely "unconventional"?
THE "PARTY"

Although the next four categories do examine some contents of the constitutions, they mostly represent an attempt to scrutinize the constitutions as a document, focusing more on style and structure rather than substance. These sections are a general grab-bag, asking a variety of questions which did not fit into the categories above. This section seeks to discover what each constitution says about itself and the political party it represents.

The Liberals in seven jurisdictions use the label "Party"; while the other five prefer the "Association" designation. There are four P.C. documents that call for the designation to be that of "Party"; the other six use the label "Association". All twelve N.D.P. jurisdictions designate themselves as a "Party". The constitutions of the P.Q., Social Credit, and Reform all call for the "Party" label.

The only constitution that refers to the possibility of polls or referenda of members is the Reform document.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE DOCUMENT

As shown, many constitutions contain the same general information, and while some constitutions are similar in structure or layout, no two are completely alike. Structurally, they vary in number of ways. Some are quite short and relatively

\[\text{\footnote{The case of the name for the Liberals in P.E.I. is unusual; Article I deals with their name, which they designate as "The Prince Edward Island Liberal Association Inc."; no other jurisdiction has "Inc." as a part of their name.}}\]
straightforward; others are long, involved, and have much accompanying material, some of which is central to the constitution and some of which is not. Therefore, some of the attendant material received from the political parties is not germane to this study and has been excluded from the survey. The time spent examining these constitutions has led to the discernment of four general structural models; these four general models are the basis of this section. The last two questions(e.&f.) are of a purely subjective nature, seeking, as they do, to render a judgement on whether the structure is "conventional" or not; while this judgement is the author's own, nevertheless it has been generated out of familiarity with the documents in question and they are judged in relation to one another.31

Of the 37 party constitutions under consideration, only four were judged to be "unconventional", the Liberal jurisdictions of Quebec and British Columbia, the P.C. document for the Yukon, and the Social Credit constitution.

31 An illustration of this point would be that the most common constitutional format is one which has a consecutive listing of each general article and clause, such that of the Nova Scotia Conservatives; an unusual or unconventional format may not include consecutive numbering, opting instead for a more idiosyncratic method of article listing, such as that of the Liberal party in Quebec.
## Chart 2.6: The "Document": General and the "Document": Length

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>&quot;Document&quot;: General</th>
<th>&quot;Document&quot;: Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nfld</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEI</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>195*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ont</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manit</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sask</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alta</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukon</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:** "Y" - Yes; "R" - No Reference; "N" - No; "U" - Unclear/Confusing; "X" - Not Applicable; "*" - Special Case/Exception
(CHART 2.6 QUESTIONS)

THE "DOCUMENT" : GENERAL
a.] Is a preamble included, separate from the body of the constitution?
b.] Does the constitution include a definition of terms?
c.] Are appendices included in the constitutional document?
d.] Is there a table of contents or an index contained in the constitution?
e.] Are general appeal procedures mentioned or outlined in the constitution?
f.] Does the constitution state that the constitution of the federal party is supreme?
g.] Is there any reference in the constitution to the "Rules of Order"?
h.] If the "Rules of Order" are referred to, are they "Robert's"?
i.] If the "Rules of Order" are referred to, are they "Bourinot's"?
j.] If the "Rules of Order" are referred to, are they other than the above two?
k.] In this last amended version of the constitution, is the date (day and month) specified?
l.] In this last amended version of the constitution, is only the year (not day and month) specified?
m.] In this last amended version of the constitution, is the place where the constitution was amended specified?

THE "DOCUMENT" : LENGTH
a.] The number of articles in the constitution.
b.] An estimation of the number of words (in thousands). Note: a "*" indicates that appendices are included.
THE "DOCUMENT": GENERAL

There are thirteen questions for this section of Chart 2.6; while there may appear to be some duplication with a few questions from previous categories, each question is an important part of the attempt to gain an overview of the constitutional document in a general sense. The last several questions of this category (g. to m.) come together in two sections, the first section (g. to j.) is concerned with the "Rules of Order", the second section (k. to m.) deals with when and where the constitution was last amended.

THE "DOCUMENT": LENGTH

Two methods of appraising the length of these constitutions are presented above (see also Appendix A). The first deals with the number of individual articles that each document contains; however this comparison is a weak approach due in part to the wide variety of formats that these documents display and in part because of a lack of coherence as to what might constitute a constitutional article; some documents are so different from the norm that deciding what is and is not an article becomes solely judgemental. As seen in Chart 2.6 there is no real congruence between the number of articles and the estimated number of words; so even though the number of articles in each document are presented, they will not be utilized in any of the below comparisons of the constitutions of Chapter Five.

The second method with which these constitutions were approached in order to judge their lengths uses a much more traditional means; the number of words in the constitutions (some
appendices are included) were estimated. The estimation for the number of words is presented in the thousands. As the information from this category is of a different nature than the above categories, it is also logical that the presentation will also be distinct; thus this category receives its own separate analysis, Table 2.2.

**ANALYSIS**

As outlined in the introductory chapter the following Tables grew out of the chart notations. The number of "yes" notations for each jurisdiction on each category were tallied. These totals can be viewed as a whole or broken down by party and/or province or region. As discussed in the introductory chapter, this study proposes to analyze the Tables from three common analytical perspectives. The resulting patterns of these Tables will first be analyzed using the left-right political continuum, followed by the regional dimension, and completed by the jurisdictional size or societal complexity perspective.
TABLE 2.1

NUMBER OF REFERENCES FROM CHARTS 2.1 TO 2.6
(SEE ALSO APPENDIX A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>P.C.</th>
<th>Lib.</th>
<th>N.D.P.</th>
<th>Other*</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nfld.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.37</td>
<td>- 3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.67</td>
<td>- 3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.E.I.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>- 2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.B.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>- 4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que.</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42.33</td>
<td>+ 5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ont.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>- 3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.33</td>
<td>+ 3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sask.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.33</td>
<td>+ 1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alta.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.67</td>
<td>- 3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47.67</td>
<td>+10.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukon</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.33</td>
<td>- 0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37.25</td>
<td>+ 0.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Party Mean: 30.9 37.42 41.67 35.67 36.89: Grand Mean
Deviation: -5.99 +0.53 +4.78 -1.22

NOTE: "mean" = average.
Deviation = average range away from grand mean (average spread).
"*" refers to - Parti Québécois in Quebec
          - Social Credit in British Columbia
          - Reform in federal parties
## TABLE 2.2

**CHART 2.6: ESTIMATED LENGTH OF CONSTITUTIONS (IN THOUSANDS)**

(SEE ALSO APPENDIX A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>PARTY</th>
<th>P.C.</th>
<th>Lib.</th>
<th>N.D.P.</th>
<th>Other*</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nfld.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.E.I.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>-1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.B.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>+2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ont.</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>+1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manit.</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>+0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sask.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alta.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>+2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukon</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Party Mean: 4.52  5.21  4.80  6.27  4.98: Grand Mean
Deviation:  -0.46   +0.23  -0.18  +1.29

NOTE: "mean" = average.
    Deviation = average range away from grand mean (average spread).
    
"*" refers to - Parti Québécois in Quebec
    - Social Credit in British Columbia
    - Reform in federal parties
Tables 2.1 and 2.2 provide us with the basis for making a number of observations and interpretations. Table 2.1 is devoted to presenting the number of references or positive notations that are profiled above and in Appendix A below. In relation to the three aforementioned analytical perspectives, several significant patterns appear in Table 2.1.

Firstly, there appears to be a strong correlation between the average number of references and the position of the political party on the conventional left-right political scale/continuum.

The New Democrats have the highest average, the Conservatives have the lowest average, and the Liberals are the closest to the grand mean. The average for the other parties is quite close to the norm, only 1.22 below. The Liberals are only 0.53 above the overall average; while the Conservatives, -5.99, are significantly below the grand mean. For the N.D.P., who are significantly above the norm, +4.78, the western jurisdictions have a much greater number of references than the eastern provinces. However the Quebec New Democrats' score of 50 references is considerably higher than that of Ontario, whose total of 33 is close to the lowest N.D.P. total.

In relation to the regional perspective, the notations of Table 2.1 are not as highly correlated as the political continuum dimension. While Quebec has a high average, 5.44 above the grand mean of 36.89, Ontario's average is 3.56 below the norm, and the provinces of Atlantic Canada are well below the overall average. However the regional model breaks down for the three prairie provinces; the Alberta average is significantly below par, while
the Manitoba average is significantly greater than the grand mean. British Columbia stands out with an average far greater than any other province.

There also seems to be only a moderate link between the level of codification and the "complexity" of the jurisdiction. British Columbia and Quebec have the two highest averages and these two provinces are two of Canada’s three largest provinces. As noted above in candidate selection, the case of British Columbia is exceptional. Their average, a deviation that is 10.78 above the grand mean, is significantly greater than any other jurisdiction; this seemingly supports an argument that British Columbia politics are of a different order than those elsewhere in Canada.

Ontario’s low average weakens the societal complexity or size perspective. However, while weak, there still does appear to be some measure of correlation between the level of constitutional codification and this dimension; albeit at a much less intense degree than appears for the political spectrum perspective.

Table 2.2 is a different animal than Table 2.1. It does not rely on positive notations, rather it is concerned with the estimated lengths of the constitutional documents. The information that it contains is found in above in Chart 2.6 of this chapter and Appendix A.

In so far as the length of the constitutions is concerned, the left-right perspective is not apparent. Only the three Other parties have an average length that is significantly higher than the overall average, 1.29 above the average. While there are a lot
of variation in individual cases, the three main parties have party averages that are remarkably similar; thus their party averages and the overall average are very close.

In contrast to the left-right perspective, there does appear to be a correlation between a regional pattern and the length of the document. As for the previous Table, the Atlantic region has the lowest averages. Quebec and Ontario have higher averages than either their eastern neighbours or the Prairie provinces. British Columbia's highest average, 2.79 above the grand mean, throws any symmetry of a centre-periphery configuration off, however this high average does further the view that this province is a distinct region when compared to other provinces.

The wrench that British Columbia throws in a centre-periphery configuration only serves to strengthen the link between socio-political complexity and the need for greater detail in the party constitutions. The three largest, and arguably, most "complex" jurisdictions, Quebec, Ontario, and British Columbia, have constitutions whose average lengths are greater than any other jurisdiction. It remains to be seen whether these general patterns also exist for the specific questions of candidate selection and party leadership.
CHAPTER THREE: CANDIDATE SELECTION

The significance to Canadian political parties of candidate selection is beyond debate.\textsuperscript{32} Political parties regard the selection of party candidates as private business. Yet the process of selection is important. This process will determine the nature of the people who will represent the political party in the electoral process, and will also, if they are elected, determine the nature of the people who will participate in the government or the "government-in-waiting". While basically similar, the procedures for the selection of party candidates among the various parties can be expected to differ in a number of important details. Candidate selection is one of the few areas where the local constituency has any input into either the party or the polity.

This chapter has a structure similar to Chapter Two. The chart is presented and the categories are discussed in general terms; a detailed presentation of the chart data is located in Appendix B. Then the number of references for each jurisdiction are tallied to produce a Figure which is analyzed in relation to the three dimensions outlined in the introductory chapter.

Charts 3.1 and 3.2 ask twenty two questions; these questions cover a wide assortment of rules which pertain to candidate selection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Calling a Meeting</th>
<th>Procedures Search Committee</th>
<th>Financial Rules/Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lib</strong></td>
<td>Y R U</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NDP</strong></td>
<td>R R Y</td>
<td>N* R R R R R R R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PC</strong></td>
<td>Y R Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NS</strong></td>
<td>Lib R R R</td>
<td>R Y Y Y Y R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEI</strong></td>
<td>Lib R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R R R R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NDP</strong></td>
<td>R Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PC</strong></td>
<td>Y R Y</td>
<td>N* Y Y Y Y R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NDP</strong></td>
<td>R R Y</td>
<td>R R Y Y R R R R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lib</strong></td>
<td>Y R Y</td>
<td>R R Y Y* Y R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PC</strong></td>
<td>R R Y</td>
<td>R R R R R R R R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NDP</strong></td>
<td>Y R Y</td>
<td>R R Y Y Y R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Que</strong></td>
<td>Lib Y R N*</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y* Y U</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PO</strong></td>
<td>Y R N*</td>
<td>R R Y Y Y R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NDP</strong></td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td>R Y Y Y Y R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lib</strong></td>
<td>Y R Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PC</strong></td>
<td>R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R R R R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NDP</strong></td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td>R R Y Y Y R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lib</strong></td>
<td>Y R R</td>
<td>R R R R R R R R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PC</strong></td>
<td>Y R Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NDP</strong></td>
<td>Y R R</td>
<td>R R Y Y Y R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lib</strong></td>
<td>Y R Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PC</strong></td>
<td>Y R R</td>
<td>R R R R R R R R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NDP</strong></td>
<td>Y R R</td>
<td>R R R R R R R R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lib</strong></td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SC</strong></td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y* U R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NDP</strong></td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y* Y Y Y Y Y R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lib</strong></td>
<td>Y R R</td>
<td>R R Y Y Y R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PO</strong></td>
<td>U R U</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NDP</strong></td>
<td>R Y R Y*</td>
<td>Y R Y Y Y Y R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lib</strong></td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PC</strong></td>
<td>R R R</td>
<td>R R Y Y Y R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NDP</strong></td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ref</strong></td>
<td>Y R Y</td>
<td>R R Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGEND:** "Y"- Yes; "R"- No Reference; "N"- No; "U"- Unclear/Confusing; "X"- Not Applicable; "*"- Special Case/Exception
CHART 3.1: CANDIDATE SELECTION(a)

(CHART 3.1 QUESTIONS)

CALLING A MEETING
a.] Does the constitution refer to the notice for the candidate selection meeting?
b.] Is the timing of the meeting mentioned?
c.] Is the Executive of the constituency responsible for the calling of the meeting?

PROCEDURES FOR MEETING
a.] Is there mention made that attendance is necessary in order to vote?
b.] Are the voting rules for the candidate selection meeting referred to in the constitution?
c.] Does the constitution state that membership in the party is necessary in order to participate in the selection process?
d.] Is there any reference made concerning a residency criterion for participation?
e.] Is there any reference made concerning a length of membership criterion for participation?
f.] Does the constitution state that a secret ballot is to be held for the vote on the selection of the candidate?

COMPULSORY SEARCH COMMITTEE
a.] Does the constitution state that a search committee is a necessary part of the candidate selection process?

FINANCIAL RULES/LIMITS
a.] Is there any reference to rules or limits concerning the candidate selection process?
CALLING A MEETING

The first section is concerned with the constitutional rules that govern the convening of the nomination meeting. This category is composed of three parts; the notice of the meeting, the timing of the meeting, and lastly, whether the local executive is mentioned as being responsible for calling the meeting.

Most striking is the almost complete lack of reference to the calling of the nomination meeting in the ten Conservative constitutions. In contrast, the majority of the Liberal and New Democrat documents contain some sort of reference to this matter. Perhaps the most significant piece of information in this category is that the P.Q. constitution has the same position as the Quebec Liberals: that the responsibility for calling the local nomination meeting is specified as beyond the preview of the local executive, and that this responsibility rests with the leadership of the party. 33

PROCEDURES FOR MEETING

The second category focuses on the constitutional references that concern the rules of the nomination meeting. "Procedures for Meeting", has six sections; the first is whether attendance is a necessity in order for members to vote, next is the matter of the constitution detailing the voting procedures, then comes the question of whether party membership is clearly defined as a prerequisite, fourthly is an inquiry of whether there exists a

33 In the opening paragraph of the P. Q. document, Chapter IX, Section 9, the National executive Council, not the local executive, explicitly retains the power to call the nomination "congress".
residency requirement for members to vote at these meetings, next is the matter of having the length of membership as a criterion in order to qualify to vote, and lastly, a look to see if a secret ballot is called for.

There does not appear to be any dominating trend which emerges from this category. The Liberal and Conservative constitutions are fairly uniform or consistent in the range of their responses while the New Democrat constitutions stress residency and length of membership more so than the other parties. Significantly, there are few references for any of the parties regarding whether the vote for the selection of the candidate is to be conducted by a secret ballot, and there are several instances of unclear regulations.34

**COMPULSORY SEARCH COMMITTEE**

This category investigates whether a compulsory search committee is called for in the constitution. Only one document, that of the Reform Party, specifies that such a committee is necessary.35 The constitution of the Yukon Conservatives raises the

---

34 There is no direct reference to having the voting done secretly in either the constitution or in the more detailed "General Regulations" of the Quebec Liberals; still, a reading of the articles on candidate selection does lead one to believe that a secret ballot is inferred. Article 13 of the Saskatchewan Tory document states, in part, that "The conduct of such Nominating Meeting ... shall follow the order of procedure as listed under Article 15." Section g. of Article 15 calls for a returning officers and ballot boxes, but a secret ballot is not directly prescribed.

35 The process which Reform's constitution calls "candidate recruitment, nomination, and development" has four articles, the result of which is to allow the party's hierarchy, the Executive Council, to exercise near complete control over the nomination process. A search committee is not specifically called for but Section 4, Article a. directs "Each duly constituted Constituency
possibility of such a body, but fails to state that such a committee is a necessity.

**FINANCIAL RULES/LIMITS**

This section asks if there was any mention of financial rules or limits for either hopeful nominees or selected candidates. What is notable here is that such a reference is contained in only three constitutions, the P.Q. and Liberals in Quebec and the Liberals in Ontario. That only these three documents refer to such a rule seems to point to some sort of shared, common concern among these parties on this particular matter.

---

Association shall conduct a thorough search to find the best possible candidate to represent the people of that constituency."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>APPEALS</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP</th>
<th>VOTES</th>
<th>PROVINCIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a b c</td>
<td>a b c d e</td>
<td>a b c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nfld</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>R R Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>N*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>R R R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>N*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>R R Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>R R R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R R R N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Y R Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y R Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y R Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>R R R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y R R N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y R Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>R R R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>R R R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y R N Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y R Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y R N Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>R R R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>R R R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y R N Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Y R Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Y R Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y R N Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>R R R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Y R Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>R R Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>R R Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGEND: "Y"- Yes; "R"- No Reference; "N"- No; "U"- Unclear/Confusing; "X"- Not Applicable; "*"- Special Case/Exception
CHART 3.2: CANDIDATE SELECTION(b)

(CHART 3.2 QUESTIONS)

APPEALS
a.] Does the constitution mention the possibility of appeals on the matter of the selection of the candidate?
b.] Does the constitution detail the procedure such appeals must follow?
c.] Does the constitution mention the possibility of intervention from outside the constituency, ie. party leadership, in the candidate selection process?

APPROVAL BY OTHERS
a.] Does the constitution mention that the approval of others, ie. the party leadership, is a necessary step in the candidate selection process?

MEMBERSHIP CRITERIA FOR NOMINEE
a.] Is it specified in the constitution that the nominee must be a party member?
b.] Is there any reference that the nominee must have been a party member for a prescribed length of time?
c.] Does the constitution mention that the nominee must satisfy a residency requirement?
d.] Is there any other criteria that a nominee must fulfil in order to stand as the candidate?

VOTES NEEDED
a.] In the candidate selection process, does the constitution specify that the successful nominee only capture a plurality of the votes cast?
b.] In the candidate selection process, does the constitution specify that the successful nominee needs a majority of the votes cast?

PROVINCIAL/FEDERAL
a] Are the constitutional rules pertaining to candidate selection for both provincial and federal ridings?(Note: This category applies only to the three main parties and does not apply to the constitution of any federal parties.)
APPEALS

The category "Appeals" has three sections; the first wonders if appeals are mentioned as possible, the second section inquires if the constitutions render a detailed procedure for an appeal, and the last section asks if the intervention of the party brass is possible in a dispute.

What stands out on appeals is the difference between the New Democrats and the other parties. Provisions for appeals of disputes regarding candidate selection are much more common in the New Democrat documents. Of particular interest is the large number of constitutions which present the possibility of intervention by the party in the candidate selection process; no constitution explicitly discounts the possibility of intervention, those even those parties whose constitutions contain no reference to this matter may also allow some manner of intervention.

APPROVAL BY OTHERS

This category looks at whether the approval of others, such as the party hierarchy, is a necessary condition for the candidate. Again in contrast to the other two main parties the New Democrat constitutions are much more disposed to make explicit the provision that approval for the local candidate must be given by the party hierarchy, as do the constitutions of both Reform and the P.Q. Of the other two main parties the only document that has such a stipulation is that of the Liberals in British Columbia.

MEMBERSHIP CRITERIA FOR NOMINEE

This category is concerned with possible membership criteria
for those individuals seeking the party's nomination and this category has four parts; the initial section asks whether or not party membership is necessary, the second part inquires if there is a prescribed length of time of party membership, the third section centres on the question of a residency requirement, and the last section in this category seeks to find out if there are any other possible requirements not mentioned above.

The most interesting pattern in this category is the tendency of the New Democrat constitutions to stipulate that nominees must be party members; the majority of constitutions for the other parties have no reference to such a matter. While only a few of the documents call for the nominees to meet a residency requirement, they usually also allow for exceptions to this rule.

VOTES NEEDED

These questions investigate the amount of support, either a plurality or a majority, needed in order to capture the candidature. Very few parties choose their electoral candidates with a "first past the post" system. There are only two constitutions which allow the candidate to be chosen with only a plurality of the votes cast, the Liberals and Conservatives in Newfoundland, and these two examples only allow this under certain circumstances. What is the greatest interest in this category is that the large majority of constitutions fail to refer to this matter at all. Except for the two cases mentioned above, the constitutions that do refer to this matter specify that the winning candidate must capture a majority of the votes cast.
PROVINCIAL/FEDERAL

The last category asks if the constitutional rules for candidate selection are for both provincial and federal ridings; of course the federal parties, the Social Credit party, and the P.Q. are exempt from this category. The most prominent feature that emerges out of this category is the difference between the Conservatives and the two other parties; a majority of the Liberal and N.D.P. constitutions stipulate that the rules on candidate selection apply to both provincial and federal constituencies, while the only Tory document that mentions federal ridings is that of Alberta, and it is less than explicit. Another significant feature is that the constitutions of two Quebec parties, the Liberals and the New Democrats, are emphatic that the rules do not apply to the selection of candidates for federal electoral offices. Also, the Yukon Liberals are focused solely on the federal arena and no mention is made towards territorial politics.
### TABLE 3.1

NUMBER OF CANDIDATE SELECTION REFERENCES FROM CHARTS 3.1 AND 3.2
(SEE ALSO APPENDIX B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>P.C.</th>
<th>Lib</th>
<th>N.D.P.</th>
<th>Other*</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nfld.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>- 0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>- 0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.E.I.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>- 2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.B.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>- 2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>+ 2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ont.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>+ 2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manit.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>- 1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sask.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>- 3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alta.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>- 1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.33</td>
<td>+ 7.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukon</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>+ 0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>- 1.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Party Mean: 5.4  7.36  11.0  8.66  8.06: Grand
Deviation: -2.66 -0.70 +2.94 +0.60 8.06: Mean

NOTE: "mean" = average.
Deviation = average range away from mean (average spread).
"*" refers to - Parti Québécois in Quebec
- Social Credit in British Columbia
- Reform in federal parties
Table 3.1 provides this chapter with the basis for making a number of observations and interpretations. In regards to candidate selection and the three analytical dimensions or perspectives described above in Chapter One, the patterns appear to be significant.

Firstly, there seems to be a strong correlation between the number of constitutional references relating to candidate selection and the position of the political party on the conventional left-right political scale or continuum. Table 3.1 presents the grand mean as 8.06. In Table 3.1 the Liberal overall average is 7.36, the Tories are at 5.4, and the N.D.P. are at 11.0, while the average of the three other parties, 8.66, is the closest to the grand mean.

According to Table 3.1, the deviation from the grand mean for the Conservatives is -2.66, for the N.D.P. the deviation is +2.94, and the Liberals are very close to the grand mean, only 0.70 below. For the three national parties it appears that the further a political party is to the right of the left-right scale, the less is the likelihood that the constitution will have a great deal of codification on the subject of candidate selection; to the left of the scale, the greater the likelihood that the constitution will have a great deal more to say on the matter of candidate selection; while the middle of the scale means closer to the overall average.

Table 3.1 reinforces both the regional perspective and the size/complexity perspective, although the regional dimension seems a bit less strongly correlated than the size/complexity perspective. When the British Columbia average is excluded, the
party constitutions of the geographical and political centre of the country, Ontario and Quebec, have the highest averages of constitutional references on candidate selection. Conversely the Atlantic region and the Prairies have averages significantly lower than the grand mean. As with the Tables in Chapter Two, the case of British Columbia deserves special note; the average of this province is significantly higher than any other province or regional grouping. Hence some level of correlation exists between the number of constitutional references on candidate selection and the analytical position that views Canada from a regional perspective.

British Columbia has the highest average (15.33) in Table 3.1. The average is significantly higher than any other jurisdiction and some reasons for this will be discussed below in the concluding chapter. Nevertheless this means that the three most populated provinces have the highest averages. This fact seems to reinforce the size/complexity perspective, which investigates if there is any linkage between the size of the province and the tendency of party constitutions to have a large number of constitutional references.

When examined jointly, both the size and regional perspectives suggest that the provincial averages seem to be strongly correlated to area, a geographical dimension.

In conclusion, there appears to be a very strong correlation between the number of constitutional references on candidate selection and the three analytical perspectives. That these patterns, the apparent link between the number of constitutional
references and the three analytical perspectives, is the situation for candidate selection is undoubtable. However there may be peculiar reasons or dynamics which may act to clarify, modify, or explain these patterns and the concluding chapter will deal with such matters. It remains to be seen whether these patterns will continue to hold for the other area to be investigated, the constitutional rules on party leadership.
CHAPTER FOUR: PARTY LEADERSHIP

Party leaders are a principal link between the party and the government. Leaders are the standard-bearers of parties; they represent the party in society in general and in the polity in particular. Party leadership is now regarded as one of the most important elements of party presence, a major determinant for the electoral success of the party.36 "Parties have become simply the vehicles for their leaders, and electoral politics becomes image politics, not policy debate."37 Also, with the "growth of government and the development of television, elections have tended to become simply contests between leaders, emphasizing personality and style,".38 Studies that focus on election issues make the point that for electoral choice, leadership is often as crucial as issues.39 This chart contains five general categories. Following the presentation of the chart the categories are discussed in general terms, and then the number of references are analyzed in relation to the perspectives outlined in the introduction.

36 One such work is that of, Harold Clarke et al, Absent Mandate: The Politics of Discontent in Canada (Toronto: Gage Publishing, 1984).


38 Forbes, "Absent Mandate '88?", p.16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADER'S ROLE</th>
<th>LEADERSHIP REVIEW</th>
<th>INTERIM LEADER SEARCH COMMITTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a b c d</td>
<td>a b c d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nfld Lib</td>
<td>U N X Y</td>
<td>Y N N Y Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nfld PC</td>
<td>U Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y N N N U U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nfld NDP</td>
<td>Y*Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y X X U U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS Lib</td>
<td>N N X Y</td>
<td>N X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS PC</td>
<td>U Y U Y</td>
<td>Y N N Y Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS NDP</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y X X U U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEI Lib</td>
<td>U V N Y</td>
<td>N X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEI PC</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>N X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEI NDP</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y X X Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB Lib</td>
<td>U N X Y</td>
<td>N X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB PC</td>
<td>U Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y N Y X U U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB NDP</td>
<td>U V Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y X X U U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que Lib</td>
<td>Y U U N</td>
<td>Y N Y X U U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que PC</td>
<td>Y*Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y N N Y Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que NDP</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y X X U U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ont Lib</td>
<td>U N X Y</td>
<td>Y N N Y Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ont PC</td>
<td>Y*U U Y</td>
<td>Y N Y X Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ont NDP</td>
<td>U Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y X X U U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manit PC</td>
<td>U Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y N Y X Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manit NDP</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y X X U U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sask Lib</td>
<td>U Y U Y</td>
<td>Y Y X X Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sask PC</td>
<td>Y*N X U</td>
<td>Y N N Y Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sask NDP</td>
<td>U Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y X X U U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alta Lib</td>
<td>Y Y U Y</td>
<td>Y N Y X U U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alta PC</td>
<td>U N X Y</td>
<td>Y N Y X Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alta NDP</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y X X U U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Lib</td>
<td>Y* N X N</td>
<td>Y Y X X Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC SC</td>
<td>U U U U</td>
<td>N X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC NDP</td>
<td>Y*Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y X X Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukon Lib</td>
<td>\ / / / / / / / / /</td>
<td>\ / / / / / / / / / / / / / /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukon PC</td>
<td>U N X Y</td>
<td>Y Y X X Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukon NDP</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y X X U U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed Lib</td>
<td>U Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y N Y Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed PC</td>
<td>U Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y N Y X Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed NDP</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y X X U U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed Ref</td>
<td>Y Y Y N*</td>
<td>Y N N Y Y Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGEND:** "Y" - Yes; "R" - No Reference; "N" - No; "U" - Unclear/Confusing; "X" - Not Applicable; "*" - Special Case/Exception
CHART 4.1: PARTY LEADERSHIP (a)

(Chart 4.1 Questions)

LEADER'S ROLE
a.] Is the leader's role in the party clearly specified?
b.] Is the leader clearly a member of the "day-to-day" management team?
c.] Does the leader have voting or decision making privileges for the above category?
d.] Is the leader also a member of the "General Council" (generic term used to describe a body with authority, but removed from the daily operation of the party)?

LEADERSHIP REVIEW
a.] Are there leadership review provisions in the constitution?
b.] Is this review to take place within a set time period, for example an "automatic review" held every two years?
c.] Do the review provisions kick in only after a defeat in a general election?
d.] Do the review provisions kick in after an election, either a defeat or a victory?
e.] Is the vote for a leadership review a secret ballot?
f.] Is the wording for the calling of a leadership review specified?

INTERIM LEADER
a.] Does the constitution make any reference to the position of interim leader?
b.] Is the interim leader appointed solely by the caucus?
c.] Is the interim leader appointed solely by the party?
d.] Do both the caucus and the party appoint the interim leader?

SEARCH COMMITTEE
a.] Does the constitution make any reference to a search committee for leadership candidates?
LEADER'S ROLE

This first category has four sections. The intent of this category is to examine what powers and role the party leader is mentioned as having in the party constitutions. The first question asks whether or not the constitution clearly specifies the leader's role; the second, third and fourth questions seek to discover the extent of the leader's acknowledged powers.

What is interesting for both the Liberals and the Progressive Conservatives is, according to their constitutions, the extent of the ambiguity of the leader's role in the party. When compared to the other two main parties, the New Democrats are quite clear on what the role and powers of the party leader are. The New Democrat leaders are acknowledged as having a wide-ranging leadership role within the party, as is the case for the leaders of both the Reform Party and the P. Q. The P.Q. document has the party leader as the overall president of party; so the party leader wears two hats, chief parliamentarian and party president.  

LEADERSHIP REVIEW

There are six sections making up this category. The first of these questions queries if the constitution does have leadership review provisions. The next three sections concern the timing of such a review. The fifth question seeks to discover if the vote for the review is conducted by a secret ballot, and the last question wonders if the wording of such a review is specified.

Leadership review provisions are contained in a large majority

40 Article XII, Section 1.
of the constitutions. While such a provision may be fairly common, concerted efforts on its implementation is usually viewed as a major crisis for the party. In most constitutions these reviews are automatic, they take place after elections or at a certain set time, such as annual meetings, and may be easily deflected by the embedded leadership.

What is most interesting is that four of the five constitutions that do not deal with this matter are found in the three Maritime provinces, three of which are Liberal documents and the other is the constitution of the Tories in Prince Edward Island; Social Credit is the fifth party document that has no reference on a review.

Half of the constitutions that do address a review also specify that the vote be carried out by a secret ballot. The other half are seemingly unclear whether or not a secret ballot is necessary. While the wording of the review call is contained in seven of the Tory constitutions and the Reform document, only one Liberal and no New Democrat document have the wording specified.

**INTERIM LEADER**

Four sections comprise this category. The initial question asks if the document mentions the possibility of an interim leader. The other three sections concern whether it is the duty of the caucus, the party, or both to choose the interim leader.

The most outstanding pattern on this matter is the differences between the New Democrats and the other parties. In contrast to all other parties, the constitutions of a majority of the New Democrats
deals with the possibility of interim leadership.

No reference to an interim leader is made in either the Social Credit or Reform constitutions. The P.Q. do have a section on how to replace the leader should the leader leave or die. Yet this document is ambiguous on the matter of an interim leader. However, since the party leader is also the president of the party, it seems logical that the vice-president would replace the president in the position of party president and interim party leader. Still, this is not specifically stated in the constitution, so it may well not be the case.

SEARCH COMMITTEE

There is no reference made to such a committee to search for or recruit leadership candidates in any of the party constitutions under consideration.

---

41 Article VI, Section 8.
42 Article VII, Section 3, Subsection a.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADERSHIP SELECTION RULES</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>h</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>j</th>
<th>k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nfld</td>
<td>Lib Y N Y R N Y Y Y Y R R R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC N N R R N Y Y R R R R R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP N N Y R N Y Y R R R R R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Lib N N R Y N Y Y R R R R R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC N N R R N Y Y R R R R R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP N N Y R N Y Y R R R R R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEI</td>
<td>Lib Y N R R N Y Y R R R R R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC N N Y Y Y N X U* Y R R R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP N N Y R N Y Y Y Y R R Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Lib N N R R N Y Y R R R R R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC N N Y R N Y Y Y R R R R R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP N N Y Y N Y Y Y R R R R R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que</td>
<td>Lib N N Y R N Y Y U* U* R R R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PQ Y N Y Y Y N X R R R R R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP N N Y U* N Y Y R R R R R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ont</td>
<td>Lib N N Y Y N Y Y Y Y R R R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC Y Y R R Y Y* N X Y Y Y R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP N N Y R N Y Y Y Y R R R R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manit</td>
<td>Lib N N Y Y N Y Y Y Y Y R R Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC N* N Y N* N Y Y Y Y R R Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP N N Y Y N Y Y Y R R R R R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sask</td>
<td>Lib N N R R N Y Y R R R R R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC Y N R R N Y Y R Y R R R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP N N Y Y N Y Y Y R R Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alta</td>
<td>Lib Y Y Y U N Y Y R Y R R R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC Y N R R N Y Y Y R R R R R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP N Y Y R N Y Y Y R Y R Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Lib Y Y Y Y N Y Y Y U* U* Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC N N Y R N Y Y U* Y R R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP N N Y R N Y Y Y Y Y R R Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukon</td>
<td>Lib \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC Y Y Y R N Y Y Y Y Y R Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP N N Y Y N Y Y Y Y R R Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed</td>
<td>Lib Y N Y U* N Y Y* R R Y R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC N N R Y* N Y Y Y R Y R R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP N N Y U* N Y Y Y R R R R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ref N N Y Y N Y Y Y Y R R R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGEND: "Y"- Yes; "R"- No Reference; "N"- No; "U"- Unclear/Confusing; "X"- Not Applicable; "*"- Special Case/Exception
CHART 4.2: PARTY LEADERSHIP(b)

(Chart 4.2 Questions)

Leadership Selection Rules

a.] Is a special or distinct set of rules for the leadership race/convention included in the constitution?
b.] Are the voting rules clearly specified?
c.] Was the matter of "notice" for the leadership vote or convention referred to in the constitution?
d.] Is there a reference in the constitution to a "length of membership" regulation, either to select delegates or to vote directly?
e.] Does the election of the new leader occur under the principle of "one-member, one-vote" (universal ballot)?
f.] Is the new leader chosen under the rules of a delegated convention?
g.] Is there reference made in the constitution regarding the composition of the delegates who are to go to the leadership convention?
h.] Does the constitution call for a secret ballot for the election of the party leader?
i.] Is any reference made in the constitution that a majority vote is necessary in order to successfully capture the leadership of the party?
j.] Is a reference made in the constitution concerning financial rules or limits that leadership hopefuls must obey?
k.] Is any mention made in the constitution on the possibility of an appeal relating to the leadership race/convention?
LEADERSHIP SELECTION RULES

There are eleven questions which focus on the constitutional rules as they concern the selection of the party's leader. The first of these two sections seek to discover whether the constitutions contain specific rules or procedures for both the leadership race and the vote for the leader. On this matter the Liberal and the Progressive Conservative constitutions differ from the New Democrat documents. Not one of the New Democrat constitutions contain special rules for the process of selecting a new party leader.43

In order to have a leadership race the party members must be put on some type of "notice" that a contest is underway. Only a few Tory constitutions address this point, a clear majority of the Liberal manuscripts cover "notice", however all of the New Democrat documents as well as those of the other three parties refer to the matter.

The fourth question concerns party rules which might call for a cut-off date for new party members. Almost half of the constitutions of all parties refer to some sort of "length of time" regulation; however exceptions to the rules seems possible and some documents have rules which are in conflict with each other.44

Interestingly it is in Prince Edward Island and Ontario where

43 The New Democrats in Alberta refer to the procedures to be followed in electing the Executive Officers, one of whom is the party leader. These rules are contained in an appendix to their constitution. Article 14, Appendix A - "Rules of Order".

44 Details on exceptions can be located on pp.171-173 of Appendix C below.
the Conservatives have a system of "one-member, one-vote" to choose the party leader.\textsuperscript{45} Proposed amendments for the Manitoba Tory constitution called for a variation on this system.\textsuperscript{46} The P. Q. are the only other party with a universal ballot. Since no Liberal or no New Democrat constitutions refer to this system, their party leadership is decided at delegated conventions. Most of the constitutions that refer to delegated conventions also detail the composition of the delegates.

A secret balloting process for the leadership vote is specifically mentioned in only a few documents. Many constitutions make inferences but fail to directly mention that the vote is secret. As with the balloting process, most constitutions do not specially mention that the leadership is to be decided by a majority of those voting. Also, only four constitutions, three Liberal and one Conservative, make any reference concerning financial rules or limits that leadership hopefuls must obey. Lastly, appeals relating to a leadership race are dealt with in only a few cases.

\textsuperscript{45} As well as severing ties to the federal party, the most recent version of the Alberta Conservative constitution shifted from the delegated leadership convention format to a system which allows each individual member to vote; "Alberta Tories Break Ties with Federal Party", \textit{Globe and Mail} (April 8, 1991), p.A5; however this study refers to the Alberta P. C. constitution which was in force as of March of 1990, when this study began.

\textsuperscript{46} Article XI, Section 4, Subsections a. and b., and Article XI, Section 5 of the proposed amendments, called for a system of balloting done according to preference and the choices were to be transferable among the leadership candidates. Subsequently, these proposed amendments failed to get the necessary 2/3's majority.
TABLE 4.1

NUMBER OF PARTY LEADERSHIP REFERENCES FROM CHARTS 4.1 AND 4.2
(SEE ALSO APPENDIX C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>PARTY</th>
<th>P.C.</th>
<th>Lib.</th>
<th>N.D.P.</th>
<th>Other*</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nfld.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>-2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.E.I.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>+0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.B.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ont.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>+0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manit.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>+0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sask.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alta.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>+1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>+0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukon</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>+3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Party Mean: 10.4 8.45 11.58 9.0 10.08: Overall Mean
Deviation: +0.32 -1.63 +1.50 -1.08

NOTE: "mean" = average.

Deviation = average range away from grand mean (average spread).

"*" refers to - Parti Québécois in Quebec
- Social Credit in British Columbia
- Reform in federal parties
Table 4.1 focuses on the matter of party leadership and is based on the number of references on this subject that are contained in the leadership chart, see above and Appendix C.

On the matter of the political continuum, the left-right pattern noted for candidate selection weakens considerably; however while muted, the pattern still somewhat remains. The N.D.P. has a considerably higher average, 11.58, than the other parties, and their deviation is 1.50 above the aggregate norm of 10.08. For party leadership, in contrast to the situation for candidate selection, the Liberals have traded places with the Conservatives. The Liberals have the lowest average, 8.45, which places their deviation 1.40 below the grand mean; while the Tory average, 10.4, is very close to the overall average, a deviation of 0.32 above the grand mean. The Tories high average may reflect all the leadership conflicts that have wreaked the Conservatives thus their subsequent sensitivity to the issue. The average for the other parties, 9.0, is once again close to the grand mean.

As with the above left-right perspective, the codification level (number of references) on party leadership weakens for the regional and socio-political "complexity" perspectives. The Atlantic Canada region continues to have significantly lower averages than elsewhere; however, the previous regional patterns noted for candidate selection break down for leadership. Quebec's average, 9.33, is 0.75 lower than the overall mean while Ontario's average, 11.0, is above the grand mean. As seen in Table 4.1, the Yukon has the highest average of references for leadership, and
there is some discussion on the Yukon below in Chapter 5. When the Yukon parties are excluded the Alberta average is the highest, for a deviation of 1.59 above the grand mean.

The linkage between levels of constitutional codification and societal "complexity" is likewise muted. As noted above, the party constitutions in Quebec have a below average number of positive notations on leadership, and this is true for all three political parties in Quebec. As with the Atlantic region, it appears that the subject of leadership, when compared to provinces west of Quebec, is not a high priority for the constitutions of Quebec's political parties. Also, while the British Columbia average of 10.33 is above the grand mean, it is only moderately so, it is identical to that of Manitoba and well below that of Alberta. The federal parties are very close to the overall average, only 0.08 below the grand mean.

The pattern that appears strongest in relation to party leadership is an east-west split. The five eastern most provinces, except for Prince Edward Island, have averages that are below the five western most provinces, excepting Saskatchewan.

For the final chapter it will be interesting to note whether any of the trends or patterns commented upon in the above three chapters will be carried through when the number of references for all the charts are combined.
CHAPTER FIVE: ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

The previous three chapters contain a great deal of data that describe the party constitutions. This chapter is not concerned with the specifics of what the documents may or may not say; its focus is on the patterns that emerge from the numbers.

Table 5.1 is a combination of the references from Tables 2.1, 3.1, and 4.1. Table 5.1 provides this chapter with the basis for making a number of observations and interpretations. Patterns have emerged from these charts which are of great interest to anyone studying Canadian politics and Canadian political parties. Not surprisingly, there is a wide range of possible comments to make about this data.

As with the three previous chapters, this final chapter uses three analytical dimensions to examine the story presented by Table 5.1. The analysis begins with observations for each political party and concentrates on the left-right perspective. Following the party discussion, an examination of Table 5.1 will be attempted in relation to the perspectives of regionalism and size or socio-political complexity.

The concluding section utilizes the stories or patterns uncovered by this study to discuss connections between political parties and their constitutions.
## Table 5.1

**Number of References From All Charts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>P.C.</th>
<th>Lib.</th>
<th>N.D.P.</th>
<th>Other*</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nfld.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>-4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.33</td>
<td>-5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.E.I.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.67</td>
<td>-4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.B.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>-8.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>+7.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ont.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.67</td>
<td>+0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manit.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.67</td>
<td>+3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sask.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.67</td>
<td>-1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alta.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>-2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>73.33</td>
<td>+19.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukon</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.67</td>
<td>+0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51.75</td>
<td>-2.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Party Mean: 46.70
Deviation: 51.92 63.33 53.33 54.32: Grand Mean

NOTE: "mean" = average.
Deviation = average range away from mean (average spread).
"**" refers to - Parti Québécois in Quebec
- Social Credit in British Columbia
- Reform in federal parties
ANALYSIS

The discussion that follows concentrates on Table 5.1, however the averages and deviations from the other Tables may be referred to in passing. The Grand Mean that is used for Table 5.1 is 54.32.

**PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES**  The Tory average in Table 5.1 is 7.62 below the grand mean. The range in the number of references in Table 5.1 is from 33 in Alberta to 64 in the Yukon. One reason which may explain the low Progressive Conservative average is that it may be directly attributable to the deference the federal and provincial documents show to local constituencies in matters such as candidate selection. The Manitoba and Yukon constitutions are the only Tory documents to include a model constitution for constituency associations; as noted earlier. Both the Manitoba and Yukon constitutions strongly suggest that the constituency associations follow the models, therefore these two jurisdictions have many more articles than the average Conservative constitution.

It seems unusual and interesting that the Yukon total of 64 positive responses is the highest of the Conservatives. In addition to the inclusion of a model constituency constitution, there are some other likely reasons which may explain the high number of positive notations in the Tory’s Yukon constitution.

Most importantly are the similarities between this constitution’s structure and both the constitutions of British Columbia’s Social Credit and Liberals. The 84 positive responses in the British Columbia Liberal constitution are the highest in all of the 37 constitutions, and the 53 positive notations in the Social
Credit document are close to the grand mean. This is significant because the Yukon P.C. constitution has a structure and tone similar to both the Social Credit and the British Columbia Liberal documents.

While this does not prove that the Yukon P.C. constitution is directly inspired by or copied from either the British Columbia Liberal or Social Credit constitutions, it does nevertheless suggest the possibility of some sort of linkage, possibly going back to the evolution of party politics in both British Columbia and the Yukon. Party politics have only recently become a feature of Yukon politics. It was in 1978 that, "party politics were formally introduced in the territorial legislature". The Yukon Tory constitution also contained a great number of unclear or confusing notations (see Appendices A, B, and C).

As to the previously noted patterns of regionalism and socio-political complexity, of the three major parties the Progressive Conservative documents reflected these patterns the least. A major reason being of course the absence of Tory party constitutions for either Quebec or British Columbia, which makes observations on these dimensions less relevant. Nevertheless, on the matter of the political spectrum, this party has continued and strengthened the tendency for a relationship between the left-right continuum and the extent of constitutional codification.

**LIBERALS** In Table 5.1 the Liberal average is 2.40 below the

---

norm, of the three national parties, they are the closest to the grand mean. The Liberal constitutions have the widest range in the number of positive notations, which is from 30 in the Yukon to 84 in British Columbia. The Liberals reflect the above noted patterns in the provincial averages quite sharply. Generally they are high in the centre and low in the peripheral areas. However, British Columbia is a special exception, and Newfoundland and Manitoba are also somewhat out of step in relation to their regions. Provincially and federally, the Liberals have not had a great number of recent electoral successes west of Manitoba. It is interesting to note that, except for British Columbia, this is where their provincial averages are the lowest. Prince Edward Island has the lowest number of references for provincial Liberals which may be explained by the fact that it is the smallest province, and rules or issues surrounding party constitutions may most likely be dealt with on an informal or conventional basis.

The case of British Columbia is interesting. It is such an anomaly for the Liberals that it bears closer examination. Although the Liberals have only recently regained representation in the provincial assembly, they nevertheless have had a long history of involvement in British Columbia politics. The political coalition that has sustained Social Credit in power probably would not have had the same degree of success if not for the participation of key Liberal players. This coalition was successful in its aim to block the socialist C.C.F. from winning elections, but the Liberal Party found itself on the sidelines and, despite considerable effort,
seemed unable to join the game for many years. What is of interest is the significant convergence between the British Columbia Liberal document and the Social Credit constitution. The format and the style are remarkably similar, and one finds phrases repeated wholesale in both. While there is little doubt that the shared history and personnel of these parties have acted to help determine this situation, such an historical analysis lay beyond the perimeters of the study.

NEW DEMOCRATS The New Democrat average of 63.33 in Table 5.1 is 9.01 above the grand average. As with the Tories, the range in the number of references is fairly narrow; British Columbia has the largest number, at 83, and Newfoundland the lowest, at 51. Overall, these constitutions appear to have the most consistent levels of codification. Their average is significantly greater than the overall average; and, at least as far as the level of codification in party constitutions is concerned, the N.D.P. is quantitatively different than the other two national parties. Many studies stress that the New Democratic Party is quite different from the other two major parties. Since the N.D.P. constitutions seemingly tend towards a greater deal of formal codification, this

---

48 Donald E. Blake, R. K. Carty, and Lynda Erickson, Grassroots Politicians: Party Activists in British Columbia (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1991), pp.44-47; in this section these authors examine the participation of both Liberals and Conservatives in the Social Credit party.

may be an indication that this party is qualitatively distinct from the Liberals and the Progressive Conservatives.

Like the Liberals, the New Democratic constitutions reflect some of the patterns noted above. There does appear to be a tendency for the larger provinces to have greater degrees of codification, however Ontario stands as an important exception to this pattern. As well as being one of the shortest N.D.P. constitutions, the document of the Ontario New Democrats also has one of the this party's lowest totals for the number of references included in the constitution. Given the high degree of political activity of the party in this jurisdiction, both federally and provincially, one might expect that the Ontario New Democrats would have a much more elaborate constitution; only time will tell if political success will change this situation.

Similar to the patterns found in the chapter on party leadership, there appears to be an east-west split, with Ontario and Quebec falling away from the pattern. The average of the New Democrats in Quebec is a fair bit higher than the overall N.D.P. average. There is now constitutional recognition of the fact that the N.D.P. in Quebec are split into federal and provincial wings and the provincial New Democrats are no longer associated with the rest of the party; the constitution that was used for this study was thus dated when received, and it remains to be seen whether their new constitution will retain the high level of codification.

The New Democrat constitutions in Alberta, British Columbia, and, to a lesser extent, the Yukon are at the high end of the scale
for the extent of codification and they present an interesting regional picture.

The British Columbia New Democrat provincial total is the highest. This may be explained in relation to the political environment of British Columbia. The political climate of British Columbia is the most antagonistic (highly polarized) environment in the Canadian political system.\textsuperscript{50} Such conflict between political parties might bestow a vitality and passion to internal party politics, thus necessitating an elaborate set of rules to govern party behaviour.

Although the Alberta New Democrats have never governed that province, they have had some electoral success and, in contrast to the Maritimes, they have been active in Alberta politics for a considerable length of time.\textsuperscript{51} It is interesting that the Alberta N.D.P. constitution is remarkably similar to that of the British Columbia New Democrats, and to a lesser extent the same is true for the N.D.P. in the Yukon. How this commonality evolved is beyond the scope of this study, yet these shared traits are of interest in so far as they point to a regional grouping.

\textsuperscript{50} Galbraith describes the political culture of B. C. as "bipolar" and writes that, "there are two sets of political beliefs, mostly in opposition to each other, in which the politics of the province are discussed, defined, debated, and described." Gordon S. Galbraith, "British Columbia", in David J. Bellamy and others, eds., \textit{The Provincial Political Systems: Comparative Essays} (Toronto: Methuen, 1976), p.62.

OTHER The Social Credit Party occupies the right-of-centre niche and has a constitution whose format or structure is unusual. That the Social Credit constitution is somewhat idiosyncratic is perhaps not surprising. The Social Credit constitution has already been partially discussed in the analysis of the above three national political parties. Their high number of positive responses, for a party of the "right", helped to push the British Columbia provincial average higher than any other. The extent of this constitution's codification may in some way be related to its reputation as a populist party. Also, as noted above, the Social Credit document shares a great deal in common with the British Columbia Liberals and the Yukon Conservatives.

While the constitution of the Parti Québécois has fewer references than either the provincial Liberals or the Nouveau Parti Démocratique du Québec, its tenor, but not structure, is close to that of the Liberals. They both share many of the same rules; for example, both party hierarchies are granted a great degree of formal control over constituency matters, and party regulations on the subject of party leadership are remarkably similar. This may in some way be related to the genesis of the P.Q. as a breakaway party by disaffected nationalists, led by former Quebec Liberal cabinet minister René Lévesque, from the provincial Liberals.52

The Reform constitution, with 56 "yes" references, is above,
but close to, the grand mean. However comparison with other parties is somewhat problematic for several reasons. Two of the federal parties, the Liberals and the New Democrats, explicitly exclude themselves from the matter of candidate selection. Also, this being their first constitution, there are probably many "holes" that will soon be filled. Since Reform is only a federal party (at the time of the writing of this study), it becomes a case of apples and oranges when comparing Reform to provincial political parties. Yet some comparisons can be attempted.

The Reform party positions itself on the right of the political continuum sharing this territory with the Conservatives and Social Credit. On this basis, the Reform constitution appears closer to the Social Credit document; both documents have significantly more positive responses than the Tory average, but the fact that the Progressive Conservative constitutions range from 33 to 64 tends to render such a comparison somewhat empty. Suffice it to say that the Reform constitution, on many matters, seems fairly involved. This may be related to this party's desire or need to maintain control and to eliminate deviations in party direction; or to restate the point, having clear constitutional regulations may allow the Reform Party to moderate extremist elements which could jeopardize the electoral chances of the party.

There appears to be a very clear correlation between the level of codification and the position of the party on the left-right political continuum, especially for the three main parties; however the three other parties [Reform, Social Credit and the Parti
Québécois] do not reflect this pattern, but this may be related to the somewhat isolated positions they occupy within their political environments. Perhaps the peculiar character of a party constitution is related to the nature and dynamics of the political party which it serves.

In conclusion for the left-right perspective, one pattern that has emerged from Table 5.1's tabulation of references appears to be the most significant. The pattern that seems to emerge from this analysis is the indication that, in so far as the constitutions of political parties are concerned, the New Democrats are distinct in relation to the two other major parties.

According to Table 5.1, a regional perspective also seems to hold for party constitutions; however, the correlation here is somewhat weaker than that of the left-right pattern. Atlantic Canada once more has the lowest totals and, except for Manitoba, the Prairies are also below the averages of the centre, and again, British Columbia stands out as an anomaly. Manitoba's high average, a deviation of 3.35 above the grand mean, weakens the regional pattern for the prairies. The Ontario total is almost identical to the grand mean, at 0.35 above the grand mean, while Quebec is quite a bit higher, +7.68, than either Ontario or the grand mean.

The proposition that the larger provinces, in terms of size (economic activity/diversity and population), might have constitutional codification levels which reflect their socio-political complexity also seems to be somewhat weaker than the left-right dimension. Quebec, Ontario, and British Columbia are the
provinces with the largest populations and the largest economies; both Quebec and British Columbia are considerably above the grand mean. However, Manitoba's average is significantly above that of Ontario; two principal reasons for this situation are the relatively high number of references in the document of the Progressive Conservatives in Manitoba and the relatively low number of references for the New Democrats in Ontario.

Two patterns that seem to emerge from this analysis is the indication that, in so far as the constitutions of political parties are concerned, both Quebec and British Columbia are distinct in relation to the rest of Canada.

CONCLUSIONS

What does this study tell us about party constitutions and political parties? One of the primary goals of the previous chapters has been to demonstrate to what extent party constitutions differ. Three major stories seem to have evolved from this study: (1) the distinctiveness of the New Democrat constitutions from those of the other two main parties, (2) the distinctiveness of party constitutions in British Columbia, and (3) the distinctiveness of party constitutions in Quebec.

While the study examined parties across the whole country, there should be a recognition of the fact that, "Canada has a regionalized three-party system."53 The Liberals have minimal electoral presence in the west, the New Democrats are not much of

a force in Quebec or Atlantic Canada, and while the Conservatives have representation across Canada at the federal level they do not have a provincial presence in either Quebec or British Columbia. However, the relative extent of codification of the party constitutions does not seem to reflect this fact. A possible explanation for this may be that in jurisdictions where the party is electorally unsuccessful, intraparty politics, as regulated by party constitutions, are the only arena in which the party is able to get a feel for political action and experience. Honing their constitutions and debating policy provides a learning platform. The politics of the party becomes the basis for both leadership and candidate recruitment. Individuals who have distinguished themselves within the party are deemed to be prepared to represent the party at large.

As noted in the above analysis, there appears to be a significant difference in the level of constitutional codification between the New Democrats and the other two main parties. It is widely recognized that the extra-parliamentary organizations of the Liberals and Conservatives impose fewer institutional restrictions on the party leader and his/her closest colleagues. One likely explanation for such differences is that,

....the N.D.P.'s origin as a movement party and its philosophical roots among the mass parties of the left may account for its more earnest treatment of the concept of party membership and the concept of the party convention.

---

54 Cairns, p.69.

55 McMenemy, "Party Structures", p.188.
This major difference in the level of codification, and hence complexity, could be in some way related to the notion of rationalism, the planning concept that pervades social democratic parties.

Seemingly, the constitutions of the New Democrats grant the whole of the party a large degree of control over the parliamentary wing, but Cairns states that,

> the general perspectives and policy orientations of a party are likely to be skewed in favour of those interests which, by virtue of strong parliamentary representation, can vigorously assert their claims.\(^{56}\)

Thus it may be that prolonged periods of electoral success for New Democrats could lead to instances where the nonelected segments of the party, such as unions and party activists, will witness a relative decline in their positions within the party vis-à-vis the parliamentary wing. It would be of interest to political scientists to investigate whether or not this becomes the case.

It seems that the New Democrat constitutions are characterized by higher levels of codification than their Liberal and Tory counterparts; it could be, of course, that this is a reflection of the actual functioning and nature of the parties; this explanation, however, seems less compelling than the argument that the differences in party constitutions is more a reflection of the fundamental differences in the origins of the parties.

To point out the distinctiveness of Quebec seems like an axiomatic exercise. The Quebec Liberal Party and the P.Q. now

\(^{56}\) Cairns, p.70.
define the Quebec party system. In the late 1950’s and the early sixties, at the time of the Quiet Revolution, the party system of Quebec started to undergo radical changes. These changes, "were determined by general changes in the provincial environment and, more specifically, in the Quebec political system..."  

Quebec built up an infrastructure of a modern capitalist society. It trained a bureaucracy able to administer a modern state and it set up an educational system suitable for such a state. The government began to take a positive role in regulating the economy and several [very important] state enterprises were set up.  

The provincial Liberal party in Quebec played an important role in the Quiet Revolution. After its victory in 1960, this party and its government exerted considerable influence over the political environment and was in turn influenced by the Quiet Revolution. In light of the political environment in Quebec it should not be too surprising to have uncovered a distinctiveness for party constitutions vis-à-vis other provinces.  

In the case of British Columbia, the distinctiveness for the constitutions of political parties is even more extreme than for that of Quebec. The political climate of British Columbia is often


Another reason for such an intense level of distinctiveness may in some way be related to this province's reputation for populism.  

Candidate selection and party leadership were two areas on which this study concentrated. Candidate selection is the process through which political parties choose the individuals who either hold or seek to hold public office. It is a function of political parties that is functionally specific to political parties, but the process can best be appreciated by an understanding of the party as an organization.

Once placed in the governmental system, these party leaders and representatives are usually seen as having a great deal of freedom from and even control over the party; this view is especially common for both the Liberals and the Conservatives, whose, "extra-parliamentary structures...have been extremely weak,  

Elkins moderates this view of B. C.'s political culture somewhat when he states that, "the major political parties in B. C. partake of a common political culture."; yet he also goes on to emphasize the bipartisan or bipolar nature of B. C. politics. "To argue, however that the parties share and are rooted in a common political culture does not rule out profound policy disagreements or bitter personal rivalries." David J. Elkins, "British Columbia as a State of Mind", in Blake, Two Worlds, p.54. The pattern of party polarization, as it relates to party activists, is analyzed in a recent volume; the authors conclude that even though spatial theory informs us that with only two parties in active contention, they should both be attempting to claim the political centre, but that this has not happened in B.C. and that, "the parties have retained substantial elements of difference,". Blake, Carty, and Erickson, Grassroots Politicians, p.15.

"Populism" is widely seen to be one of the dominant characteristics of B. C.'s political culture. Elkins reveals the different facets of populism in B. C. politics and concludes that populism is an important force for both Social Credit and the N. D. P. Elkins, in Blake, Two Worlds, pp.61-64,74.
lacking in continuity, and without any disciplining power over the parliamentary party."\textsuperscript{61} And also, "Despite their power to choose the leader, Canadian extra-parliamentary party organizations are relatively weak and loosely organized..."\textsuperscript{62} While not disagreeing with the above statements, some qualification on this point is called for. The party does exert some control over the actions of both leaders and candidates; those who hold or seek to hold public office have an interdependent relationship with the party. If ordinary members feel that their views are not being adequately represented by the party, they can exercise the exit option, that is they can easily leave the party. Office seekers or holders, if they find themselves in a basic disagreement with some party policy, cannot as easily walk away; they depend on the patronage of the party.

Whatever reservations they might entertain about the processes or goals at any given moment, their capacity to pack their bags is constrained by their desire to rise to elected positions in the polity.\textsuperscript{63}

However, this being said, there are major differences in the constitutions of the three main parties which may help to explain why the parties regard themselves as distinct from one another.

The constitutions illustrate several important features of


\textsuperscript{63} Schonfeld, p.492.
political parties; typically the party leadership is given a fair amount of discretion and latitude for action; membership has certain obligations and entails accepting party discipline; furthermore, there is the tacit recognition that party authority is hierarchically structured, control coming from both the top and the centre. However these documents also illustrate that the degree of control is not absolute; party leaders must try to get along with the various levels of the party's hierarchy or intraparty conflict could impair the party's electoral capability; members have some freedom at the constituency level, if they feel disaffected they can simply leave the party, and since every party needs some kind of membership base, the attitudes and inputs of the lowly member must somehow be accounted for. Also, the structures of party authority may be circumscribed by reality, necessity, or simple human wilfulness. What the constitutions also illustrate is that,

negotiation between members of distinct strata, local initiative, and local inertia are widespread features of collective life. Automatic, unquestioned obedience and the absence of autonomy are very rare.\(^6^4\)

As well as the internal order of political parties, this study of party constitutions also affords an interesting vantage point from which to compare the parties. The system of Canadian political parties is organized into branches or provincial subsidiaries; membership is generally held at the provincial level, with each member belonging to the particular constituency association within whose boundaries they reside.

\(^6^4\) Schonfeld, p.494.
The above data and its analysis would seem to support the widely held view that the governmental structure of Canada affects the total political system: this is especially true for political parties and their constitutions. Engelmann and Schwartz state that,

In Canada the party system and individual parties are affected by demands arising from three aspects of the system of government: the parliamentary system, the electoral system, and the federal system.\(^6\)

The parliamentary system, with its emphasis on the cabinet and parliamentary discipline, determines the shape of the governmental structures at both the provincial and federal levels. This makes party leadership of paramount importance and also creates significant pressure for all party members to close ranks on all party decisions, which is great for group coherence but definitely dampens the chances for innovative ideas and new approaches to the complex problems facing today's societies.

The electoral system that is found in all Canadian jurisdictions, single members representing single ridings, has certainly had a major effect on party constitutions. The party is organized on the basis of the constituencies and exists to win elections at this level. One can easily agree with Cairns when he states "...the electoral system has been an important factor in the evolution of the Canadian party system."\(^6\)

Of course the federal system has also played and continues to play a determining role in the development of Canadian political

\(^{65}\) Engelmann and Schwartz, *Political Parties and the Canadian Social Structure*, p.115.

\(^{66}\) Cairns, p.55.
parties and their constitutions. Canada is a federated state; one of the features inherent in this condition is the constitutional division of power between the provincial governments and the federal government. Parties exist on both levels and their relationship is reflected in their party documents. The relationship between different parties is also involved because of the Canadian habit of electing different parties at both the federal and provincial levels. One of the inherent conditions of having the Canadian polity organized according to the principles of a federal system is that there seems to be a fairly high level of tension in the relations between these two levels of government; that this tension is also evident for political parties hardly seems surprising.

The only thing certain in our world is change. Canada appears to be on the cusp of some major reforms; the federal system may be where some significant change manifests itself, or failing that, the possibility of dismemberment is being discussed in some quarters. Whether or not any of this comes to pass, there are ongoing societal processes that will no doubt have an impact on the political system and political parties; one can expect that any effects that are felt by the political parties will impact upon their constitutions.

In his study of the Canadian party system Cairns has noted that "there are indications that the extra-parliamentary apparatus of the parties is growing in importance,". Cairns, p.68.
and the United States for comparative insights and reasons that, the stimuli resulting from a powerful mass-membership left-wing party and by serious restrictions on campaign expenditures, as in Great Britain are absent in Canada, .... Compared to the United States, Canada also has a paucity of elections and elective offices, and party spoils have constituted a less attractive inducement to organizational work for the party. 68

If Cairns' reasoning is solid, then there is every possibility of a strengthening of the extra-parliamentary structure for parties, at least at the federal level. An elected Senate, if realized, would provide an increase in elections and elective offices, thus increasing party spoils and offering added inducements to organizational work for the parties. Also, there has been a steady increase in the regulations and supervision of campaign expenditures by Elections Canada plus a growth in the internal party rules on finances, as for leadership races. Should these trends continue, and they show no sign of abating, they could act as important stimuli on the development of political parties.

The various reforms for both the Canadian federal system and the electoral system that are being proposed by some, would affect the party system and also the constitutions of the parties. The judicial system also has the potential to influence the party system, as seen in the recent court challenge on constituency boundaries in Saskatchewan. 69 Wholesale or profound changes in the electoral and parliamentary systems, such as those reforms

68 Cairns, pp.68-69.

commented upon by Smiley and Watts in their volume for the "MacDonald Commission", would result in vastly different constitutions for political parties in Canada.\textsuperscript{70} No doubt the proposed party reforms contained in the report from the "Lortie Commission" would, if implemented, also impact on party structures and constitutions.\textsuperscript{71}

The constitutions are institutional arrangements consisting of sets of rules which order the relationships between the various actors found in political parties; in other words, it appears that these documents help to shape the processes of intraparty relations. The environment within which political parties operate places demands on the party; the constitutions are important indicators on how the political parties respond to these demands and these documents provide us with valuable insights into one aspect of the environment of parties.

This study has demonstrated that party constitutions can be used as a basis for comparison. The three stories or patterns revealed; (1) the distinctiveness of the New Democrat constitutions


from those of the other two main parties, (2) the distinctiveness of party constitutions in British Columbia, and (3) the distinctiveness of party constitutions in Quebec, are neither remarkable nor original. However, the method by which these three stories were uncovered had not been previously attempted; so, the fact that commonly held perceptions about political parties in Canada were reinforced through an examination and comparison of party constitutions seems both interesting and important.
BIBLIOGRAPHY OF PARTY CONSTITUTIONS (PRIMARY SOURCES)

PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES:

Constitution of the Progressive Conservative Association of Canada
As Amended August 26, 1989 in Ottawa.

Constitution of the Progressive Conservative Association of Newfoundland and Labrador (This Constitution is to take effect following the Annual General Meeting 1989).


Constitution of the Progressive Conservative Party of New Brunswick (Enacted at Moncton, New Brunswick, the 7th day of May, 1988 to be effective immediately).


Constitution of the Manitoba Progressive Conservative Association (Incorporating all Amendments to April 12, 1987).


Constitution of the Progressive Conservative Association of Alberta (Revised & Adopted March 31, 1984).

Constitution and Bylaws (P.C. Yukon Party).

LIBERALS:


Constitution of the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador as Amended March 5, 1988 - Holiday Inn, St. John's.

Constitution and By-Laws of the Nova Scotia Liberal Association (Approved - General Meeting, March 11, 1989).

Constitution of the Prince Edward Island Liberal Association "Inc". (As Amended to November 7, 1987).

N.B.L.A. Constitution (As Amended to May 14, 1988).

Constitution of the Ontario Liberal Party (as amended April 1, 1989).


Constitution of the Saskatchewan Liberal Association (As Amended – April 1989).


Constitution of the Yukon Liberal Association (No Date or Place).

NEW DEMOCRATIC:


Constitution of the Alberta New Democratic Party.

Constitution of the Yukon New Democratic Party (As Amended at the Annual Convention, June 1989 Whitehorse, Yukon).

OTHERS:


Les Statuts Du Parti Québécois (No Date or Place).


APPENDIX A
DATA FROM CHARTS 2.1 TO 2.6: MAJOR OVERVIEW

CHART 2.1: INTERNAL ORDER

a.] Are the party officers or directors presented?: Liberal (Y-8, N-4) Of the 12 Liberal constitutions, only 4 do not present the party officers, Que., Alta., Yukon, and federal. P.C. (Y-10) All 10 of the Tory documents present the party officers. N.D.P. (Y-12) All 12 of these jurisdictions present the officers or directors. Other (Y-1, N-2) Only the Social Credit constitution presents the party officers.

b.] Are the duties/roles of above clearly defined? (note: those jurisdictions which received a "N" notation above will receive a "X" here.): Liberal (Y-8, X-4) The same eight Liberal documents as above also detail the duties or roles of the party’s officers. P.C. (Y-9, N-1) The only Conservative constitution that does not clearly define these duties is the federal document. N.D.P. (Y-7, N-5) The N.D.P. constitutions in N.B., Ont., Sask., Alta., and federal do not clearly define the roles of the party officers. Other (N-1, X-2) The Social Credit document does not include a definition of the duties of the party’s officers.

c.] Is there an "Executive Committee" level (body with authority which is above officers but below "General Council")?: Liberal (Y-11, N-1) The only Liberal document that does not mention an "Executive Committee" is that of P.E.I. P.C. (Y-9, N-1) Only the Alta. Tories do not mention an "Executive Committee" level. N.D.P. (Y-12) All 12 of these documents deal with such an authority
structure. Other(Y-2,N-1) Only the Social Credit constitution does not mention a body such as an "Executive Committee", while both the Reform and P.Q. documents do.

d.] Are the duties/roles of above clearly defined? (note: those jurisdictions which received a "N" notation above will receive a "X" here.): Liberal(Y-8,N-3,X-1) Of the 11 Liberal constitutions that deal with an "Executive Committee" only 8 define the duties of this body, the 3 that do not make a mention of the duties are those of N.S., Sask., and Alta. P.C.(Y-6,N-3,X-1) The P.E.I., Ont., and federal documents, 3 of the above 9, do not define the duties of this body. N.D.P.(Y-4,N-8) The constitutions of Que., B.C., Yukon, and federal New Democrats do not clearly define the duties of such a body, while the remaining 8 documents do. Other(Y-2,X-1) As above in c.], the constitutions of both Reform and P.Q. deal with the duties of such a body.

e.] Is there a "General Council" level (body with penultimate authority, above both officers and "Executive Committee", but below convention’s authority)?: Liberal(Y-11,N-1) Yukon is the only Liberal document that does not mention such a body. P.C.(Y-9,N-1) The only Conservative constitution that makes no mention of a "General Council" is Ont. N.D.P.(Y-12) All 12 jurisdictions have such a body mentioned in their constitutions. Other(Y-1,N-2) Only the Social Credit constitution mentions such a structure.

f.] Are the duties/roles of above clearly defined? (note: those jurisdictions which received a "N" notation above will receive a "X" here.): Liberal(Y-4,N-7,X-1) Of the 11 Liberal
documents that refer to a body such as a "General Council" only 4, Nfld., Que., Ont., and B.C., detail the duties of this structure. P.C.(Y-3,N-6,X-1) Of the 9 Tory constitutions that mention such a body only 3, Nfld., Manit., and Yukon, detail the role of this structure. N.D.P.(Y-5,N-7) All 12 N.D.P. jurisdictions deal with such a body but only 5, Que., Ont., Alta., B.C., and Yukon, detail the duties of such a structure. Other(Y-1,X-2) The only constitution that deals with such a body, Social Credit, also details the duties of such.

g.] Are there more structures or levels of authority than the above three levels?: Liberal(Y-2,N-10) Que. and Manit. are the only Liberal jurisdictions whose constitutions present more than the three above levels of authority. P.C.(N-10) No Tory constitution makes any reference to more levels of authority than the above three. N.D.P.(N-12) There is no mention made in any of these constitutions in regards to other levels of authority. Other(Y-1, N-2) The constitution of the P.Q. does mention more than the above three levels of authority.

h.] Are the above authority structures and their duties presented without any apparent confusion?: Liberal(Y-5,N-7) The authority structures and their duties are not confusing in 5 Liberal jurisdictions, Nfld., Ont., Manit., B.C., and Yukon. P.C.(Y-6,N-4) There are 4 Conservative documents which are confusing on these matters, P.E.I., Ont., Alta., and federal, the other 6 are do not present any confusion. N.D.P.(Y-3,N-9) Of the 12 constitutions, only 3 are presented without any apparent confusion,
Que., B.C., and Yukon. Other (N-3) All 3, P.Q., Social Credit, and Reform, have some degree of confusion on these matters.

i.) Does the document include a reference to a person or group empowered to interpret the constitution?: Liberal (Y-3, R-9) Que., B.C., and Yukon are the 3 Liberal constitutions which empower either a person or group to interpret the constitution. P.C. (Y-3, R-7) Only 3 of these documents make a reference to giving someone the authority to interpret the constitution, N.S., N.B., and Ont. N.D.P. (Y-5, R-7) The N.D.P. constitutions for N.S., P.E.I., Que., Manit., and federal contain a reference to giving someone the power to interpret the constitution. Other (Y-1, R-2) The only document that contains such a reference is that of Social Credit.

CHART 2.1: OTHER PARTY STRUCTURES

a.) Is the party director/staff mentioned or dealt with?: Liberal (Y-3, R-9) Only 3 Liberal documents mention either staff or director, Nfld., N.B., and Que. P.C. (Y-8, R-2) Only 2 of these constitutions do not mention either the party director or the staff, Ont. and Yukon. N.D.P. (Y-11, R-1) Of the 12 N.D.P. jurisdictions, only 1, Ont., fails to mention either. Other (Y-2, R-1) Both P.Q. and Social Credit refer to either the director or staff, while the Reform document does not.

b.) Are party committees/commissions mentioned or dealt with?: Liberal (Y-10, R-2) Only 2 Liberal documents make no mention of such matters, Alta. and Yukon. P.C. (Y-4, R-6) There are 4 P.C. documents which refer to such bodies, P.E.I., Ont., Manit., and Alta. N.D.P. (Y-10-R-2) The Alta. and federal documents are the only 2 N.D.P.
constitutions that do not make any reference to such matters. Other (Y-2,R-1) The Social Credit constitution is the only 1 of the 3 that does not mention committees or commissions of the party.

c.] Does the constitution discuss a special electoral campaign body (either a committee or a distinct party organ)?: Liberal(Y-7, R-5) There are 7 Liberal jurisdictions where such a body is referred to, Nfld., P.E.I., Que., Ont., Sask., B.C., and federal. P.C.(Y-1,R-9) The only Conservative document with such a reference is Sask. N.D.P.(Y-3,R-9) Only the N.S., N.B., and Yukon documents refer to such a body. Other(Y-2,R-1) Both Reform and P.Q. refer to such a body.

d.] Does the constitution discuss a fund-raising body (either a committee or a distinct party organ)?: Liberal(Y-6,R-6) There are 6 Liberal constitution which discuss such a body, N.S., Que., Ont., Sask., B.C., and federal. P.C.(Y-3,R-7) The only Conservative documents which refer to a fund-raising body are Ont., Alta., and federal. N.D.P.(Y-1,R-11) Only 1 N.D.P. constitution, Sask., discusses such a body. Other(R-3) Not one of these 3 constitutions make any reference to such a body.

e.] Is the "signing authority" referred to in the constitution?: Liberal(Y-6,R-6) The Liberal constitutions in P.E.I., Manit., Sask., Alta., B.C., and Yukon refer to the "signing authority". P.C.(Y-2,R-8) The only Tory jurisdictions which refer to this are N.S. and P.E.I. N.D.P.(Y-5,R-7) There are 5 documents out of 12 that refer to "signing authority", P.E.I., Que., B.C., Yukon, and federal. Other(R-3) Not one of these constitutions deal
with this matter.

f.] Does the constitution refer to the "assets and/or liabilities" (of the party not the ridings)?: Liberals(Y-1,R-11) Only 1 Liberal document, that of Yukon, makes any reference to the subject. P.C.(R-10) There is no reference to the matter in any of these constitutions. N.D.P.(Y-5,R-7) The N.D.P. constitutions in Nfld., P.E.I., Sask., Alta., and B.C. mention "assets and/or liabilities". Other(Y-2,R-1) The constitutions of both Social Credit and Reform refer to the matter.

  g.] Is the appointment of an auditor mentioned in the constitution?: Liberal(Y-4,R-8) There are 4 Liberal jurisdictions which refer to the appointment of the auditor, P.E.I, Que., Manit., and B.C. P.C.(Y-3,R-7) There are 3 P.C. documents which refer to this point, Nfld., P.E.I., and Yukon. N.D.P.(Y-3,R-9) Only 3 out of 12 N.D.P. documents refer to the appointment of an auditor, Nfld., Manit., and Alta. Other(Y-1,R-2) Only the Social Credit document makes a mention of this matter.

CHART 2.2: MEMBERSHIP

  a.] Is there a membership article in the constitution?: All(Y-37) The constitutions of all 37 political parties contain an article on membership.

  b.] Are memberships for individuals dealt with in the constitution?: All(Y-37) The constitutions of all 37 political parties deal with memberships for individuals.

  c.] Are memberships for groups/affiliates dealt with in the constitution?: Liberal(R-12) No reference is made in any of the 12
Liberal jurisdictions on such a point. P.C. (R-10) No reference is made in any of the 10 P.C. documents on the subject. N.D.P. (Y-11, U*-1) The only N.D.P. constitution that is unclear in its reference to group memberships is that of Alta., the other 11 documents do deal with the membership of groups. Other (N*-1, R-2) Social Credit and P.Q. have no reference to the matter, while the Reform constitution is quite explicit in that this type of membership is prohibited.¹

d.] Are honorary or life memberships dealt with in the constitution?: Liberal (Y-4, R-8) A reference on this matter is contained in 4 Liberal constitutions, N.B., Sask., B.C., and Yukon. P.C. (Y-3, R-7) The P.C. constitutions in N.S., N.B., and Yukon mention such a possibility. N.D.P. (Y-5, R-7) P.E.I., Que., Manit., Alta., and B.C. are the 5 N.D.P. jurisdictions which mention life or honorary memberships. Other (Y-1, R-2) Only the Social Credit document contains a reference to the subject.

e.] Are the rights and duties of the members clearly outlined?: Liberal (Y-2, R-10) Manit. and B.C. are the 2 Liberal jurisdictions which clearly outline the rights and duties of the members. P.C. (Y-1, R-9) Only 1 P.C. document, P.E.I., clearly outlines the rights and duties of members. N.D.P. (Y-3, R-9) There are 3 N.D.P. documents which are clear on this matter, Que., Sask., and Alta. Other (Y-1, R-2) The P.Q. document is the only 1 of these 3 constitutions to clearly outline the rights and duties of members.

¹ Article 2, Section C states that, "Only natural persons may be members of the Party. No corporations, trade unions, society, or other organization shall be eligible for membership."
f.] Does the constitution contain an "exclusion" clause (no membership in other political parties is allowed)?: Liberal(Y-6,R-6) There are 6 Liberal constitutions which contain an "exclusion" clause, P.E.I., Ont., Manit., B.C., Yukon, and federal. P.C.(Y-1, R-9) The only P.C. constitution which has such a clause is that of the Yukon. N.D.P.(Y-12) All 12 of the N.D.P. constitutions contain a clause which prohibits belonging to other political parties. Other(Y-1,R-2) Of these 3 documents, only the Social Credit constitution has this clause.

g.] Is the age of admission specified in the constitution?: Liberal(Y-11,R-1) Ont. is the only Liberal jurisdiction which does not mention an age of admission, however the case of the N.B. Liberals is of an unusual nature.2 P.C.(Y-4,R-4,U*-2) The age of admission is referred to in 4 P.C. constitutions, P.E.I., Ont., Sask., and federal; 2 other documents are confusing on the issue, Manit. and Yukon, while the other 4, Nfld., N.S., N.B., and Alta., do not refer to the matter. N.D.P.(Y-4,R-8) The constitutions of the N.D.P. in Nfld., N.S., Que., and Alta. specify the age of admission.3 Other(Y-3) The constitutions of the P.Q., Social

2 A model constitution for constituencies, Article XV, is included within the constitution of the N.B. Liberals. This article decrees that the age of admission should be fifteen years; however this age limit could easily be changed by individual constituencies when they amend this model constitution, as they are permitted to do.

3 The federal N.D.P. document receives an "R*" notation because while it does refer to an age of admission, it allows each of the provincial constitutions to set the age limit for their jurisdiction; Article III, Section 1, Subsection 2.] states that "individual membership shall be dealt with in accordance with the constitution of the appropriate provincial party". Since only 4 of
Credit, and Reform all specify the age of admission.

h.] Is the age of admission fourteen(14) years or older? (note: Only positive notations will be dealt with from this point; also if there was no reference to the age of admission in g.], then the notation in the chart will automatically be "X".): Liberal(Y-8) The Liberals in Nfld., N.S., P.E.I., Manit., Sask., B.C., Yukon, and federal have fourteen as the age of admission. P.C.(Y-4) There are 4 P.C. jurisdictions which have this as the age of admission, P.E.I., Ont., Sask., and federal. N.D.P.(Y-3) The 3 N.D.P. jurisdictions of Nfld., N.S., and Alta. maintain an age of admission of fourteen years. Other(Y-0) The age of admission is other than fourteen years for these 3 parties.

i.] Is the age of admission sixteen(16) years or older?: Liberal(Y-2) There are 2 Liberal jurisdictions which have the age of admission as sixteen years, Que. and Alta. P.C.(Y-0) No P.C. document proclaims sixteen as the age of admission. N.D.P.(Y-1) Que. is the sole N.D.P. jurisdiction which has sixteen as the age of admission. Other(Y-2) Both the Social Credit and P.Q. constitutions call for the age of admission to be sixteen years.

j.] Is the age of admission eighteen(18) years or older?: Other (Y-1) The only constitution that specifies that the age of admission is eighteen is that of Reform.

k.] Does the constitution mention the possibility of the party resorting to the discipline/sanction of members?: Liberals(Y-3,R-9)

these documents contain a reference on the matter, the potential for some confusion or conflict seems to exist.
The constitution of the N.B., Que., and Ont. Liberals mentions such a possibility. P.C.(Y-2,R-8) There are 2 P.C. documents that refer to punishment for members, Sask. and Yukon. N.D.P.(Y-12) All 12 of the N.D.P. constitutions contain a reference to this matter. Other (Y-3) All 3, P.Q., Social Credit, and Reform, present the possibility of some sort of sanction against members.

1.] Does the member have the right to appeal such action?:
Liberal(Y-4,R-8) The 3 Liberal constitutions mentioned in k.] plus the federal document refer to members being able to appeal action taken against them. P.C.(Y-2,R-8) The constitutions of the Sask. and federal Conservatives mention such an appeal. N.D.P.(Y-11,R-1) Only the federal document fails to mention the possibility of such an appeal. Other(Y-3) All 3 constitutions mention such an appeal.

m.] Are membership dues or fees included in the constitution?:
Liberal(Y-9,R-3) There are 3 of the 12 Liberal jurisdictions that do not deal with membership fees or dues, N.B., Manit., and federal. P.C.(Y-6,R-4) Of the 10 P.C. documents, 6 refer to the dues or fees, while 4, Nfld., N.S., N.B., and Alta., contain no reference on the subject. N.D.P.(Y-12) All 12 of the N.D.P. constitutions refer to dues or fees. Other(Y-2,R-1) Both the Social Credit and the Reform constitutions mention the matter of membership fees, while the P.Q. document makes no reference.

n.] Is the amount of the dues or fees prescribed in the constitution? and; o.] Are the dues or fees set elsewhere than the constitution? (note: If the notation for m.] above was "R", then the chart notation for these two entries will be "X".): Liberal
Of the 9 Liberal documents that raised the matter of dues, not one specified what the dues might be; and these 9 jurisdictions mentioned that these fees were to be set elsewhere. P.C. The only P.C. jurisdiction which prescribed the membership fee owed was P.E.I.; the other 5, Ont., Mani., Sask., Yukon, and federal, which referred to the fees stated that they were to be set elsewhere. N.D.P. There are 3 N.D.P. constitutions which specify what the fees will be, P.E.I., Ont., and Yukon; the other 9 mention that these fees will be set elsewhere. Other The Social Credit constitution specifies the amount of the fees; while Reform states that the fees will be set elsewhere.

CHART 2.3: RIDINGS

a.] Does the constitution deal with ridings (constituency associations)?: ALL the only exception to this is the Yukon Liberals; their constitution targets only the federal arena and since there is only one riding to be concerned with it is only natural that their constitution does not have a section dealing with ridings.4

b.] Is there reference made to the composition of the riding executive in the constitution?: Liberal The constitutions of the Liberals in Nfld., Que., and B.C. refer to the composition of the riding executive. P.C. The only P.C. document that

4 As explained in Chapter ? (see fn. X), the Yukon Liberals are only concerned with federal politics; there being only one federal riding in this jurisdiction, it is arguable that their entire constitution is devoted to the concerns of constituencies.
mentions the composition of the riding executive is P.E.I. N.D.P. (Y-7,R-5) There are 7 N.D.P. jurisdictions which refer to the composition of the riding executive, N.S., Que., Ont., Sask., Alta., B.C., and Yukon. Other(Y-3) All 3, P.Q., Social Credit, and Reform, constitutions contain some reference on this matter.

c.] Does the constitution refer to any sort of regional groupings for the ridings?: Liberal(Y-7,R-5) The Liberals in N.S., N.B., Que., Ont., Manit., Alta., and federal refer to some sort of regional grouping for their ridings. P.C.(Y-4,R-6) Only 4 out of 10 Tory jurisdictions make a reference on this point, Manit., Sask., Alta., and federal. N.D.P.(Y-8,R-4) Of the 12 N.D.P. documents, 4 do not mention such a grouping of ridings, P.E.I, N.B., Alta., and Yukon; the other 8 do mention such a thing. Other(Y-2,R-1) Both P.Q. and Reform refer to this matter, while Social Credit does not mention such a possibility.

d.] Does the constitution refer to the subject of candidate selection (please refer to Appendix "A" for greater detail)?: Liberal(Y-9,R-3) The only 3 Liberal constitutions that do not refer to candidate selection are P.E.I., Sask., and Yukon; the other 9 do deal with this subject. P.C.(Y-5,R-5) Half of the P.C. documents refer to candidate selection, N.S., N.B., Manit., Alta., and Yukon, the other 5 do not. N.D.P.(Y-12) All 12 N.D.P. jurisdictions refer to candidate selection. Other(Y-3) The P.Q., Social Credit, and Reform constitutions contain a reference on candidate selection.

e.] Are federal ridings dealt with in detail (provincial parties only)?: Liberals(Y-7,N-4) There are 4 Liberal jurisdictions
which do not deal with federal ridings in their constitutions, P.E.I., Que., Ont., and Alta.\(^5\) P.C.\((Y-1,N-8)\) The only Tory document which deals with federal ridings at all is Alta.\(^6\) N.D.P.\((Y-10,N-1)\) Of the 11 N.D.P. constitutions that are concerned here, 10 do deal with federal ridings and the only one that does not is Manit.

f.] Is there reference made in the constitution regarding a model constituency constitution/bylaws? and; g.] Is a model constituency constitution or bylaws included in either the body of the party constitution or in an appendix? (note: Those jurisdictions which received a "R" notation for f.] have received a "X" in their chart notation here.): Liberal f.\((Y-1,R-11)\) and; g.\((Y-0)\) Only the N.B. Liberal constitution refers to such a matter; no Liberal document contains a model constituency constitution/bylaws. P.C. f.\((Y-2,R-8)\) and; g.\((Y-1)\) The only Tory documents that refer to a model constituency constitution or bylaws are those of Manit. and Yukon; only the Manit. constitution contains such a model. N.D.P. f.\((Y-6,R-6)\) and; g.\((Y-4)\) There are 6 N.D.P. constitutions, Que., Manit., Sask., Alta., B.C., and Yukon, which refer to such a matter; of these 6, the jurisdictions of Que., Sask., Alta., and B.C. do contain some sort of model constituency constitution or bylaws. Other f.\((R-3)\) and; g.\((X-3)\) Not one of these 3 constitutions have any reference to such a matter.

---

\(^5\) As explained in the above fn., the Yukon Liberals focus their attention only on the federal sphere.

\(^6\) See fn. \(?\) in Chapter \(\?) which gives some detail on the Alta. Tories and their present stance vis a vis federal ridings.
h.] Does the constitution refer to the recognition of party activity in municipal politics?: Liberal(Y-1,R-11) The only Liberal constitution that recognizes party activity at the municipal level is Ont. P.C.(R-10) There is not one Tory document that contains a reference to this subject. N.D.P.(Y-4,R-8) There are 4 N.D.P. constitutions which refer to party involvement in municipal politics, Ont., Manit., B.C., and Yukon. Other(R-3) None of these 3 documents refer to any such recognition.

i.] Is the subject of "redistribution" (electoral boundaries) mentioned in the constitution?: Liberal(Y-2,R-10) Only 2 Liberal jurisdictions refer to "redistribution", Ont. and B.C. P.C.(Y-1) Manit. is the sole P.C. document which mentions this subject. N.D.P.(R-12) No N.D.P. constitution mentions the matter. Other(Y-2,R-1) Both Reform and Social Credit mention the possibility of "redistribution", while P.Q. does not.

CHART 2.3: CONVENTIONS

a.] Is the party convention or meeting dealt with in the constitution?: All(Y-37) Every one of these party constitutions deal with the party meeting or convention.

b.] Is this convention/meeting held on an annual basis? and; c.] Is this convention/meeting held on a biennial basis? (note: some of the notations will be "Y*" for either one or both of these questions because the constitution may call for an annual meeting but may allow exceptions due to special circumstances such as an election.): Liberal b.][Y-8,Y*-1) and; c.][Y-3) Only 3 Liberal meetings, N.B., Que., and federal, are held biennially; the other
9 Liberal constitutions call for the convention or meeting to be held annually, however the Alta. document allows for exceptions to these rule. P.C. b.\(Y-4,Y^*-4\) and; c.\(Y-2\) The Tories in Nfld., N.S., P.E.I., and Yukon call for an annual meeting, the Tories in 4 other jurisdictions, N.B., Manit., Sask., and Alta., also have the same rule but they include a clause that allows the rule to be exempted in special cases; there are 2 P.C. documents which specify a biennial convention, Ont. and federal. N.D.P. b.\(Y-6,Y^*-1\) and; c.\(Y-5\) There are 5 N.D.P. constitutions, Nfld., N.B., Que., Ont., and federal, which call for biennial meetings; the other 7 specify annual meetings, but the N.D.P. in B.C. allow the rule to be waived in special circumstances. Other b.\(Y-1\) and; c.\(Y-2\) Social Credit has an annual meeting; both P.Q. and Reform call for biennial meetings.

d.} Are the delegates to the convention/meeting identified?:
Liberal\(Y-11,N^*-1\) The only Liberal jurisdiction which does not identify the delegates is Yukon, because their meeting is a non-delegated function in that all members are eligible to attend. P.C. \(Y-8,N-1,N^*-1\) Of the 10 P.C. jurisdictions, only N.S. and P.E.I. do not specify the delegates, and in the case of P.E.I. this is due to the fact that their meeting is open to all members.\(^7\) N.D.P. \(Y-12\) All 12 of N.D.P. documents identifies those who may be delegates to the convention or party meeting. Other \(Y-3\) All 3 of these party constitutions specify who can attend the party meeting

\(^7\) As explained in Chapter ?, the Conservatives in P.E.I. have an annual meeting which is non-delegated, meaning all members are entitled to attend, Article V, Section 1, Subsection b.\].
as a delegate.

e.] Does the constitution refer to a leadership convention (please refer to Appendix "B" for greater detail)?: Liberal(Y-11, N*-1) Of the 12 Liberal documents, the only one that does not refer to a leadership convention is Yukon.\(^8\) P.C.(Y-10) Every P.C. document refers to a leadership convention; however both P.E.I. and Ont. have non-delegated leadership conventions.\(^9\) N.D.P.(Y-6,R*-6) In 6 N.D.P. jurisdictions, Que., Sask., Alta., B.C., Yukon, and federal, there is a reference to a leadership convention. The other 6 N.D.P. documents combine the leadership convention with the party meeting. Other(Y-3) Each of these constitutions refers to a leadership convention; however, the leadership selection process for the P.Q. is of the "single member, single vote" system.\(^10\)

CHART 2.4: CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

a.] Does the constitution make any reference to the possibility of amending the document?: All(Y-37) Each of the 37 party constitutions makes some sort of reference to amending the document.

---

\(^8\) As explained in Chapter ? and above in fns. 4 & 5, the Yukon Liberals have no references to party leadership due to their focus on the federal political scene.

\(^9\) As explained in chapter ? and above in fn. 7, P.E.I. Tory meetings, including leadership conventions, are non-delegated. The Conservatives in Ont. have a variation on the same theme, they do not have a strict "one member, one vote" format, rather they have a system that is based on an universal vote and "apportioned" ballot, Article 23, Sections 1 to 6.

\(^10\) As with the Conservatives in P.E.I. and Ont., the P.Q. leadership selection process is not accomplished via a delegated convention, please see Chapter ? and fn. ? for further reference.
b.] Is there a distinct article on constitutional amendments, an article set aside from other constitutional clauses?: All(Y-35, N-1,N*-1) Only 2 constitutions do not contain a distinct article on constitutional amendments, Social Credit and Liberals in B.C.\(^{11}\)

c.] Can a simple majority (50% plus 1) amend the constitution?; d.] Is a two-thirds (2/3's) majority required to amend the constitution? and; e.] Is some other percentage of votes required in order to amend the constitution (for example seventy-five percent)?: Liberal c.](Y-2,Y*-1,U-1); d.](Y-8,Y*-1) and; e.](Y-0) The constitutions in 3 Liberal jurisdictions, Nfld., Sask., and Alta., can be amended by a simple majority (50% plus 1), however, in the case of Alta. there are exceptions.\(^{12}\) The document of the Liberals in B.C. is confusing on this subject. There are 9 Liberal constitutions which have the rule that a two-thirds(2/3's) majority vote is required in order to amend the constitution, as mentioned above, this measure is qualified in the case of Alta. P.C. c.](Y*-1,U-4); d.](Y-5,Y*-1) and; e.](Y-0) The only P.C.

\(^{11}\) There are several references to amending the constitution in various sections of the B.C. Liberal document; a part of "Bylaw 2" discusses the amending process, as does sections of "Standing Rule 2". However, due to the highly idiosyncratic nature of this constitution, it becomes a problematical exercise to categorize the contents of this document on measures relating to amending the constitution. For example, Article I, Section A, Subsection 4.] of "Standing Rule 2" states that, "All amendments to the Constitution require a two-thirds vote,". However, "Bylaw 12", Article 6, Section C allows these "Standing Rules to be repealed or amended by the party executive.

\(^{12}\) The Alta. Liberal constitution, Article XII, says that if a copy of the proposed amendment has been included in the notice calling the annual convention, then only a simple majority vote is necessary; however if the proposed amendment was not included in the notice, then a two-thirds vote is in order.
constitution which prescribes only a simple majority is Alta.¹³

There are 4 Conservative documents which are unclear on confusing on the issue of amending their constitutions, N.S., N.B., P.E.I., and Manit. The P.C. jurisdictions of Nfld., Ont., Sask., Yukon, and federal maintain that a two-thirds vote is necessary, as does the Tory document in Alta. in some circumstances. N.D.P. c.][Y-1]; d.][Y-11] and; e.][Y-0] The only N.D.P. constitution that can be amended by a simple majority is Que.; the other 11 call for a two-thirds majority vote in order to amend. Other c.][Y-1]; d.][Y-1] and; e.][Y-1] Only the P.Q. constitution has the rule that an amendment can be passed by a simple majority. Reform calls for a two-thirds majority. Social Credit is the only jurisdiction of the 37 that has neither a simple majority nor a two-thirds rule, they call for amendments to pass by a 75% majority.

f.] Does the constitution refer to a notice of proposed amendments being forwarded to members or constituency associations?: Liberal[Y-8,Y*-3,U-1] The Liberal document for the Yukon is unclear on this matter; of the remaining 11 that do require a notice, 3 have a stipulation that exceptional circumstances may allow the rule to be waived, Ont., Sask., and Alta. P.C.[Y-6,Y*-1,R-1,U-2] There are 7 P.C. jurisdictions which call for proposed amendments to be forwarded prior to the meeting, Nfld., N.S., P.E.I., N.B., Ont., Sask., and federal, of these 7 the federal document allows for exceptions. The constitution of the

¹³ On this point the Alta. P.C. constitution, Article 15, is identical to the rules listed above(fn. 12) for the Alta. Liberals.
Manit. Tories does not refer to the matter, while the issue is confusing for the P.C.'s in both Alta. and Yukon. N.D.P. (Y-1, R-10, U*-1) The only N.D.P. document that specifies such a rule is Alta., the constitution for the N.D.P. in P.E.I. is unclear on the subject, and the remaining 10 make no reference whatsoever on this point. Other (Y-3) Each of these 3 constitutions states that the proposed amendments must be forwarded prior to the meeting.

**CHART 2.4: SPECIAL ROLES FOR TARGET GROUPS**

a.] Does the constitution make any reference to the English/French "fact" (a clause that recognizes the legitimacy of both cultures and languages)?: Liberal (Y-2, R-10) The only 2 Liberal constitutions which make an explicit comment on this point are Manit. and federal. P.C. (Y-2, R-8) The Tory documents for the N.B. and federal jurisdictions are the only 2 P.C. constitutions that refer to the English/French "fact". N.D.P. (Y-1, R-11) The constitution of the federal party is the only N.D.P. document to make a mention of this matter. Other (R-3) Perhaps not surprisingly, not one of these 3 constitutions has a reference to such a point.

b.] Are both languages in the same document?: Liberal (Y-2, N-10) As above, the only 2 Liberal constitutions which have both languages in the same document are Manit. and federal. P.C. (Y-1, N-9) The only P.C. constitution which has both an English and French version is the federal document. N.D.P. (N-12) None of the 12 N.D.P. constitutions contain both languages. Other (N-3) Not one of these documents contains both languages.

c.] Does the constitution state that both the French and
English versions are equal?: Liberal(Y-1,N-11) The only Liberal constitution which makes such a stipulation is Que. P.C.(Y-1) The only P.C. document that states this is N.B. N.D.P.(Y-1) The only N.D.P. constitution with such a statement is the federal document. Other(N-3) Once again, none of these 3 constitutions has such a statement.

d.] Does the constitution refer to an ethnic/multicultural dimension?: Liberal(Y-4,R-8) The Liberal jurisdictions of Que., Manit., B.C., and federal have a reference to multiculturalism. P.C.(R-10) There is no reference to this matter in any of the 10 P.C. constitutions. N.D.P.(Y-2,R-10) The only N.D.P. documents to have a reference to multiculturalism are Ont. and Manit. Other(Y-1, R-2) Only the P.Q. constitution has a reference on the subject of multiculturalism.

e.] Is any reference made on a role in the party for Aboriginal peoples?: Liberal(Y-3,R-9) There are 3 Liberal constitutions which have such a reference, B.C., Yukon, and federal. P.C.(R-10) There is no reference to a role for Aboriginal peoples in any of the Tory documents. N.D.P.(Y-2,R-10) The N.D.P. constitutions in Manit. and Sask. contain a reference on a role for Aboriginal peoples. Other(R-3) There is no such reference in any of these documents.

f.] Is a "Youth Section" clearly discussed in the constitution?: Liberal(Y-6,N-6) The liberals split on this matter, 6 of their constitutions, Nfld., N.S., Que., Manit., B.C., and federal, clearly discuss a "Youth Section", while the other 6 do
not. **P.C.**(N-10) Not one of the 10 Tory constitutions clearly discusses the matter. **N.D.P.**(Y-12) Every one of the 12 N.D.P. jurisdictions discusses a "Youth Section". **Other**(Y-2,N-1) The constitutions of both the P.Q. and Social Credit discuss such a point, while the Reform document does not.

g.] Is a "Women's Section" clearly discussed in the constitution?: **Liberal**(Y-5,R-7) A "Women's Section" is clearly discussed in 5 Liberal jurisdictions, Nfld., N.S., Manit., B.C., and federal. **P.C.**(N-10) This point is not clearly discussed in any of the P.C. documents. **N.D.P.**(Y-3,N-9) The N.D.P. constitutions in Sask., Alta., and Yukon are the 3 that do clearly discuss a "Women's Section". **Other**(Y-2,N-1) A "Women's Section" is discussed in the constitutions of the P.Q. and Social Credit, but not Reform.

h.] Does the constitution either attempt to prescribe gender ratios or refer to plans which promote gender parity?: **Liberal**(Y-7,R-5) The Liberals in Nfld., N.S., Manit., Sask., B.C., Yukon, and federal either attempt to prescribe gender ratios or refer to plans which promote gender parity. **P.C.**(Y-3,R-7) There are 3 P.C. documents which contain a reference on this point, N.S., Ont., and federal. **N.D.P.**(Y-9,R-3) The only 3 N.D.P. jurisdictions which do not have a reference to the matter are N.B., Ont., and Manit. **Other**(R-3) Neither the P.Q., Social Credit, nor Reform documents refer to such a point.

i.] Is there any reference made in the constitution that words employed in the masculine gender shall include the feminine gender?: **Liberal**(Y-3,R-9) A reference such as this is made in 3
Liberal constitutions, N.B., Que., and B.C. P.C. (Y-1, R-9) The only P.C. jurisdiction with such a reference is P.E.I. N.D.P. (Y-1, R-11) There is only 1 N.D.P. constitution, Sask, which states that words employed in the masculine gender shall include the feminine gender. Other (R-3) Such a reference is not to be found in any of these 3 documents.

j.] Does the constitution clearly employ "non-sexist" language?: Liberal (Y-8, N-4) Of the 12 Liberal jurisdictions the only 4 that do not clearly employ "non-sexist" language are N.B., Que., Ont., and Sask. P.C. (Y-1, N-9) There is only 1 Tory document that clearly uses such language, N.B. N.D.P. (Y-12) Every one of the 12 N.D.P. constitutions employs "non-sexist" language. Other (Y-3) All 3, P.Q., Social credit, and Reform, clearly use "non-sexist" language.

CHART 2.5: THE "PARTY"

a.] Is the party constitutionally designated as a "Party"? (or) b.] Is the party constitutionally designated as an "Association"?: Liberal a.] (Y-7) and; b.] (Y-5) The Liberals in 7 jurisdictions, Nfld., Que., Ont., Manit., Alta., B.C., and federal, use the label "Party"; while the other 5, N.S., P.E.I. 14, N.B., Sask., and Yukon prefer the "Association" designation. P.C. a.] (Y-4) and; b.] (Y-6) There are 4 P.C. documents that call for the designation to be that of "Party", N.B., Ont., Sask., and Yukon;

---

14 The case of the name for the Liberals in P.E.I. is unusual; Article I deals with their name, which they designate as "The Prince Edward Island Liberal Association Inc."; no other jurisdiction has "Inc." as a part of their name.
the other 6, Nfld., N.S., P.E.I., Man., Alta., and federal, use the label "Association". N.D.P. a.](Y-12) and; b.](Y-0) All 12 N.D.P. jurisdictions designate themselves as a "Party". Other a.](Y-3) and; b.](Y-0) The constitutions of the P.Q., Social Credit, and Reform all call for the "Party" label.

c.) Is the "name" of the party or association specifically declared in the constitution?: Liberal(Y-10,N-2) There are 2 Liberal constitutions which do not specify the "name" of the party or association within the document, Ont. and federal. P.C.(Y-7,N-3) The Tory constitutions in Ont., Alta., and federal do not specifically declare their "name" within their constitutions. N.D.P.(Y-12) All 12 N.D.P. documents do specifically declare their "name" in the constitution. Other(Y-2,N-1) Social Credit and Reform do declare their "name" in their constitutions, while the P.Q. does not.

d.) Does the constitution clearly state the aims, purpose, and/or objectives of the party or association?: Liberal(Y-12) All 12 of the Liberal constitutions do this. P.C.(Y-9,N-1) The only P.C. document that does not make such a statement is N.B. N.D.P.(Y-10,N-2) There are 2 N.D.P. documents that do not contain such a statement, N.S. and N.B. Other(Y-1,N-2) Out of these 3 constitutions the only document to make such a declaration is Social Credit.

e.) Is there a reference in the constitution regarding the party’s or the association's area of jurisdiction or operation?: Liberal(Y-1,R-11) Only the Liberals in B.C. have such a reference
in their constitution. **P.C.** (Y-3, R-7) There are 3 P.C. constitutions which have such a reference, Manit., Sask., and Yukon. **N.D.P.** (Y-1, R-11) The only N.D.P. document that has this reference is Yukon. **Other** (Y-2, R-1) Both the P.Q. and Reform constitutions refer to this point, while the Social Credit document does not.

f.] Is the location of the party's or the association's headquarters or principal office mentioned in the constitution?:

**Liberal** (R-11, Y*-1) The only Liberal constitution to mention the location of an office or headquarters is Que., but they list two possible sites.\(^{15}\) **P.C.** (Y-6, R-4) Of the 10 Tory constitutions, 6 mention a principal office, N.S., P.E.I., N.B., Manit., Yukon and federal. **N.D.P.** (R-12) Neither the possibility nor the location of the party's headquarters is mentioned in any of the 12 N.D.P. constitutions. **Other** (Y-1, R-2) Mention is made of such a location in Reform's constitution, but not in either the P.Q. or Social Credit document.

g.] Does the constitution refer at all to the authority of the party or association over elected representatives?: **Liberal** (R-12) This matter is not raised in any of the 12 Liberal constitutions. **P.C.** (R-10) As with the Liberals, none of these documents refer to such a possibility. **N.D.P.** (Y-3, R-9) This issue is dealt with in 3 of the 12 N.D.P. jurisdictions, P.E.I., Sask., and Alta. **Other** (Y-1, R-2) The only constitution with such a measure of these 3 is the

\(^{15}\) Chapter 1 Article R-2, Section 1.] of the "General Regulations" of the Que. Liberals defines terms, and states that the, "Secretariat shall mean the central offices of the Quebec Liberal Party in Montreal and Quebec City."
h.] Is there any reference in the constitution on policy forums or inputs, this includes policy sessions or resolutions at conventions?: Liberal(Y-9,R-3) Only 3 Liberal constitutions do not contain a reference on this matter, Sask., Alta., and federal. P.C.(Y-4,R-6) Of the 10 P.C. jurisdictions, only 4 constitutions have such a reference on policy forums, P.E.I., Ont., Alta., and federal. N.D.P.(Y-5,R-7) The N.D.P. constitutions in N.S., Manit., Alta., B.C., and Yukon contain a reference to possible policy inputs. Other(Y-2,R-1) Both P.Q. and Reform refer to policy forums, while the Social Credit does not have such a reference.

i.] Does the constitution refer to the possibility of polls or referenda of members?: All(Y-1,N-36) The only constitution that refers to the possibility of polls or referenda of members is Reform.

CHART 2.5: THE STRUCTURE OF THE DOCUMENT

a.] What is the structure of the document? Is it only the constitution, without any accompanying appendices, model constituency constitutions, preambles, extra bylaws, etc.? Liberal(Y-8) The majority of the Liberal constitutions, 8, are of this first model, Nfld., N.S., P.E.I., Ont., Sask., Alta., Yukon, and federal. P.C.(Y-8) As with the Liberals, the majority of the P.C. documents, 8, are structured this way, Nfld., N.S., P.E.I., N.B., Ont., Sask., Alta., and federal. N.D.P.(Y-5) In contrast to the other two main parties, less than one half of the N.D.P. constitutions are structured in the above, straightforward manner;
the 5 that are so structured are Nfld., P.E.I., Ont., Manit., and Yukon. Other(Y-1) Only the P.Q. constitutions is thus structured.

b.] What is the structure of the document? Is it composed of a preamble and constitution?: Liberal(Y-2) There are 2 Liberal constitutions that are composed with a preamble to the constitution, N.B. and Manit. P.C.(Y-0) No Tory constitution is structured in this manner. N.D.P.(Y-0) Likewise, no N.D.P. constitution is of this particular model. Other(Y-1) Of these 3, the only constitution based on this model is Reform.

c.] What is the structure of the document? Is it composed of the constitution plus appendix(ices)?: Liberal(Y-0) Not one of the 12 Liberal documents resemble this model. P.C.(Y-1) There is one Tory document that is composed of the constitution plus an appendix(ces), Manit. N.D.P.(Y-5) A total of 5 N.D.P. documents have a structure of this type, N.S., N.B., Que., Sask., and federal. Other(Y-0) None of these 3 documents have a structure as described above.

d.] What is the structure of the document? Is it composed of a preamble, constitution, and appendix(ices)?: Liberal(Y-0) Neither of the remaining 2 Liberal constitutions, Que. and B.C., are constructed in the above manner. P.C.(Y-0) The final P.C. constitution to be categorized, Yukon, is not based on this format. N.D.P.(Y-2) The remaining 2 N.D.P. documents, Sask. and Alta., are structured in this manner. Other(Y-0) The single constitution as yet uncategorized, Social Credit, is not based on the above model.

e.] What is the structure of the document? Is it composed of
some other structure than those three listed above?: Liberal(Y-2)
So far, 10 of the Liberal constitutions have already been put in
other categories, but the 2 remaining documents, Que. and B.C., are
composed on some other basis. P.C.(Y-1) The document of the Yukon
Conservatives is not based on any of the above three formats.
N.D.P.(Y-0) The constitutions for all 12 N.D.P. jurisdictions have
been picked as somewhere among the above three models. Other(Y-1)
The constitution of Social Credit is unlike any of the above three
structures.

f.] Is the structure or format largely "conventional"? (or)
g.] Is the structure or format largely "unconventional"?: All(Y-33,
N-4) The 4 constitutions which had positive notations for the above
question e.] received a positive notation here for question g.] Of
the 37 party constitutions under consideration, only 4 were judged
to be "unconventional", the Liberal jurisdictions of Que. and B.C.,
the P.C. document for Yukon, and the Social Credit constitution in
B.C.

CHART 2.6: THE "DOCUMENT":GENERAL

a.] Is a preamble included, separate from the body of the
constitution?: Liberal(Y-4,N-8) A preamble was included in 4 of the
Liberal constitutions, N.B., Manit., B.C., and federal. P.C.(N-10)
A preamble is not included in any of the 10 Conservative documents.
B.C., and federal all have preambles, the other 7 do not. Other(Y-1
N-2) Of these 3, only Reform has a preamble.

b.] Does the constitution include a definition of terms?:

There are 3 Liberal jurisdictions, Que., Ont., and B.C., where the constitutions contain a definition of terms. Of the 10 Tory jurisdictions, 6 of the constitutions include some sort of definition of terms, Nfld., N.B., Ont., Manit., Yukon, and federal. The N.D.P. documents in Nfld., Que., Sask., and federal include a section which defines some terms used in the constitution. Of these 3 documents, only Social Credit includes a definition of terms, neither the constitutions for Reform nor P.Q. have such a section.

Are appendices included in the constitutional document?:
There are 2 Liberal documents which include appendices, Que. and B.C. As with the Liberals, there are 2 P.C. constitutions which include appendices, Manit. and Yukon. A majority of the N.D.P. jurisdictions, 8, have constitutions which include appendices, N.S., N.B., Que., Ont., Sask., Alta., B.C., and federal. Not one of these 3 constitutions include appendices.

Is there a table of contents or an index contained in the constitution?: Half of the Liberal constitutions have a table of contents, Que., Manit., Sask., Alta., B.C., and federal. Only 1 P.C. document, Manit., includes a table of contents. The constitutions for the N.D.P. in Que., and B.C. include a table of contents. Of these 3 jurisdictions, only Social Credit has a table of contents included in the document.

Are general appeal procedures mentioned or outlined in the
constitution?: Liberal(Y-2,R-10) Such procedures are referred to in 2 Liberal constitutions, Manit. and B.C. P.C. (Y-5, R-5) One half of the Tory documents do have such a reference, N.S., N.B., Ont., Manit., and federal; the other 5 do not. N.D.P. (Y-6,R-6) As with the Conservatives, half of the N.D.P. constitutions refer to general appeal procedures, N.S., P.E.I., Sask., Alta., B.C., and Yukon. Other (R-3) General appeal procedures were not referred to in any of these 3 constitutions.

f.] Does the constitution state that the constitution of the federal party is supreme?: Liberal(Y-3,U-1,N-8) The supremacy of the constitution of the federal party is acknowledged in a limited way in 3 Liberal jurisdictions, N.B., Manit., and federal. The constitution of the B.C. Liberals is confusing on this issue. The other 8 documents contain no statement as to this effect. P.C. (Y-1, N-8) Interestingly, the only Conservative constitution to state as such is the federal document. N.D.P. (Y-7,N-5) An acknowledgement of the primacy of the charter of the federal party is found in 7 N.D.P. jurisdictions, N.S., P.E.I., Manit., Sask., Alta., B.C., and federal. Other (X-3) Of course this question is not applicable for these 3 parties.

g.] Is there any reference in the constitution to the "Rules of Order"? (note: If the notation here is "R", then a "X" will automatically be received for the chart notation on questions h.] to j.); h.] If the "Rules of Order" are referred to, are they "Robert"s"?; i.] If the "Rules of Order" are referred to, are they "Bourinot’s"? and; j.] If the "Rules of Order" are referred to, are
they other than the above two?: Liberal g.][Y-9, R-3); h.][Y-4); i.][Y-3) and; j.][Y-2) There are 9 Liberal constitutions that refer to the "Rules of Order" and 3, Nfld., Yukon, and federal, which do not. Of the 9 Liberal documents that have such a reference, 4 specify that they obey "Robert's Rules of Order", P.E.I., Ont., Manit., and Sask.; 3 specify that "Bourinot's" are the "Rules of Order", N.S., Alta., and B.C.; the other 2, N.B. and Que, have "Rules of Order" other than the above two. P.C. g.][Y-7, R-3); h.][Y-4); i.][Y-0) and; j.][Y-3) There are 3 Conservative jurisdictions where the constitutions do not refer to the "Rules of Order", Nfld., Manit., and federal; the other 7 do contain a reference to this matter. Of the 7 P.C. documents that do refer to this, 4 state that they follow "Robert's", Nfld., Ont., Sask., and Yukon; no P.C. jurisdiction calls for "Bourinot's"; but 3 Tory documents, P.E.I., N.B., and Alta., state that they follow "Rules of Order" other than the two listed above. N.D.P. g.][Y-8, R-4); h.][Y-3, Y*-1); i.][Y*-2) and; j.][Y-5) Of the 12 N.D.P. documents, only 4 fail to refer to the matter of the "Rules of Order", Nfld., P.E.I., N.B., and Ont. There are 4 N.D.P. jurisdictions which call for the following of "Robert's Rules of Order", Manit., B.C., Yukon, and federal, however Yukon does allow other rules to be followed at some times.\[16 The constitutions for the N.D.P. in Sask. and Alta. state that "Bourinot's" rules are to be adhered to, but

---

\[16 The constitution for the Yukon N.D.P., under Article 16, lays out, in fairly extensive detail, the "Rules of Order" for their convention, but this document also states that matters not covered by these regulations will follow the procedures outlined under "Robert's Rules of Order".
these 2 documents also allow for other rules to be followed when necessary. So of course, the 3 jurisdictions which received a "*" for the above two questions, Yukon, Sask., and Alta., also allow for other "Rules of Order" to be followed. Other g.](Y-1,R-2); h.](Y-1); i.](Y-0) and; j.](Y-0) There is only 1 constitution out of these 3 that has a reference on the "Rules of Order"; the Social Credit document states that "Robert's" are the rules to be followed.

k.} In this last amended version of the constitution, is the date(day and month) specified?; l.} In this last amended version of the constitution, is only the year(not day and month) specified? and; m.} In this last amended version of the constitution, is the place where the constitution was amended specified?: Liberal k.](Y-11,N-1); l.](Y-0) and; m.](Y-3,N-9) In this, the last amended version of the constitution, the day and month was included in 11 of the Liberal documents, the only 1 that do not include this was Yukon and it did not even specify which year the document was last amended. The site of the last amended version is stated in 3 of these constitutions, Nfld., Alta., and federal. P.C. k.](Y-8,N-2); l.](Y-2) and; m.](Y-1) The day and month that the constitution was last amended is given in 8 Conservative documents; the other 2 jurisdictions, Nfld. and N.S., only state the year. The location where this amending process took place is identified in only the federal P.C. document. N.D.P. k.](Y-7,N-5); l.](Y-3); and; m.](Y-3,N-9) The 5 N.D.P. jurisdictions where the constitution does not give the day and month of the last amending are Nfld., N.S., Ont.,
Sask., and Alta., but out of these 5, 3 do give the year, Nfld., Ont., and Sask., while the other 2 give no date whatsoever. The location of the amending process is given in 3 of these constitutions, N.B., Yukon, and federal. Other k.](Y-2,N-1); 1.](Y-0) and m.](Y-1,N-2) The constitutions for both Social Credit and Reform mention the day and the month that this version of their document was amended on; the P.Q. constitution gives neither the date nor the year. Only one of these constitutions, Reform, gives the place where the amendments were adopted.

**CHART 2.6: THE "DOCUMENT": LENGTH**

a.] The number of articles in the constitution. and; b.] An estimation of the number of words(in thousands). Note: a "*" indicates that appendices are included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a.</th>
<th>b.</th>
<th></th>
<th>a.</th>
<th>b.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nfld</td>
<td>Lib 16</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>PC 18</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>NDP 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lib 24</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>PC 18</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>NDP 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lib 19</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>PC 27</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>NDP 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Lib 19</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>PC 20</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>NDP 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEI</td>
<td>Lib 195*</td>
<td>10.5*</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Lib 16</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Lib 19</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Lib 18</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que</td>
<td>Lib 195*</td>
<td>10.5*</td>
<td>NDP 18</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC 13</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>Fed</td>
<td>Lib 19</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDP 27</td>
<td>4.1*</td>
<td>PC 18</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>NDP 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a "*" indicates that appendices are included.
APPENDIX B

DATA FROM CHARTS 3.1 AND 3.2: CANDIDATE SELECTION

CHART 3.1: CALLING A MEETING

a.] Does the constitution refer to the notice for the candidate selection meeting?: Liberal(Y-8,R-3) As noted above, the constitution of the federal Liberals delegates the responsibility for candidate selection to the provincial parties, so there are 11 Liberal jurisdictions. Of the 11, 8 had a clause that dealt with the notice for the meeting, while N.S., P.E.I., and Manit. had no reference. P.C.(Y-3,R-3,U-1) For this article the situation is almost the reverse of the Liberals; 6 of the 10 had no reference, while Nfld., P.E.I., and Manit. contained some sort of reference, and the Yukon constitution was confusing on this issue.1 N.D.P.(Y-8,R-3) As with the Liberals, the federal N.D.P. constitution passes responsibility on to the provincial parties, so there are 11 jurisdictions involved. Of the 11, 8 did make some mention of notice being required, while the constitutions of the Nfld., P.E.I., and Yukon parties made no mention. Other(Y-3) All three, Reform, P.Q., and Social Credit, did contain a reference to notice.

b.] Is the timing of the meeting mentioned?: Liberal(Y-1,R-10) Only the B.C. Liberals had a rule about timing, which refers to the timing necessary for both the notice and the meeting. P.C.(R-10)

1 Article VIII, Section 4, Subsection b.] refers to the "Reading of the notice of the meeting;", however no further reference to the notice is included in the constitution itself but attached to the P.C. Yukon constitution is "Schedule A: Constitution and Bylaws for Constituency Associations" and further information on constituency is contained therein.
There was no mention in any of these constitutions about timing.

N.D.P. (Y-5, R-6) The constitutions of 5 jurisdictions, N.S., Quebec, Ontario, Alta., and B.C., discussed timing; the remaining 6 did not. Other (Y-1, R-2) Only the Social Credit constitution made any reference to timing.

c. Is the Executive of the constituency responsible for the calling of the meeting?: Liberal (Y-3, R-6, N-1, U-1) Only 3 constitutions give the local executive responsibility to call the candidate nomination meeting, N.B., Ontario, and B.C. Nfld's constitution is confusing on this issue; while Quebec's is specific that such power rests not with the local executive but the Leader of the party. The remaining Liberal constitutions make no reference to this point. P.C. (Y-3, R-6, U-1) As with the Liberals, 3 constitutions make a special point of having the local executive responsible for the calling of the meeting, Nfld., P.E.I., and Manit. The constitution of the Yukon party is confusing on this subject. The remaining 6 do not make a reference to this point.

---

2 In Chapter 7 of the "General Regulations of Quebec Liberal Party" (Feb., 1988), Section 3: Article R-109: "Occurence"(sic) states that "Only the Leader may call for the holding of a nomination meeting"; further, Section 3, Article R-111: "Date and Location" gives the power to set the date and location of the nominating meeting to the Organizing Committee which is an adjunct of 3 individuals who report to the Executive Committee of the Party, "G. R.", Ch. 7, Sec. 3, Arts. R-106-108.

3 "Schedule A", mentioned above, does not explicitly say that the local executive calls the nomination meeting; however even with the lack of direct reference, it seems possible to infer that the local executive is granted this power because under Article VI, Section 3, one of the duties of the executive is to "call such meetings of the constituency as may be necessary under this constitution...".
N.D.P. (Y-10, R-1) The only New Democrat jurisdiction that did not specifically give the local executive the responsibility for the calling of the nomination meeting was N.B., the other 10 documents were specific that this power rested with the local executive. Other (Y-2, N-1) Both Reform and Social Credit allow the local executive to call the nomination meeting, however the P.Q. constitution has the same position as the Quebec Liberals in that the responsibility for calling the local nomination meeting is specified as beyond the preview of the local executive, this responsibility rests with the leadership of the party. 4

**CHART 3.1: PROCEDURES FOR MEETING**

a.] Is there mention made that attendance is necessary in order to vote?: Liberal (Y-4, R-70) Only 4, Nfld., Quebec, Ontario, and B.C., specifically say that attendance is necessary. The other 7 have no reference to this matter. P.C. (Y-3, R-6) Only 3, Nfld., Manit., and Yukon, mention that attendance is necessary. The P.E.I. constitution makes the specific note that it is not necessary. The remaining 6 make no reference. N.D.P. (Y-4, R-6, N-1) Only 3, N.S., Alta., and Yukon, state that attendance is necessary; the B.C. constitution also says that it is necessary, but then allows special circumstances where the rule may be waived. The Nfld. N.D.P. constitution has the same rule as the P.E.I. Tory constitution, noted above, specifying that attendance is not

4 As detailed above under the heading "P. Q. - Quebec", in the opening paragraph of Chapter IX, Section 9, the National executive Council, not the local executive, explicitly retains the power to call the nomination "congress".
necessary. The remaining 6 make no reference. Other(Y-1,R-2) Neither the P.Q. nor the Reform constitution make a mention that attendance is necessary, but the Social Credit document stipulates that it is necessary.

b.) Are the voting rules for the candidate selection meeting referred to in the constitution?: Liberal(Y-5,R-6) No reference to the voting regulations at the meeting is made in 6 of the constitutions. There is a reference to the voting rules in the other 5, Nfld., N.S., Quebec, Ontario, and B.C. Liberals. P.C.(Y-5,R-5) There is a split here in that 5 of the constitutions discuss voting rules and 5 do not, Nfld., P.E.I., Manit., Sask., and Yukon. N.D.P.(Y-4,R-7) There are 7 of these documents that have no mention of voting rules, while the N.S., Quebec, Alta., and B.C. constitutions do have such a reference. Other(Y-1,R-2) Again, the P.Q. and Reform constitutions have no reference while the Social Credit does.

c.) Does the constitution state that membership in the party is necessary in order to participate in the selection process?: Liberal(Y-8,R-3) There are 8 Liberal constitutions that specifically mention that to vote at the nomination meeting an individual must be a party member; and there are 3 constitutions that make no reference to this, P.E.I., Manit., and Alta. P.C.(Y-5,R-5) A split occurs once more with 5 documents making a mention that party membership is a prerequisite in order to vote and 5, N.S., N.B., Ontario, Sask., and Alta., make no such a mention. N.D.P.(Y-1,R-10) Only the Nfld. constitution has this point
specifically made. Other(Y-3) All 3 make party membership a necessity.

d.] Is there any reference made concerning a residency criterion for participation?: Liberal(Y-7,R-4) P.E.I., Manit., Alta., and Yukon have no provision that relates to residency. The other 7 documents do have the provision that in order to be a member of a particular constituency association, the individual must normally be a resident in the electoral district that the association serves. However both N.B. and Quebec have modified the rule, in that they provide for exceptions.\(^5\) P.C.(Y-5,R-5) Once again 5 of these constitutions have a rule that stipulates that residency is a requirement and 5 make no such stipulation, N.S., N.B., Ontario, Sask., and Alta. N.D.P.(Y-10,R-1) Only the Nfld. constitution does not have a residency requirement; however, in N.B. the residency requirement, under Article IX, Section 4, can be set aside. Other(Y-3) Both the Reform and the P.Q. constitutions have such a rule, as does the Social Credit, however By-Law 2, Section a. of the Social Credit constitution allows this requirement to be waived.

e.] Is there any reference made concerning a length of membership criterion for participation?: Liberal(Y-6,R-5) There is a stipulation on the length of time that an individual must be a party member before being eligible to vote in 6 of the Liberal constitutions. There is no mention on this matter in the other 5,

\(^5\) New Brunswick - Article XV, Part II, Section A, Part 1.; and Quebec - Chapter 4, Section 1, Article [12].
Nfld., P.E.I., Manit., Sask., and Alta. **P.C.**(Y-3,R-7) Only the P.E.I., Manit., and Yukon constitutions have a provision that deals with members and the length of time necessary as members in order to vote; the other 7 have no clause on length of membership. **N.D.P.**(Y-9,R-2) Such a rule is found in 9 of these constitutions, only the Nfld. and P.E.I. parties have no such rule. Other(Y-2,U-1) The P.Q. and Reform constitutions do have length of membership as a requirement, while the Social Credit document is confusing on this point.\(^6\)

f.] Does the constitution state that a secret ballot is to be held for the vote on the selection of the candidate?: **Liberal**(Y-3, R-7,U-1) Having a secret ballot for the nomination meeting is called for in three Liberal jurisdictions, Nfld., Ontario, and B.C.; of the remaining 8, 7 make no comment on this subject, while the document of the Quebec Liberals is unclear in this regard.\(^7\) **P.C.**(Y-3,R-6,U-1) Of the 10 documents in question, 6 have no provision that specifically call for a secret ballot; Nfld.,

---

\(^6\) By-Law 1, Section f. has the rule that in the case of a new member, the "good standing" status is available only after the Party headquarters has been in receipt of the application for membership for 30 days; however if a former member has allowed his/her membership to lapse, they have up to 1 year to renew and are instantly granted the full rights of membership.

\(^7\) There is no direct reference to having the voting done secretly in either the constitution or in the more detailed "General Regulations"; still, a reading of the articles on candidate selection does lead one to believe that a secret ballot is inferred, yet according to "Gen. Reg.", Ch. 7, Sec. 3, Art. R-113, it is the returning officer who "shall be responsible for voting procedures."; and that "The organizing committee shall appoint the returning officer." This committee is a three member body appointed by the Executive Committee of the Party.
Manit., and Yukon do have such a provision, and the Sask. P.C. constitution is confusing. N.D.P. (Y-2,R-9) Alta. and B.C. are the only N.D.P. constitutions that have a rule requiring secret balloting; the matter of a secret ballot is not mentioned in the remaining 9. Other (Y-1,R-2) Neither the P.Q. nor the Social Credit have a stipulation that requires the balloting to be secret; the Reform constitution, on the other hand, does require that the vote be secret.

**CHART 3.1: COMPULSORY SEARCH COMMITTEE**

a.) Does the constitution state that a search committee is a necessary part of the candidate selection process?: Liberal (R-11) Not one of these documents has a provision for a candidate search committee. P.C. (R-9,U-1) Only the Yukon document has a reference to this, but while the possible use of such a committee is mentioned, its role and powers are unclear. N.D.P. (R-11) As with the Liberals, none of the N.D.P. constitutions mention having a search committee. Other (Y-1,R-2) Only the Reform Party has a specific provision that deals with a search committee for candidates.

---

8 Article 13 of this document states, in part, that "The conduct of such Nominating Meeting ... shall follow the order of procedure as listed under Article 15." Section g. of Article 15 calls for a returning officer, scrutineers, and ballot boxes, but a secret ballot is not directly prescribed.

9 Article VIII, Section 5, of "Schedule A", deals with a "nominating committee"; this committee does not automatically exist, but "may be established" by the local executive.

10 The process which this constitution calls "candidate recruitment, nomination, and development" has four articles, the result of which is to allow the party's hierarchy, the Executive Council, to exercise near complete control over the nomination process. A search committee is not specifically called for but
CHART 3.1: FINANCIAL RULES/LIMITS

a.] Is there any reference to rules or limits concerning the candidate selection process?: Liberal(Y-2,R-9) Only the Quebec and the Ontario Liberals have a notation on the existence of rules or guidelines to deal with financial limitations for candidate nomination. P.C.(R-10) There is no reference to such rules in any of these constitutions. N.D.P.(R-11) Likewise, there is no such reference in any of these constitutions. Other(Y-1,R-2) Only the P.Q. constitution contains a reference to financial rules.

CHART 3.2: APPEALS

a.] Does the constitution mention the possibility of appeals on the matter of the selection of the candidate?: Liberal(Y-4,R-8) Please note that for this category and its three subsections that the constitution of the federal Liberals is included. Of the 12 jurisdictions, 8 contained no specific appeal provisions to deal with disputes over candidate nominations, while the remaining 4, N.B., Quebec, Ontario, and B.C., provide for such an appeal. P.C.(Y-5,R-5) 5 of these documents fail to mention the possibility of appeal for candidate nomination disputes, and 5 of these do have such a provision, N.S., N.B., Ontario, Yukon, and federal. N.D.P.(Y-9,R-3) As with the Liberals, please note that for the purposes of this category and its subsections that the constitution of the federal N.D.P. is included. There are 12 documents and 9 of these constitutions do allow such appeals, while 3, N.B., Manit.,

Section 4, Article a. directs "Each duly constituted Constituency Association shall conduct a thorough search to find the best possible candidate to represent the people of that constituency."
and federal, do not have such a provision. **Other** (R-3) None of these 3 parties makes any mention on such an appeal.

b.] Does the constitution detail the procedure such appeals must follow?: **Liberal** (Y-1, R-10) The only constitution that gives a detailed procedure to follow for an appeal on the matter of candidate selection is the B.C. Liberals. **P.C.** (Y-3, R-7) Only 3 of these documents, Ontario, Yukon, and federal, details the procedure to follow for an appeal on a dispute about candidate selection. **N.D.P.** (Y-6, R-6) The 12 jurisdictions are evenly split on this matter, 6 do contain detailed provisions while the other 6, N.B. Quebec, Ontario, Manit., Sask., and federal, do not. **Other** (R-3) Since such appeals are not mentioned in any of these 3 constitutions neither are detailed procedures.

c.] Does the constitution mention the possibility of intervention from outside the constituency, ie. party leadership, in the candidate selection process?: **Liberal** (Y-7, R-5) 7 of the 12 constitutions do have such a provision; while 5, P.E.I., Manit., Alta., Yukon, and federal, make no reference to the possibility of intervention by the party in the candidate selection process. **P.C.** (Y-5, R-5) 5 constitutions contain such a provision and 5, Nfld., P.E.I., Manit., Sask., and Alta., do not. **N.D.P.** (Y-10, R-2) Of the 12 constitutions, 10 contain a reference to such a possibility, while N.B. and Manit. do not. **Other** (Y-2, R-1) Both the P.Q. and the Reform constitutions contain such a provision while the Social Credit document makes no such reference.

**CHART 3.2: APPROVAL BY OTHERS**
a.] Does the constitution mention that the approval of others, ie. the party leadership, is a necessary step in the candidate selection process? Liberal\( (Y-1,R-9,U-1) \) Only the B.C. Liberals have a provision that calls for the choice of the candidate to be approved by the party; the remainder have no such stipulation, however the Quebec Liberal constitution is somewhat confusing on this point.\(^{11}\) P.C.\( (R-10) \) No such provision exists in any P.C. constitution. N.D.P.\( (Y-7,R-4) \) In contrast to the other two main parties, 7 of the N.D.P. constitutions have an explicit provision that approval for the local candidate must be given by the party hierarchy, there are 4 constitutions, Nfld., N.B., Sask., and Yukon, that have no reference to this matter. Other\( (Y-2,R-1) \) Both Reform and P.Q. make such approval necessary, while the Social Credit constitution has no reference to this point.

CHART 3.2: MEMBERSHIP CRITERIA FOR NOMINEE

a.] Is it specified in the constitution that the nominee must be a party member?: Liberal\( (Y-3,R-7) \) Quebec, Ontario, B.C., and Yukon all have the rule that a nominee must be a party member; the other 7 have no reference to such a rule. P.C.\( (Y-2,R-8) \) Only Manit. and Yukon have this rule clearly stated; the other 8 have no specific regulation which stipulates that a nominee must be a party member.

\(^{11}\) Both the party Leader and the Executive Committee of the Party wield considerable power over all the activities of the party, as illustrated previously in category 2., part f.], "Secret Ballot". Under General Regulation, Chapter 7, Section 4, Article R-122, titled "Disallowance", "The Leader may at any time, after having consulted the association executive committee, disallow a candidacy for cause." The term "cause" is neither defined nor explained.
member. N.D.P. (Y-10,R-1) Once more, the N.D.P. stands in contrast to the other two main parties on this point. Of the 11 jurisdictions considered for this provision, only the Sask. N.D.P. does not specifically mention that a nominee must be a member of the party. Other (Y-1,R-2) Neither the Reform nor the P.Q. have this rule stated in their constitutions; the Social Credit constitution clearly calls for membership.

b.] Is there any reference that the nominee must have been a party member for a prescribed length of time?: Liberal (Y-2,R-9) Only the Ontario and B.C. constitutions have a rule that discusses or stipulates that a nominee for the candidature has to be a party member for a prescribed length of time. P.C. (R-10) Not one of the P.C. constitutions makes any mention of this as a criterion for potential candidates. N.D.P. (Y-2,R-9) Alta. has such a provision, as does B.C., however the B.C. constitution has a provision for overcoming this rule. Other (R-3) None of these three parties has such a rule.

c.] Does the constitution mention that the nominee must satisfy a residency requirement?: Liberal (Y-1,R-10) Only 1, B.C., has a rule that specifically calls for a residency requirement for nominees. P.C. (Y-2,R-8) Manit. and Yukon are the only P.C. constitutions that have such a rule, the rest make no reference. N.D.P. (Y-1,R-8,N-2) Alta. is the only N.D.P. constitution that has this requirement; 2 documents, Manit. and Yukon, are specific in

12 The constitution of the N. D. P. in B. C. has a sixty [60] day criterion for prospective candidates, but Article IX. Section 05 also allows the provincial executive to waive this criterion.
that it is not required, and the rest of these constitutions make no reference to this point. **Other**(Y-1,R-2) The P.Q. and Reform have no reference to such a requirement, but the Social Credit constitution does, although it allows for exceptions.\(^ {13} \)

**d.** Is there any other criteria that a nominee must fulfill in order to stand as the candidate?: **Liberal**(Y-3,R-8) There are 3 constitutions, Quebec, Ontario, and B.C., which have further requirements that a nominee must meet; the remaining constitutions have no reference to additional requirements. **P.C.**(Y-2,R-8) The Manit. and Yukon documents have further requirements that nominees must meet, the rest make no reference to other requirements. **N.D.P.**(Y-1,R-10) Only Alta. lists additional requirements that a nominee must meet. **Other**(R-3) There are no further criteria referred to in any of these 3 constitutions.

**CHART 3.2: VOTES NEEDED**

**a.** In the candidate selection process, does the constitution specify that the successful nominee only capture a plurality of the votes cast? (or) **b.** In the candidate selection process, does the constitution specify that the successful nominee needs a majority of the votes cast?: **Liberal** a.](Y-1,R-7); b.](Y-3,R-7) Only 1 constitution, Nfld., stipulates that a plurality is necessary. 7 of these constitutions, N.S., P.E.I., N.B., Manit., Sask., Alta., and

\(^ {13} \) Bylaw 2, Section a. begins by requiring residency for members and/or potential candidates, but then the same bylaw allows non-residents with the proviso that they must declare beforehand to the nomination meeting their status as a non-resident of the constituency and furthermore this person is forbidden from activity in other Social Credit constituency associations.
Yukon make no reference to whether a plurality or a majority is required. The remaining 3 Liberal jurisdictions specify that a majority vote is necessary. P.C. a.](Y-1,R-5); b.](Y-5,R-5) Only in Nfld., under special circumstances, can a candidate be selected by having only a plurality of the votes cast. There are 5 P.C. constitutions, N.S., N.B., Ontario, Alta., and federal, which have no reference to whether a plurality or majority vote is required; and 5 of these documents, Nfld.[see above], P.E.I., Manit., Sask., and Yukon, specifically stipulate that a majority vote is necessary. N.D.P. a.](R-7); b.](Y-4,R-7) There is no N.D.P. jurisdiction that allows for a plurality; but 7 of these constitutions, Nfld., N.B., N.S., P.E.I., Manit., Sask., and Yukon, make no specific reference to whether a plurality or majority is necessary. Only 4 documents, Quebec, Ontario, Alta., and B.C., require that the vote be a majority. Other a.](R-2); b.](Y-1,R-2) Neither the P.Q. nor the Reform documents make any reference one way or the other in this regard. The Social Credit constitution calls for a majority vote.

**CHART 3.2: PROVINCIAL/FEDERAL**

a] Are the constitutional rules pertaining to candidate selection for both provincial and federal ridings?(Note: This category applies only to the three main parties and does not apply to the constitution of any federal parties.): Liberal(Y-7,R-2,N*-2) That the rules are for both the federal and provincial levels is specified in 7 of the Liberal constitutions. The constitution of the Quebec Liberal Party is emphatic that the rules do not apply to
the selection of candidates for federal electoral offices. Conversely, the Yukon Liberals are focused solely on the federal arena and no mention is given of the territorial assembly or potential Liberal representatives for this body. Neither the P.E.I. nor the Alta. constitutions make any reference to this subject. P.C.(U-1,N-8) Of course the federal P.C. constitution is exempted from consideration for this category; of the 9 P.C. constitutions being considered, only Alta. stated, somewhat ambiguously, that the constitution was concerned with both federal and provincial constituencies; in Alta. support for both federal and provincial candidates is required under Article 1 of this constitution.\(^\text{14}\) However, it is open to debate whether this clause can be interpreted as applying the rules to both levels. All the other P.C. jurisdictions stated that these rules were only applicable at the provincial or territorial level. N.D.P.(Y-10,N-1) With the exception of Quebec, all the N.D.P. jurisdictions applied the constitutional rules on candidate selection to both levels. In Quebec the provincial party is an autonomous entity, it is not directly affiliated with either the national party or any other

---

\(^\text{14}\) At an Alta. P. C. convention held in Edmonton, April 1991 this provision was amended when the party formally severed ties with the federal party. "Alberta Tories Take First Step Toward Divorcing Federal Party", Globe and Mail [Oct. 29, 1990], pp. A1-2. This story relates the bitterness of the provincial party members and explains that the two recommendations, to strike down the clause that promises to support the federal party and to ban the presence of federal party members at provincial gatherings, were prepared at a policy convention and are to be presented at the provincial party's upcoming convention. "Alberta Tories Break With Federal Party", Globe and Mail [April 8, 1991], p.A5. This story relates that the convention approved the above two recommendations.
provincial New Democratic parties.¹⁵ Rules for federal ridings are dealt with by "N.D.P.-Quebec". Other(X-1) Since Reform is, as of the researching of this study, purely federal, and the Social Credit Party of B.C. and the P.Q. of Quebec are purely provincial, then this category does not apply to these 3 parties.

¹⁵ At the time of the gathering of these constitutions, this organization had only a nascent institutionalization and had no formal constitutional document for examination.
APPENDIX C

DATA FROM CHARTS 4.1 AND 4.2: PARTY LEADERSHIP

CHART 4.1: LEADER'S ROLE

a.] Is the leader's role in the party clearly specified?:

**Liberal** (Y-3, U-7, N-1) Since the constitution of the Yukon Liberals is aimed at the federal level, it is excluded from this chart; so for this chapter there are a total of 11 Liberal jurisdictions. What is interesting for both the Liberals and the Progressive Conservatives is, according to their constitutions, the extent of the ambiguity of the leader's role in the party. Of the 11 Liberal constitutions, 7 are confusing or unclear about the leader's role. The constitution of the Liberals in N.S. does not contain any mention of the party leader. There are 3 Liberal documents, Que., Alta., and B.C., that specify the role that the leader is to play in the party; the B.C. Liberals have the most well defined rules concerning the party leader.\(^1\) **P.C.** (Y-3, U-7) There are 10 Conservative jurisdictions dealt with in this chapter; of course Quebec and British Columbia are not included. As with the Liberals, the majority of Conservative constitutions are ambiguous about the role of the leader. He/She is mentioned in all 10 of the Tory constitutions, but usually their duties and responsibilities are not clearly defined. There are 3 Conservative documents where the role of the leader is clearly outlined, P.E.I., Ont., and Sask. Both the Ont. and Sask. constitutions give the leader a wide

\(^1\) Bylaw 4, "Provincial Leader", lists the duties and responsibilities of the party leader, this Bylaw has 7 sections and numerous subsections.
"leadership" role within the party. In the constitution of the Ont. Conservatives the leader is to provide the, "overall direction of the Party." The same article further states that, "Nothing in this Constitution purports to bind the Leader in the capacity of Parliamentary leader of the Caucus." The remaining 7 Tory documents do not specify what role the leader is to play in the party. N.D.P.(Y-9,U-3) There are 12 New Democratic Party jurisdictions. The N.B., Ont., and Sask. N.D.P. constitutions are unclear on the duties and responsibilities of the leader. The remaining 9 did define the leader's position in the party. The Nfld. and B.C. constitutions are the most definite about what role the leader is supposed to play. The following is from the Nfld. document;

The Leader is the Chief Political Spokesperson of the Party and shall make Statements on behalf of the Party, shall enunciate the Policies laid down by it(sic) Conventions, and shall, if a member of the House of Assembly, lead the Party Caucus in the House. He/She shall actively encourage the development and building of the Party in all possible ways.

Other(Y-2,U-1) The P.Q. and Reform constitutions are definite about the role of the party leader. The P.Q. document has the party leader as the overall president of party; so the party leader wears two hats, chief parliamentarian and party president. The Social Credit constitution is unclear about the leader's role.

\(^2\) Article 19, Section 1.
\(^3\) Article 19, Section 2.
\(^4\) Article 12, Section 1, Subsection a.]
\(^5\) Article XII, Section 1.
b.] Is the leader clearly a member of the "day-to-day" management team? Liberal (Y-4, N-6, U-1) In 4 Liberal jurisdictions the leader is given some responsibility in the "day-to-day" management of the party, P.E.I., Sask., Alta., and federal. The Que. constitution is unclear on this matter; and in the remaining 6 documents the leader does not have a hand in the "day-to-day" running of the party. P.C. (Y-6, N-3, U-1) The majority of the P.C. constitutions, 6, do give the party leader a role in the daily life of the party. While in 3 jurisdictions, according to their constitutions, the leader is not involved on daily basis, Sask., Alta., and Yukon. The constitution for the Ont. Conservatives is unclear on the subject. Interestingly, all the Atlantic provinces give the leader such a role; while in the west, except for Manit., the leader is excluded in the "day-to-day" running of the party. N.D.P. (Y-12) In all 12 jurisdictions the constitutions recognize that the party leader has a role to play in the daily affairs of party life. Other (Y-2, U-1) Both the P.Q. and Reform have the leader as a member of the "day-to-day" management team of the party. However the Social Credit document is unclear once again.

c.] Does the leader have voting or decision making privileges for the above category? (note: If "no" for category 1.b.], then an "X"-not applicable- is used; also if 1.b. was "unclear" then the notation for this category will also be "U"). Liberal (Y-1, N-1, U-3, X-6) Only the federal Liberals specifically give the leader a vote and a voice in the daily running of the party. The Liberal
leader in P.E.I. specifically does not have a vote. In 3 jurisdictions, Que., Sask., and Alta., it is unclear whether the leader does have a vote or veto in the daily decision making process. In the remaining 6 Liberal documents this category is not applicable because the leader is not a member of the "day-to-day" team. P.C. (Y-5, U-2, X-3) In 5 P.C. jurisdictions, Nfld., P.E.I., N.B., Manit., and federal, the leader’s role in daily party life includes a vote. In N.S. and Ont. it is unclear whether the leader does have a vote; and in the remaining 3 documents this category does not apply because the leader is not involved in the party’s daily affairs. N.D.P. (Y-12) As a member of the "day-to-day" management team of the party, all N.D.P. leaders have a vote or veto on daily decisions. Other (Y-2, U-1) Again both the P.Q. and Reform leaders have such a vote, and whether the Social Credit leader has such a vote is unclear.

d.] Is the leader also a member of the General Council (a generic term used to describe a body with authority, but removed from the daily operation of the party)?: Liberal (Y-9, N-2) In 2 jurisdictions, Que. and B.C., the leader does not sit on such a body. According to the other 9 constitutions the leader does sit on a body of this type. P.C. (Y-9, U-1) In the Sask. Conservative constitution it is unclear if the leader sits on such a body. The remaining 9 documents specify that the leader is a member of such

---

6 According to Article IV, Section 1, the party leader is on the Provincial Executive, but is a non-voting member; and, according to Article V, Section 1, Subsection a.], the party leader is also an officer of the Provincial Executive, but is a non-voting officer.
a body. **N.D.P.**(Y-12) As with the other categories in this section, all 12 N.D.P. constitutions state that the leader is a member of such a body. **Other**(Y-1,N-1,U-1) The P.Q. leader is granted membership on such a body. Once again the Social Credit constitution is unclear on the subject. The case of Reform is somewhat confusing because in this party, according to their constitution, there is a fusion between the executive level and the "General Council" level, so the chart notation for Reform on this category was "N*".

**CHART 4.1: LEADERSHIP REVIEW**

a.] Are there leadership review provisions in the constitution?: **Liberal**(Y-8,N-3) Only the Liberal constitutions of the 3 Maritime provinces do not contain provisions on leadership review. The other 8 Liberal documents do have such provisions. **P.C.**(Y-9,N-1) Only the Tory constitution in P.E.I. does not contain a reference to leadership review provisions. The remaining 9 Conservative jurisdictions do have such a provision. **N.D.P.**(Y-12) All 12 N.D.P. jurisdictions have some type of provision for a leadership review. **Other**(Y-2,N-1) Both Reform and the P.Q. have provisions for leadership reviews. The Social Credit document contains no such provisions.

b.] Is this review to take place within a set time period, for example an "automatic" review held every two years? (note: For those constitutions which have no reference to leadership review, this category and the three below are not applicable.): **Liberal**(Y-2,N-6,X-3) In only 2 Liberal jurisdictions, Sask. and B.C., did the
constitutions have an automatic leadership review process. There are 3 constitutions that have no leadership review provisions, so of course this means that this category does not apply for the Liberals in the three Maritime provinces. In the remaining 6 constitutions, the leadership review is held in ways other than within a set period of time. P.C.(Y-1, N-8, X-1) The only Conservative constitution that holds the leadership review within a set time period is in the Yukon. Since the P.E.I. constitution has no leadership provisions, this category is not applicable. N.D.P.(Y-12) The leadership review provisions in all 12 N.D.P. constitutions call for the review to be within a certain set time period, usually as a part of their annual or biannual meetings. Other(N-2, X-1) The leadership review provisions are not automatic in either the P.Q. or Reform. Of course since there are no leadership review provisions in the Social Credit constitution, this category is not applicable.

c.) Do the review provisions kick in only after a defeat in a general election? (note: If the constitutions have an "automatic" review, then for this category the notation will be "X" for not applicable; and again, if there are no review provisions in the constitution, then "X" will continued to be used.): Liberal(Y-2, N-4, X-5) There are 5 Liberal jurisdictions for which this category is not applicable, N.S., P.E.I., and N.B., because they have no review provisions. This category also does not apply to Sask. and B.C. because their review takes place within a set time period, independent of elections. Both Que. and Alta. have such a post-
defeat clause. In the remaining 4, Nfld., Ont., Manit., and federal, the review is post-election, either defeat or victory. P.C.(Y-5,N-3,X-2) The provision for a leadership review after an electoral defeat is found in 5 Conservative constitutions, N.B., Ont., Manit., Alta., and federal. This category does not apply for 2 Tory documents; in P.E.I. because no provision for a leadership review exists, and in the Yukon because a review happens within a set time period. In the remaining 3, Nfld., N.S., and Sask., the review is post-election, either in victory or defeat, so their notations are "N". N.D.P.(X-12) Since the provisions for a leadership review in all N.D.P. constitutions specifies that the review is to be held within a predetermined time period, then this category is not applicable for all 12 N.D.P. jurisdictions. Other(N-2,X-1) This category is not applicable for Social Credit because they have no leadership review provisions in their constitution. Both Reform and the P.Q. receive an "N" notation because their reviews are post-election, independent of either defeat or victory.

d.] Do the review provisions kick in after an election, either a defeat or a victory? (note: Of course if no review provisions exist, then the notation is "X", meaning not applicable; if the review happens either automatically or only after an electoral defeat, the notation is also "X"): Liberal(Y-4,X-7) In 4 of the Liberal jurisdictions, Nfld., Ont., Manit., and federal, the leadership review is held after either an electoral defeat or victory. In the remaining 7 jurisdictions this category is not
applicable; in the 3 Maritime provinces there are no leadership provisions, and in the other 4, Que., Sask., Alta., and B.C., the review is either held in a set time period or only following a defeat in a general election. **P.C.**(Y-2,N-1,X-7) In only 2 Conservative constitutions, N.S. and Sask., is the leadership review held with either a post-election defeat or victory. For 7 Tory jurisdictions this category is not applicable; in P.E.I. because no leadership review provisions exist, and in the other 6 because the review happens either in a set time period or only following a defeat in a general election. Nfld. received a "N" notation, this is because while this constitution does mention the possibility of a review, it happens in neither a set time period nor after an election; it takes place when one of three events unfold, the leader requests one, the office of the leader becomes vacant, or when such a resolution (secret ballot) is passed at any Annual Meeting.\(^7\) **N.D.P.**(X-12) Once again this category does not apply to the N.D.P. documents because all their reviews take place in a set time period. **Other**(Y-2,X-1) In both the P.Q. and the Reform documents the leadership review is mandated to happen following a general election, regardless of defeat or victory. This category does not apply to Social Credit because they have no provisions for a leadership review.

**e.)** Is the vote for a leadership review a secret ballot? (note: If no leadership review provisions exist in the constitution then of course an "X" notation is given.): **Liberal**(Y-5,U-3,X-3) In

\(^7\) Article 12, Section 1. Subsections a.], b.], and c.].
Nfld., Ont., Sask., B.C., and federal. the vote is specifically stated to be by a secret ballot. In 3 Liberal documents, Que., Manit., and Alta., it is unclear whether a secret ballot is necessary. In the 3 Maritime provinces, no Liberal constitution has provisions relating to a review. P.C.(Y-7,U-2,X-1) In only 2 Conservative documents, Nfld. and N.B., is it unclear whether a secret ballot is called for. Since the Liberals in P.E.I. have no leadership review provisions in their constitution, this category is not applicable for them. The remaining 7 P.C. documents all stated that the vote for a leadership review was to be conducted by means of a secret ballot. N.D.P.(Y-2,U-10) In only 2 N.D.P. constitutions, P.E.I. and B.C., is it clearly stated that the vote for a leadership review is to be a secret ballot. The other 10 documents were unclear whether a secret ballot is necessary. Other(Y-2,X-1) Both the P.Q. and Reform constitutions specifically call for a secret ballot. Of course, since the Social Credit constitution has no review provisions, this category does not apply for Social Credit.

f.] Is the wording for the calling of a leadership review specified? (note: Of course, for those constitutions that do not have any reference to a review, this category is not applicable): Liberal(Y-1,N-7,X-3) Only the Nfld. Liberal constitution contains the specific wording that would be voted on in a ballot on whether to hold a leadership review; the example here is fairly typical for those constitutions that do specify the wording. The question is very straightforwardly phrased. "Do you want a Leadership
Convention of the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador?" In the 3 provinces, Que., Manit., and Alta., where the Liberal constitutions are unclear on the necessity of a secret ballot, the wording is not specified. There are 4 constitutions, Ont., Sask., B.C., and federal, that do call for a secret ballot but do not specify the wording. Since the Liberals in the 3 Maritime provinces fail to mention the possibility of a leadership review, this category is not applicable for them. P.C.(Y-7,N-2,X-1) It is almost the reverse for the Tories when compared to the Liberals. There are 7 Conservative documents that contain the specific wording of the review resolution, N.S., Ont., Manit., Sask., Alta., Yukon, and federal. Both Nfld. and N.B. are unclear on the matter of the secret ballot, and neither contain the specific wording. Since the constitution of the P.E.I. Liberals fails to mention leadership review, it receives an "X" notation. N.D.P.(N-12) All 12 N.D.P. constitutions refer to a review but not one of the 12 specify the wording. Only 2 of the 12 specifically call for a secret ballot, but neither the P.E.I. nor the B.C. document include the wording. The other 10 N.D.P. jurisdictions, which did not specify a secret ballot, also failed to specify the wording of the call for a review. Other(Y-1,N-1,X-1) The Reform constitution does specify the wording of the resolution that would call for a leadership review. Again, another straightforward question. "Do you want a Leadership Assembly to be called?" Although the P.Q. document calls for a

---

8 Article VI, Section 2.

9 Article 6, Section C.
secret ballot, it does not include the wording for such a resolution. Since the Social Credit constitution fails to mention any possibility of a leadership review, this category does not apply.

CHART 4.1: INTERIM LEADER

a.] Does the constitution make any reference to the position of interim leader?: Liberal(Y-3,R-8) Only 3 Liberal constitutions, P.E.I., Que., and Alta., make some mention of the possibility of an interim leader. The other 8 have no reference to the matter. P.C.(Y-4,R-6) There are 4 P.C. documents that include some provisions concerning interim leadership, P.E.I., N.B., Ont., and Yukon. The Conservatives in N.B. mention such a position under the section "Definitions and Interpretations" and what is written certainly is open to interpretation.

"Interim leader" means the leader elected by the Executive Council when the Party does not form the Government of New Brunswick and by the Caucus when the Party forms the Government of New Brunswick, until such time as a new Leader is elected.10

Earlier in the same article, the N.B. document defines the "Leader" and refers one to Article XV for reference on how the party leadership could possibility be reviewed and changed.11 However, this article further confuses the matter because it fails to mention the interim leader and ultimately the document is unclear about the change from leader to interim leader.12

---

10 Article II, Section 1, Subsection 1.]
11 Article II, Section 1, Subsection b.]
12 Article XV.
remaining 6 constitutions have no references to an interim leader. N.D.P.(Y-9,R-3) The position of interim leader is mentioned in 9 of the N.D.P. constitutions. The document of the Sask. New Democrats has several references to an interim or "Acting Leader", but there is a mistake in the constitution because it is stated that the, "Acting Leader shall serve until the vacancy is filled by one of the methods set out in Article 5.14." This however is incorrect because it is Article 5, Section 13 which deals with methods for filling a vacancy of the party leader. The Nfld., Que., and Ont. N.D.P. constitutions contain no references to the possibility of an interim leader. In the case of Que., the possibility of a vacancy in the position of leader is mentioned, however the only further mention outlines the steps to take to choose a new leader and the position of an interim leader is not raised. Other(R-2,U-1) No reference to an interim leader is made in either the Social Credit or Reform constitutions. The P.Q. do have a section on how to replace the leader should the leader leave or die. Yet this document is ambiguous on the matter of an interim leader. However, since the party leader is also the president of the party, it seems logical that the vice-president would replace the president in the position of party president and interim party leader. Still, this is not specifically stated in the constitution, so it may well not

13 Article 5, Section 12.
14 Article 6, Section 04.
15 Article VI, Section 8.
16 Article VII, Section 3, Subsection a.}
b.] Is the interim leader appointed solely by the caucus? (note: If the constitution has not made a reference to the matter of interim leadership, then the notation for this category and the following two categories will be "X" for not applicable.): Liberal(N-3,X-8) Of the 3 Liberal constitutions, P.E.I., Que., and Alta., that refer to interim leadership, none give the caucus the sole responsibility for appointing the interim leader. Owing to their lack of reference to an interim leader, this category does not apply to the remaining 8 jurisdictions. P.C.(Y-3,N-1,X-6) Of the 4 P.C. constitutions, P.E.I., N.B., Ont., and Yukon, that included a reference to an interim leader, only P.E.I. did not give the caucus sole authority for appointing the interim leader. The Liberals in Ont. and Yukon specifically awarded the responsibility to the caucus, and as shown above, the case of N.B. is somewhat confusing on the matter of interim leadership. As the quotation presented previously in category 3 a.] makes clear, the interim leader is elected by the Executive Council when the party fails to form the government but if the party wins the election, then the caucus has this responsibility. Thus N.B. gets a "Y*" notation for all four categories in this section. This category is not applicable for the other 6 Tory jurisdictions because they fail to include provisions on interim leadership. N.D.P.(Y-2,N-7,X-3) Of the 9 N.D.P. constitutions that deal with the subject of an interim leader, only 2, P.E.I. and Yukon, delegate the responsibility of

17 Article II, Section 1, Subsection 1.}
appointing an interim leader solely to the caucus. The other 7, N.S., N.B., Manit., Sask., Alta., B.C., and federal, do not give this authority to the caucus. For the 3 N.D.P. jurisdictions which fail to mention interim leadership, Nfld., Que., and Ont., this category is not applicable. Other(X-3) Since no reference is made in either the Reform or the Social Credit constitutions, and since there are only cryptic and confusing comments in the P.Q. document, this category does not apply to any of these 3 parties.

c.] Is the interim leader appointed solely by the party?:
Liberal(Y-1,N-2,X-8) Of the 3 Liberal documents, P.E.I., Que., and Alta., that have a reference to interim leadership, only Alta. gave the power to appoint the interim leader solely to the party with the caucus excluded from the process. There are 8 Liberal jurisdictions that fail to deal with the matter of an interim leader, this category is not applicable to those 8. P.C.(Y-2,N-2,X-6) There are 4 Conservative constitutions that deal with the subject of an interim leader, of those, Ont. and Yukon give the caucus this responsibility and the other 2, P.E.I. and N.B., each give the party the authority to appoint an interim leader, however the case of N.B. is somewhat complicated, please refer to category 3 b.]. This category is not applicable for the remaining 6 P. C. constitutions because they failed to include a reference to an interim leader. N.D.P.(Y-2,N-7,X-3) Of the 12 N.D.P. constitutions, 9 contain a reference to the position or possibility of an interim leader. Of those 9, only the documents for N.B. and Manit. give the power to appoint an interim leader solely to the party. The
remaining 7 either give this responsibility to the caucus or state that it should be shared between the caucus and the party. For the 3 jurisdictions, Nfld., Que., and Ont., that do not have any reference to an interim leader, this category does not apply. Other (X-3) This category does not apply to any of these parties.

d.] Do both the caucus and the party appoint the interim leader?: Liberal (Y-2, N-1, X-8) The 2 Liberal jurisdictions which specify that the authority to appoint the interim leader is split between the caucus and the party are P.E.I. and Que. As seen above, in Alta. this responsibility lies with the party. This category is not applicable for the other 7 Liberal jurisdictions because they do not address the subject of an interim leader. P.C. (Y-1, N-3, X-6) There are 4 P.C. constitutions that include a reference to an interim leader; of those 4, Ont. and Yukon gives the caucus the authority to appoint the interim leader, P.E.I. gives this power to the party, and as stated above, the case of N.B. is complicated. The other 6 Tory documents do not contain a reference to an interim leader, so this category does not apply to them. N.D.P. (Y-5, N-4, X-3) Of the 9 N.D.P. documents that refer to an interim leader, 5 of them state that the power to appoint the interim leader is to be shared between the party and the caucus, N.S., Sask., Alta., B.C., and federal. In P.E.I., N.B., Manit., and Yukon this power rests either with the party or the caucus. For the 3 jurisdictions that do not make any reference to an interim leader, this category does not apply. Other (X-3) This category does not apply to any of these parties.
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CHART 4.1: SEARCH COMMITTEE

a.] Does the constitution make any reference to a search committee for leadership candidates?: All(R-all) There is no reference made to such a committee in any of the party constitutions under consideration.

CHART 4.2: LEADERSHIP SELECTION RULES

a.] Is a special or distinct set of rules for the leadership race/convention included in the constitution?: Liberal(Y-5,N-6) There are 5 Liberal jurisdictions which have a reference to special or distinct rules for the leadership race, Nfld., P.E.I., Alta., B.C., and federal. The other 6 constitutions do not have special rules or guidelines for the leadership race. P.C.(Y-4,N-6) Special rules are included in the constitutions of 4 Conservative jurisdictions, Ont., Sask., Alta., and Yukon. The remaining 6 documents contain no such special rules; however the case of the P.C. constitution in Manit. deserves a special mention. The Manit. document, as received, was last amended in April of 1987, but it contained a large new batch of proposed amendments primarily devoted to the party's election of the leader. These proposed amendments were to be considered at Tory's Nov., 1988 Annual General Meeting; However since there is some doubt whether the amendments passed as proposed, this study relies on the old and quite brief article on party leadership. N.D.P.(N-12) None of the 12 N.D.P. constitutions have special rules for the process of selecting a new party leader. Other(Y-1,N-2) There is a set of special rules in the P.Q. constitution, but neither the Reform nor
the Social Credit documents have special rules.

b.] Are the voting rules clearly specified?: Liberal(Y-2, N-9) Only 2 Liberal constitutions, Alta. and B.C., clearly specify the voting rules to be followed for the election of leadership candidates. P.C.(Y-2, N-8) Only 2 Conservative constitutions, Ont. and Yukon, have spelt out the rules to be used for the vote on party leadership. N.D.P.(Y-1, N-11) There is only one N.D.P. document, the constitution for the Alta. N.D.P., that may specify the rules for the leadership vote. While the N.D.P. in Alta. do not have special rules on the leadership vote nevertheless their document does refer to the procedures to be followed in electing the Executive Officers, one of whom is the party leader. These rules are contained in an appendix to their constitution.18 Other (N-3) None of the other 3 constitutions specifies the rules to be followed for the vote on the leadership of the party.

c.] Was the matter of "notice" for the leadership vote or convention referred to in the constitution?: Liberal(Y-7, R-4) "Notice" is brought up in 7 of the Liberal documents, Nfld., Que., Ont., Manit., Alta., B.C., and federal. The remaining 4 constitutions do not make any reference to this matter. P.C.(Y-4, R-6) The matter of "notice" was raised in 4 of the Conservative jurisdictions, P.E.I., N.B., Manit., and Yukon. The other 6 documents failed to include a reference to "notice". N.D.P.(Y-12) All 12 of the N.D.P. constitutions contain some sort of reference to the matter of "notice" for the leadership vote or convention.

18 Article 14, Appendix A - "Rules of Order".
Other(Y-3) The P.Q., Social Credit and Reform documents all have a reference to the matter of "notice".

d. Is there a reference in the constitution to a "length of membership" regulation, either to select delegates or to vote directly?: Liberal(Y-4,R-5,U-2) The Liberal constitutions in N.S., Ont., Manit., and B.C. make some sort of reference that a member must possess his or her membership for a prescribed length of time in order to vote in the leadership selection process. The federal document does not prescribe a "length of membership" criterion, however it does state that, "Provincial and territorial rules relating to the election of delegates shall be observed...". While some provincial constitutions do not have such rules, some also do; so, for the federal Liberals, it appears that a "length of membership" rule may apply for some members but not for others. The Alta. Liberal constitution is also unclear or confusing on the matter. There are no predetermined "length of membership" criteria mentioned anywhere in this document; however it is stated that the Executive Board is the body responsible for calling the Leadership Convention. This document further states that the Executive Board has the power to determine, "who will be eligible to vote at Delegate Selection Meetings;". So such a "length of membership" regulation may or may not be in effect for this jurisdiction. The other 6 Liberal jurisdictions do not make any reference to a

---

19 Article 16, Section 5.

20 Article 5, Section 05, Subsection f].

21 Article 5, Section 05, Subsection f].
"length of membership" criterion. P.C.(Y-3 R-7) "Length of membership" is mentioned as a criterion in 3 Conservative constitutions, P.E.I., Ont., and federal. The constitution of the federal Tories does contain a reference to a "length of membership" regulation for those members of constituency associations who wish to participate in the delegate selection process. The federal document states that the Executive Committee of the party will provide a cut-off date for the admission of new members,\(^{22}\) and that, "Such period (is) to be a minimum of one [1] week and a maximum of two [2] weeks;".\(^{23}\) However the Executive Committee also has, "the power to alter, abridge or suspend the minimum and maximum time periods prescribed in 15.1."\(^{24}\) The remaining 7 documents do not contain a reference to a "length of membership" criterion. However the Conservative document in Manit. does prescribe a "length of membership" criterion for those members who wish to be delegates.\(^{25}\) N.D.P.(Y-5,R-5,U-2) With respect to the leadership vote, there are 5 N.D.P. jurisdictions which include some type of "length of membership" regulation in their constitutions, N.B., Manit., Sask., B.C., and Yukon. Both the federal and Que. constitutions are unclear. In the document of the

\(^{22}\) Article 15, Section 1, Subsection 2.].

\(^{23}\) Article 15, Section 15, Subsection 3.].

\(^{24}\) Article 15, Section 2.

\(^{25}\) Article X, Section 6, Subsection a.]; the proposed amendments (please see category 5. a.]), which are excluded from consideration for this study, prescribe two new criteria on the "length of membership", Article XI, Section 4, of the proposed amendments.
provincial N.D.P. in Que. each constituency association is allowed
to draft party approved regulations. It seems possible that one
such regulation could deal with "length of membership". Like the
P.C. Manit. constitution the Que. N.D.P. document has a "length of
membership" rule that applies to delegates. The case of the
federal party is similar to that of the federal Liberals. According
to their constitution the, "Applications for individual membership
shall be dealt with in accordance with the constitution of the
appropriate provincial Party and shall be subject to the approval
of that provincial Party." So it appears that some N.D.P. members
participating in the delegate selection process for a federal
leadership convention could be subject to some sort of "length of
membership" criteria, while other members might not have to deal
with such regulations. The other 5 N.D.P. constitutions do not
include any reference to the "length of membership" being a
criteria for participating in the process to choose a new party
leader. Other Both the P.Q. and the Reform constitutions do
have a rule on the "length of membership"; while the Social Credit
document does not include any such reference.

e.} Does the election of the new leader occur under the
principle of "one-member,one-vote"(universal ballot)? Liberal Not one of the 11 Liberal jurisdictions have a "one-member,one-
vote" system in place for the leadership selection process. P.C. (Y-

26 Article 19, Section 02.
27 Article 22, Section 01.
28 Article III, Section 1, Subsection 2.)
Interestingly it is in the smallest, P.E.I., and the largest, Ont., provinces where the Conservatives have a system of "one-member, one-vote" to choose the party leader. The other 8 jurisdictions do not have this system. The proposed amendments for the Manit. Tory constitution, excluded from this study (see category 5. a.), proposed a variation on this system.  

No N.D.P. jurisdiction has a system where the party leader is elected by the "one-member, one-vote" system. Other (Y-1, N-2) The P.Q. have a "one-member, one-vote" system of choosing the party leader. Neither Reform nor Social Credit elect their leader with an universal ballot.

f.] Is the new leader chosen under the rules of a delegated convention? (note: For this category, the notations will the reverse of the above category.): Liberal (Y-11) In all 11 Liberal jurisdictions the process to select the party leader is that of a delegated convention. P.C. (Y-8, N-2) It is only in P.E.I. and Ont. that delegated conventions are not used. The other 8 jurisdictions utilize the delegated convention format. N.D.P. (Y-12) All 12 N.D.P. jurisdictions have a system where the party leader is elected by the "one-member, one-vote" system. Other (Y-1, N-2) The P.Q. have a "one-member, one-vote" system of choosing the party leader. Neither Reform nor Social Credit elect their leader with an universal ballot.

As well as severing ties to the federal party, the most recent version of the Alta. Conservative constitution shifted from the delegated leadership convention format to a system which allows each individual member to vote; "Alberta Tories Break Ties with Federal Party", Globe and Mail [April 8, 1991], p. A5; however this study does not use the most recent Alta. P. C. constitution but refers to the one which was in operation in March of 1990, when this study began.

Article XI, Section 4, Subsections a.] and b.], and Article XI, Section 5 of the proposed amendments, a copy of which was received from the Manit. Conservatives in March of 1990, called for a system of balloting done according to preference and the choices were to be transferable among the leadership candidates.
jurisdictions resort to the method of the delegated convention to choose the party leader. Other(Y-2,N-1) Both Reform and Social Credit use the delegated convention system to select their party leader. The P.Q. do not use such a system.

**g.** Is there reference made in the constitution regarding the composition of the delegates who are to go to the leadership convention? (note: This category is not applicable to those jurisdictions which do not use a system of delegated conventions.):

**Liberal(Y-10,R-1)** In 10 of the Liberal constitutions reference is made to the composition of the delegates for the leadership convention. The constitution for the federal Liberals gives a detailed profile for the representation at leadership conventions.\(^{31}\) However this Constitution also allows for some latitude on this matter when it states that, "Representation at any convention shall be determined by the National Executive,".\(^{32}\) Only in the document of the N.B. Liberals is no reference made to the composition of the delegates. **P.C.(Y-7,R-1,X-2)** Since the Tories in P.E.I. and Ont. do not have delegated leadership conventions, this category does not apply to them. The N.S. document made no reference to the composition of the delegates. The remaining 7 Conservative constitutions do refer to the composition of the delegates. **N.D.P.(Y-12)** There are references made to delegate composition in all 12 of the N.D.P. constitutions. Other(Y-1,X-2)

---

\(^{31}\) Article 16, Section 13, Subsections a.\(\) to j.\(\), and Section 14 of the same article.

\(^{32}\) Article 16, Section 2.
Since the P.Q. do not have a delegated convention to select their leader, this category does not apply to them. The Reform and Social Credit constitutions do contain references to the composition of the delegates.

h.) Does the constitution call for a secret ballot for the election of the party leader?: Liberal(Y-2,R-7,U-2) A secret ballot for the vote on the party leadership is called for in only 2 Liberal constitutions, Nfld. and Ont. In Que. and B.C. the constitutions are confusing on the matter. One of the rules for the Que. Liberals is that, "The provisions of Section 1 relating to the Convention apply as well to a Leadership Convention,".33 Yet the referred to provisions state that, "Voting shall be conducted by a show of hands or if it is the wish of three quarters (3/4) of the members present by ballot."34 To say the least, this seems an unusual procedure to elect the leader of a established political party in a large and diverse province. However there is the possibility that this procedure may be avoided because the constitution also states that for a leadership convention, "The manner of voting shall be determined by the organizing committee."35 This "organizing committee" is appointed by the Executive Committee of the party.36 With the B.C. Liberals there is no direct reference to a secret vote, but since ballots, ballot

33 Chapter 3, Section 2, Article R-19.
34 Chapter 3, Section 1, Article R-17.
35 Chapter 3, Section 2, Article R-21.
36 Chapter 3, Section 1, Article R-13.
boxes, scrutineers, and a returning officer are all called for, the inference seems to point to a secret ballot.\(^{37}\) The remaining 7 Liberal constitutions are silent on the matter of a secret ballot. \(\text{P.C.}(Y-3,R-6,U-1)\) In 3 of the Conservative jurisdictions, Ont., Manit., and Yukon, a secret ballot to elect the party leader is called for. In the P.E.I. constitution the issue of a secret ballot is confusing. This document states that if, "a vote by ballot is required, it shall be conducted in the manner provided for in Article XXII, paragraphs [b], [c], and [d]."\(^{38}\) However, the sections of the article referred to deal with the establishing of a Poll Committee which represents members of the smaller polling division who reside in the larger District Association or constituency. The remaining 6 P.C. constitutions do not state whether the vote is to be by a secret ballot. \(\text{N.D.P.}(Y-2,R-10)\) Only 2 of the N.D.P. documents call for a secret ballot on the leadership vote, P.E.I. and B.C. The other 10 jurisdictions fail to mention if the vote is to be done by a secret ballot. \(\text{Other}(Y-1,R-1,U-1)\) The P.Q. constitution does not make a mention whether a secret ballot is necessary. While the Reform constitution does call for a secret ballot, the Social Credit document is somewhat unclear. This constitution states that the, "Balloting shall be conducted according to Section 12[c] 1 and 2."\(^{39}\) However, while

---

\(^{37}\) Articles D, E, F, and G of "Standing Rule 4" of the "British Columbia Liberal Party Standing Rules"; this study treats these "Standing Rules" as an integral component of the constitution.

\(^{38}\) Article XXIV, Section d.

\(^{39}\) Article 11, Section e.
these two subsections discuss "balloting", a secret vote is not specifically mentioned, yet it is possible to infer that the vote is secret.

i.] Is any reference made in the constitution that a majority vote is necessary in order to successfully capture the leadership of the party?: Liberal(Y-3,R-6,U-2) Only 3 Liberal constitutions, Nfld., Ont., and Alta., specifically state that the vote must be by a majority of the votes cast. There are 2 jurisdictions, Que. and B.C., where this issue is confusing. Regarding the scant references that do exist in the constitution of the Que. Liberals concerning the vote for the leader, please refer to category 5. h.]; a secret vote is not discussed in any of these sections. The B.C. Liberal constitution does not specify that the vote be carried by a majority, however, as with the above category (5. h.]), the relevant articles certainly lead one to infer such.40 The other 6 Liberal jurisdictions do not specifically state that a majority vote is necessary. P.C.(Y-4,R-6) In 4 of the Tory constitutions there is specific mention made that the vote for the party leadership is to be decided by a majority of those voting, P.E.I., Ont., Sask., and Yukon. The other 6 jurisdictions do not make a reference to this matter. N.D.P.(Y-1,R-11) Only 1 N.D.P. constitution, that of Alta., specifically prescribes a majority vote on leadership; the other 11 have no reference to whether a majority vote is necessary. Other(Y-1,R-2) Neither the Reform nor

40 Articles D, E, F, and G of "Standing Rule 4" of the "British Columbia Liberal Party Standing Rules".
the P.Q. document make any reference to this matter. The Social Credit constitution does call for a majority vote.

j.] Is a reference made in the constitution concerning financial rules or limits that leadership hopefuls must obey?:

Liberal(Y-3,R-8) In the N.B., B.C., and federal parties there are financial limits or rules that those vying for the leadership must obey. The other 8 jurisdictions make no reference to any rules or limits on finances. P.C.(Y-1,R-9) Only the Ont. Conservatives include rules on financial limits for leadership contenders. The remaining 9 constitutions are silent on the issue. N.D.P. (R-12) All 12 N.D.P. constitutions fail to include any reference to such regulations. Other(R-3) Neither the Reform, the Social Credit, nor the P.Q. documents have a reference to any financial rules or limits.

k.] Is any mention made in the constitution on the possibility of an appeal relating to the leadership race/convention?:

Liberal(Y-1,R-10) The only constitution that raises the possibility of an appeal is that of the Liberals in B.C. The other 10 do not contain any references to such a possibility. P.C.(Y-2,R-8) There are 2 Conservative jurisdictions where such an appeal is mentioned, Manit. and Yukon. The remaining 8 Tory documents make no reference to the matter. N.D.P. (Y-5,R-7) The possibility of such an appeal is raised in 5 N.D.P. constitutions, P.E.I., Sask., Alta., B.C., and Yukon. No mention is made in the other 7 documents. Other(R-3) No appeal provisions relating to leadership are mentioned in either the P.Q., Social Credit, or Reform constitutions.