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This thesis endeavours to answer the question, "What does the Reform Party's 'populism' consist of?" An attempt is made herein to characterize the nature of the Reform Party's populism via Margaret Canovan's typology of populisms. The analysis concludes that the Reform Party manifests the characteristics of two of the seven different kinds of populist phenomena that Canovan identifies. It is found, on the one hand, that through his "anti-political" rhetorical orientation, Reform Party leader Preston Manning evinces a certain form of what Canovan refers to as "politicians' populism." On the other hand, it is posited that the party's policies vis a vis federal bilingualism, multiculturalism and immigration programs reflect Canovan's conception of "reactionary populism."
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Preface

The prospective reader of this thesis is hereby apprised of the author's membership in the Reform Party of Canada. The author's attraction to the Reform Party, briefly stated, consists in the party's zeal for the reform of Canada's criminal justice system and for the implementation of reform's designed to address with appropriate urgency Canada's ever-growing fiscal crisis.
Introduction

While one can only speculate about what metaphors future political historians will use to describe Canada’s recent federal general election, it is probably safe to assume that the word "watershed" will be employed as often as any. Indeed, the 1993 election seems to have presided over more than its share of noteworthy and unusual political events. Among them, after nine long years in opposition, the Liberals were returned to the government benches with their largest majority in forty years. New Democrats, on the other hand, retained only nine of the forty-three seats that they held at Parliament’s dissolution and thus failed, for the first time in their thirty-year history as a party, to win enough seats in order to qualify for official-party privileges in the House of Commons. The election also served to underscore the disbandment of the tacit federal electoral alliance between Quebec nationalists and the Mulroney-era Progressive Conservatives. The Conservatives, having failed to "deliver the goods" as promised by their former leader, surrendered all but one of their Quebec seats in a hopeless electoral battle with the relentless Bloc Quebecois. Astonishingly enough, Quebec was among the more Conservative-friendly regions of the country on election day: west of the Ottawa River, the Conservatives failed to win a single seat. Atlantic Canada was hardly more generous, allowing the Conservatives to carry only one constituency. Needless to say, the party suffered an electoral collapse of unprecedented magnitude.

The election also witnessed the tensely anticipated rise of the Reform Party of Canada. Aside from its modest but encouraging
performance in Ontario, where it won one constituency and finished second to the Liberals in fifty-six others, the Reform Party took a combined five seats from Manitoba and Saskatchewan, and a stunning forty-six of the fifty-eight seats in Alberta and British Columbia. To put the party’s electoral achievements in the obligatory metaphorical terms, as one watched the returns on election night, it was as if a seemingly innocuous spark, caused by the tumbling of a few pebbles on the Canadian shield, blew westward, igniting what became a full-fledged prairie fire; burning with greater intensity as it blazed across the prairies and into the foothills, the fire completely subsumed the forests of the Rocky Mountains, and did not burn itself out until it reached the beaches of the West Coast.

To equate the Reform Party’s electoral performance with the rapid spread of fire is to draw attention to the party’s ostensibly populist character. Like its western Canadian populist predecessors - most notably, the Progressive movement, the Social Credit League, and the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation - the Reform Party acquired a large mass membership and attained widespread popularity relatively soon after its inception. Since the party’s formation in 1987, the party’s membership has grown steadily and rapidly. As of October 1990, the party’s membership stood at approximately 50,000, only 10,000 fewer than the federal Liberal Party’s membership total.¹ By early 1992, the Reform Party


2
possessed over 100,000 members.\textsuperscript{2} Indeed, the Report group of western newsmagazines, the party's most vociferous supporter within the Canadian media, has designated the party "the fastest-growing political movement in Canadian history."\textsuperscript{3} Having now achieved a decisive electoral breakthrough on short order, the Reform Party will undoubtedly be considered among the movements listed above in the works of future students of western Canadian populism.

Meanwhile, as far as current students and analysts of western Canadian populism are concerned, the Reform Party has apparently presented some difficulty. While most commentators seem to agree or assume that the party is in some sense populist, it remains the case, as Steve Patten points out, that very few have engaged in "any sustained theoretical discussion of what it means to refer to the Reform Party as a populist party."\textsuperscript{4}

This thesis adheres to the prevailing analytical orthodoxy in assuming that the Reform Party is populist. At the same time, this thesis attempts to mitigate the offence to rational analysis that such an assumption presents by seeking to give meaning to the populist label that the Reform Party now wears. This thesis endeavours, therefore, to delineate the Reform Party’s populist


\textsuperscript{3}O’Neill, front cover.

character. An attempt will be made to characterize the party's populism by means of Margaret Canovan's typology of populisms.5

The following analysis consists of three main sections. The first section outlines the basic contours and purpose of Canovan's typology. The second specifies which among Canovan's various types of populism the Reform Party would not appear to represent. The final section attempts to provide the party with a definitive location within Canovan's typology, and, in the process, offers a perspective on what the party's populism consists of.

I. Towards an Understanding of Populism: Canovan's Typology

Any analysis that endeavours to delineate the populist character of something must first of all recognize that the term "populism" is notoriously difficult to work with. As Canovan explains, the difficulty arises from the fact that "the term is exceptionally vague and refers in different contexts to a bewildering variety of phenomena."6 Aside from the Russian narodnichestvo and the American People's Party of the late nineteenth century - the "acknowledged classics of populism" - the label "populist" has been attached to political phenomena as diverse as Peronism, direct democracy, George Wallace and the "white backlash," Jimmy Carter's 1976


6Ibid., p.3.
Presidential campaign, Maoism and Ronald Reagan. What accounts for the considerable licence that has thus been taken with the term? Peter Worsley provides the following answer: Populism, as opposed to conservatism or socialism, "is not part of a shared, more inclusive tradition as far as the subjective orientation of the actors is concerned. Its typological status is solely an analytical one." Thus, relatively unencumbered by the weight of historical or ideological baggage, the term has been freely imposed by observers, and appropriated freely by the observed.

The main goal of Canovan’s landmark work is to bring a degree of clarity (and perhaps sanity) to the debates on the meaning of populism that have been raging for years within academic circles. Rather than simply imposing her own "single essentialist definition" of what populism is, or should be - the approach that sparked the debates in the first place - Canovan proposes to work within the confines of the debates by constructing a typology of populisms that corresponds with what she sees as the two main academic approaches to the study of populism. "One broad way of thinking about populism," she explains, "stresses its agrarian character and takes a sociological approach toward its roots and

---

7Ibid.


9Ibid.

10Canovan, p.12.
significance."11 Using this approach as a guide, Canovan establishes a category heading entitled "Agrarian Populisms," under which she lists three different types of populist phenomena: farmers' radicalism, peasant movements, and intellectual agrarian socialism.12 Under a second main heading, labelled "Political Populisms," Canovan arranges four more or less distinct varieties of populism: populist dictatorship, populist democracy, reactionary populism, and politicians' populism.13 This second group of populist phenomena is said to reflect the primary focus of the other main analytical approach to the study of populism, where "the emphasis...is much less upon any particular socioeconomic base or setting, and much more upon political characteristics."14 More specifically, within this second school, "what those who talk of 'populism' have in mind is a particular kind of political phenomenon where the tensions between the elite and the grass roots loom large."15

Due to their differing analytical foci, the two schools of populism yield remarkably dissimilar groupings of political


12Canovan, p.13.

13Ibid.

14Ibid., p.9.

15Ibid.
phenomena, although some overlap inevitably occurs. Each of the sub-species of populism that fall under Canovan's main headings is summarized separately below.

1. Farmers' Radicalism

Farmers' radicalism can be defined in general as an expression of political protest by an agrarian petit-bourgeoisie experiencing acute socioeconomic insecurity due to problems associated with commodity production and marketing. More specifically, historical instances of farmers' radicalism feature "a clash between a political tradition which led farmers to expect to be able to control their own destiny, and their actual economic thraldom to outside corporate and financial interests." The American People's Party and the Junker-led German agrarian movement, both of the 1890s, and the Depression-era Social Credit League and Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, rank as classic examples of farmers' radicalism. Each movement arose in times of depressed agricultural commodity prices and/or drought, and proposed substantial government intervention as a means of alleviating

\[16\text{Ibid.}\]
\[17\text{Ibid., p.100.}\]
\[18\text{Ibid., pp. 100-5. Canovan inexplicably omits from her discussion of farmers' radicalism any mention of the Canadian Progressive movement of the years 1910 to 1925. The movement would appear to represent a paradigm case of farmers' radicalism. See Paul Sharp, The Agrarian Revolt in Western Canada (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1945); and W.L. Morton, The Progressive Party in Canada (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1950).}\]
production and marketing problems. The interventionist measures that were favoured included government control of railways, grain elevators and storage, and credit. "One of the notable features of this type of populism, indeed," writes Canovan, "is that it seems invariably to include calls for extensive government intervention in the economy coming from people who own property..."19

2. Intellectual Agrarian Socialism

Examples of this sub-species of agrarian populism include the policy orientation of the Nyerere regime in Tanzania, and the ideals of the Russian narodnichestvo of the 1870s.20 Essentially a phenomenon of feudal or tribal societies in the early phases of capitalist modernization, populism of this genre seeks to pre-empt the upheaval and dislocation of the modernization process by embracing the ostensibly communal proclivities and values of the peasantry.21 While it idealizes the peasantry, however, this type of populism does not emanate from within the peasantry; rather, it springs from the minds of intellectuals. With reference to the Russian context, for example, populism was by no means "the ideology of the small producer": Russian populism "was an ideology of intellectuals oriented toward the peasantry" that drastically and naively overestimated the latter's marginally communal

19Canovan, p.104.
20Ibid., pp. 105-10.
21Ibid.
Indeed, the Russian peasants proved to be remarkably resistant to the inculcation of the utopian socialist vision that was espoused and carried to them by the idealistic narodniki. Thus, Canovan identifies a separate sub-species of agrarian populism as a means of categorizing populist movements both for, and of, the peasantry.

3. Peasant Movements

Canovan attempts to render her larger notion of agrarian populism intelligible by viewing "peasant populism" as a kind of conceptual bridge between each of the above sub-species:

[B]etween grass roots farmers' movements on the one hand and intellectual dreams of the transformation of society by the peasantry on the other, there surely lies another vast and significant category of rural radicalisms: actual grass-roots peasant movements.

As examples of such movements she points to the various peasant parties that appeared in eastern Europe shortly after the end of the First World War. Referred to collectively as "the Greens," the eastern European peasant parties were often led by peasants, or former peasants, and invariably expressed an ideological perspective that peasants could relate to and support. At the

---

[22] Ibid., p.92. For an interpretation of Russian populism as an expression of the class perspective of the small agrarian producer, see Conway, op. cit.


[25] Ibid., p.123. In passing, it is interesting to note that the leader of the Greens in Bulgaria, Alexander Stamboliski, articulated a vision of democracy that bears remarkable similarity to the democratic vision that was put forth at roughly the same
core of the Greens' ideology was a desire to preserve the ties that bound the peasantry to the land. Fearful of both industrial capitalism and state socialism, the Greens typically emphasized the sanctity of family property, and favoured small-scale rural industry over industry centralized in the cities, and voluntary cooperation over enforced collectivization.26

4. Populist Dictatorship

Populist dictatorship refers to "the familiar phenomenon of a charismatic leader who builds a dictatorship by appealing past the established elite and political system to 'the people'." Guided by the prolific scholarly literature on Latin American populism, Canovan looks to the Peron regime in Argentina for her paradigmatic instance of populist dictatorship. After his democratic election to Argentina's presidency in 1945, Peron easily overturned the country's nascent democratic structures, maintaining a dictatorial hold on power until overthrown in 1955. His ten-year dictatorship was sustained on the basis of his compelling rhetorical appeals to Argentina's lower classes, with whom he built a direct, personalistic relationship, thus rendering impotent his


27 Ibid., p.137.
enemies within the formerly powerful landed aristocracy.28

Within the North American context, the Louisiana "Kingfish," Huey Long, ranks as a characteristic populist dictator.29 Louisiana's governor from 1928 to 1932, and a Louisiana senator from 1932 until his assassination in 1935, Long established and maintained a virtually unassailable grip on the state's politics by means of promises and appeals to poor farmers and workers, and through use of bribery, patronage, and blatant thuggery.30 Secured by his "reputation as the champion of the common man," Long was able to withstand the vehement hostility with which he was regarded by the state's political and economic elites, represented "by an oligarchy of established planters and new industrialists."31

Canovan claims that Nazism and Italian Fascism can also be portrayed in a sense as manifestations of populist dictatorship. "Both Mussolini and Hitler," she points out, "made much of the fact that they were men of the people, born outside the social elite and able to articulate the interests and values of ordinary people."32 Citing the elitism inherent in both Nazism and Fascism, however, Canovan balks at categorizing them as ideal representatives of "populist" dictatorship.

28 Ibid., pp. 143-7.
29 Ibid., p.151.
31 Ibid., p.152.
32 Ibid., p.149.
5. Populist Democracy

Canovan applies the label "populist democracy" to two different kinds of political phenomena: political movements and parties which campaign for the implementation of various forms of direct democracy, and political jurisdictions which routinely employ direct democracy measures in the conduct of public affairs. Examples of the former include the U.S. People's Party and the American Progressive movement, each of which vigorously campaigned for the implementation of the referendum, the initiative, and the recall. Their support for these mechanisms "rested upon a view of politics and society according to which 'special interests' (particularly the big corporations and the corrupt politicians in their pay) tend constantly to dominate the political process to the detriment of 'the people'." By replacing representative democracy with a system synthesizing direct and delegate democracy, "the people" would be able to govern themselves without the tutelage of "professional politicians" and "party bosses," thus resulting in a more effective and responsive political decision-making process.

The political jurisdictions to which Canovan attaches the label populist democracy, based on their more or less routine use of referenda, citizens' initiatives, and recall mechanisms, include

---


34Ibid., p.178.
Switzerland and several western and mid-western American states.\textsuperscript{35}

6. Reactionary Populism

While somewhat elusive at times in attaching precise definitions to the labels of her populism sub-species, Canovan could hardly provide a more concise definition of what she calls reactionary populism:

"Populism" of this sort is an appeal to the people which deliberately opens up an embarrassing gap between "the people" and their supposedly democratic and representative elite by stressing popular values that conflict with those of the elite: typically, it involves a clash between reactionary, authoritarian, racist, or chauvinist views at the grass roots, and the progressive, liberal, tolerant cosmopolitanism characteristic of the elite.\textsuperscript{36}

She points to the policies and views espoused to great popular appeal by George Wallace and Enoch Powell during the late 1960s as characteristic expressions of reactionary populism.\textsuperscript{37}

In the wake of the passage of the Civil Rights Act by the U.S. federal government, Alabama governor George Wallace attained national notoriety and, indeed, popularity, "as a particularly outspoken opponent of desegregation."\textsuperscript{38} Upon situating himself as the political point guard of pro-segregationists, Wallace ran as an independent candidate in the 1968 presidential election, garnering

\textsuperscript{35}Ibid., pp. 192-9.

\textsuperscript{36}Ibid., p.229.

\textsuperscript{37}Ibid., pp. 226-9.

\textsuperscript{38}Ibid., p. 226.
ten million votes. "His platform of concern with racial issues, crime, traditional moral values and anti-elitism was clearly one which had considerable appeal to the mass of American voters." 39

Concurrent with Wallace's efforts to encourage grass roots–elite cleavage vis à vis the issue of desegregation was Enoch Powell's attempt to mobilize Britons against the British government's liberal immigration policy. In 1968, Powell stunned the nation's political elites "by breaking the tacit convention whereby all major parties in Britain had avoided making immigration and race political issues," 40 calling for a reduction in immigration levels and for stricter immigrant admission criteria. 41 Although his immigration policy views resulted in his dismissal from Conservative party leader Edward Heath's Shadow Cabinet, Powell's stance was enormously popular among rank and file Britons. "According to various opinion polls, he was supported by between 60 and 75 percent of the electorate - far more than any party leader could command." 42

Once again, then, reactionary populism, as embodied in the appeals made by Powell and Wallace, mobilizes reactionary sentiments among ordinary citizens against the ostensibly progressive policies and values of a political elite.

39Ibid., pp. 227-8.

40Ibid., p. 228.


42Canovan, p. 228.
7. Politicians' Populism

The last of the populism sub-species that Canovian considers, politicians' populism, encompasses a vast and seemingly disparate assortment of political phenomena, from the style and themes of Jimmy Carter's campaign for President in 1976, to the Mexican P.R.I., and the Scottish National Party. Indeed, politicians' populism seems to be a kind of residual category within Canovian's schema, a sort of conceptual haven for phenomena that scholars have at times labelled "populist," but do not seem to fit into any of Canovian's other categories. Nonetheless, in the course of her discussion of politicians' populism, Canovian provides an insightful look at some of the practical uses to which "populism" has been put by the politically opportunistic.

"Politicians' populism," states Canovian, "is a matter of political style and tactics, not of particular policy commitments."43 She lists five more or less distinct forms of politicians' populism, only one of which will be considered here. One form witnesses the attempt by a political leader to attain power by "appealing away from politics altogether."44 Populists of this genre rhetorically "denounce parties as factions and politicians as self-interested manipulators,"45 and implore "the people" to transcend partisan politics and rally behind an

43 Ibid., p. 286.
44 Ibid., p. 263.
45 Ibid.
"unpolitical leadership that will put their interest first." This generally "antipolitical" rhetorical orientation can be discerned from a look at the character of Jimmy Carter's campaign for President in 1976. Capitalizing on widespread public cynicism towards politicians in the wake of the Watergate scandal, Carter placed great emphasis during the campaign upon "truth, honesty and openness in government," and cultivated an image of himself as a political outsider, unbeholden to interest groups and above partisan politics. In articulating his substantive policy views, however, Carter evinced a strategically vague and evasive manner. As a means of appealing to both liberals and conservatives, he simultaneously espoused fiscal conservatism and progressive social policy. At the same time, Carter "rejected all ideological labels except that of 'populist,' explaining that this last epithet indicated 'that I derived my political support, my advice and my concern directly from the people themselves, not from powerful intermediaries or representatives of special-interest groups.'" He also attempted to idealize the simplicity and wholesomeness of average American citizens, and portrayed himself among the latter.

He dwelt constantly upon his home and family, the small town he lived in, his experience as a small businessman, his family farm...Even his religion - that of a "born-again" Southern Baptist, which seemed so exotically archaic to the reporters - helped to confirm his image as an ordinary, decent American who was not too clever to

---

46 Ibid., p. 265.
47 Ibid., pp. 269 - 73.
48 Ibid., 270.
49 Ibid., p. 271.
believe in God.\textsuperscript{50}

Thus, to summarize very briefly, the form of politicians' populism exemplified by the character of Carter's campaign witnesses the strategic use of "antipolitical" and more or less ideologically-neutral populist rhetorical themes and appeals.

Having thus set forth the salient characteristics of Canovan's populism sub-species, the analysis will now turn to the matter of fitting the Reform Party's "populism" into Canovan's typology. The subsequent analysis begins with a specification of the categories that the party would not appear to fall within.

II. What the Reform Party is Not

Of all of Canovan's populism sub-species, the three forms of populism that fall under the heading "agrarian populism" would appear to provide the least appropriate means of characterizing the Reform Party's ostensibly "populist" nature. The party, first of all, obviously cannot be categorized as a manifestation of peasants' populism, given the fact that Canada possesses no identifiable peasantry. Nor can it be cited as an example of intellectual agrarian socialism: whatever it is that the party idealizes, it is certainly not an indigenous peasantry, fictitious or otherwise. Finally, the applicability of Canovan's conception of farmers' radicalism to a characterization of the Reform Party's populism would appear to be compromised by the general orientation

\textsuperscript{50}Ibid., p.272.
of the party’s agricultural policy. Party policy favours "a shift from a government-supported agricultural industry to an industry shaped by the free operation of comparative advantage between regions and commodities, free entry into all sectors of production and marketing, and free trade on a global basis."\(^5\) In general, the party’s agricultural policy rejects the kinds of interventionist mechanisms favoured by radical farmers’ movements, and leans markedly towards the interests of consumers over the interests of agricultural producers. The party’s consumer-oriented agricultural policy can be partially explained via reference to the socioeconomic composition of the party’s membership. Summarizing the results of a 1989 survey of 5,000 party members, Peter McCormick writes,

The largest single [socioeconomic] category was "retired" - accounting for 38.4 percent of the respondents. Another 41.3 percent were clearly middle class (small business 16.7 percent, professional 15.75 percent and management 8.9 percent), 9.5 percent were homemakers and only 4.7 percent identified themselves as involved in labour or trade. Striking by its absence is the agricultural sector; on this profile, the party emerges as solidly urban middle class and not a rural phenomenon at all.\(^5\)

Of Canovan’s political populism sub-species, populist dictatorship may also be summarily rejected as a means of conceptualizing the nature of the Reform Party’s populism. To be sure, as will be discussed below, the party’s leadership has displayed an autocratic tendency in its efforts to control the


party’s membership and policy-making processes, and has attempted
to gain power "by appealing past the established elite... to 'the
people.'" However, it has not given any indication that it wishes
to subvert Canada’s democratic political institutions with a view
to the creation of a dictatorship, and thus cannot be accurately
categorized alongside Peron, Long, Hitler and Mussolini.

Reference to Canovan’s conception of populist democracy would
appear to provide a somewhat more encouraging means of lending
substance to the notion that the Reform Party is a populist party.
Indeed, since its inception in 1987, the Reform Party has
distinguished itself as a vocal proponent of direct legislation,
calling for binding referenda and voters’ initiatives. The party’s
policy book states,

The Reform Party supports the mechanism of binding
referendums on the current government of Canada by a
simple majority vote of the electorate, including a
simple majority in at least two-thirds of the Provinces
(including the territories).

Further,

The Reform Party supports voters’ initiatives by way of
a referendum, if three percent (3%) or more of the
eligible voters of Canada sign a petition to the Chief
Electoral Officer requesting that a question or
legislative proposal be put before the people. Such a
question or legislative proposal should be placed on the
ballot at the subsequent federal general election.

The party has also emphasized the need to "break the back of party
discipline" in the House of Commons, and thus render Members of

53 Canovan, p.137.

54 Reform Party of Canada, Blue Sheet: Principles and Policies
and Election Platform (Reform Fund Canada, 1993), p.3.

55 Ibid.
Parliament more accountable to their constituents. The policy book states that the party "supports the principle of allowing constituents a recall procedure against an M.P. they feel has violated his/her oath of office." Party policy also calls for amendments to Parliamentary procedure concerning the circumstances in which a government may be defeated in the House.

We believe that the defeat of a government measure in the House of Commons should not automatically mean the defeat of the government. Defeat of a government motion should be followed by a formal motion of non-confidence, the passage of which would require either the resignation of the government or dissolution of the House for a general election.

This procedure thus strips the government of the capability to threaten to dissolve Parliament as a means of forcing its backbench M.P.s to vote in favour of government measures notwithstanding the views on such measures held by backbench M.P.s' constituents.

Thus, insofar as it clearly embraces forms of direct legislation, such as referenda and voters' initiatives, and espouses means of enhancing the people's control of their elected representatives by means of such mechanisms as recall and freer votes in the House of Commons, the Reform Party appears to manifest what Canovan refers to as populist democracy. Before definitively

56 Reform Party of Canada, So You Don't Trust Politicians? Neither Do We. (Reform Fund Canada, 1993).

57 Blue Sheet, p. 3.

58 Ibid.

59 Ibid.

60 See Tom Flanagan and Martha Lee, "The Roots of Reform." A paper prepared for presentation to the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, Charlottetown, P.E.I., June
locating the party conceptually alongside the Populists and the Progressives, however, it is perhaps relevant to consider whether the party to date has conducted its internal affairs in a manner that would appear to conform to the spirit in which the earlier movements campaigned for the implementation of direct democracy. As stated earlier, the Populists and the American and western Canadian Progressive movements predicated their case for direct democracy upon a desire to wrest control of the political decision-making process away from party bosses and political professionals and vest such control in "the people." 61

In light of the party's militant support for direct democracy, one might reasonably expect the party's decision-making and policy-making processes to be firmly ensconced in the hands of the party's rank and file membership. Indeed, the party's leadership and spokespersons have gone to great lengths in attempting to solidify the party's public image as a party that is driven and directed by its membership. However, despite its image as "a bottom-up populist party," 62 as Manning characterized it during the recent election campaign, there is substantial evidence to suggest that the Reform Party is controlled to a large extent by the party's leadership, as embodied in Preston Manning and other prominent


members of what dissidents within the party have referred to as the "Calgary Clique."  

Notwithstanding Manning's public crusade against "professional politicians" and the organizational methods of Canada's "old-line" parties, the party's head office in Calgary has not been hesitant to retain the services of political professionals, nor has it refrained from employing organizational tactics and devices that are characteristic of Canada's old-line parties. As Sidney Sharpe and Don Braid point out, atop the grass roots sits a modern political apparatus that operates out of the party's headquarters on 4th Avenue Southwest in Calgary. Nearly every day, computer operators open sacks of mail and pour out new membership applications, each with $10 enclosed. By fall of 1991 the party had launched a major drive for corporate donations, headed by Reform chairman Cliff Fryers; hired Frank Luntz, a Republican pollster and campaign planner who used to work in Ronald Reagan's White House; engaged national pollsters; and signed Hayhurst Communications, a sharp Calgary-based advertising firm, to sell its image. Meanwhile, the party's fund raising vehicle, Reform Fund Canada, "is exactly the same as the PC Canada Fund," to quote Manning. From the Liberals the Reform Party has appropriated Rick Anderson, who served as a senior director of the party's recent election campaign. At the time of his defection to the Reform Party from the Liberals in 1991, Anderson was the general manager of the prominent Ottawa-based lobbying firm Hill and Knowlton. Prior to his defection, Anderson had served as an organizer for several

---

64Sharpe and Braid, p. 8.
65Ibid., p. 9.
noteworthy Liberal Party figures, including former leader John Turner, present finance minister Paul Martin Jr., and Donald Johnston.66

From its headquarters in Calgary the Reform Party hierarchy has exercised control over much more than day-to-day administration of party affairs. The members of the Calgary Clique, the most prominent of which include Manning, party chairman Cliff Fryers, and former Chief Policy Officer and current M.P. for Calgary West Stephen Harper, have exercised considerable control over the party's policy agenda, as well as over the party's membership. In one of the very few in-depth works that have been published to date on the formation and development of the Reform Party, Murray Dobbin provides an intriguing account of how the party's Calgary-based hierarchy has dominated the party's membership and policy-making processes.

An impression of the hierarchy's somewhat domineering and manipulative proclivities can be gleaned from a look at the policy-making process that culminated in the adoption of the party's current policy book at the 1991 Assembly. According to Dobbin,

There were, in Harper's words, "two channels" through which policy reached the 1991 Assembly: local riding associations and the Party Policy Committee.67 These two streams of policies were then screened by the Party


67Appointed by the party's Executive Council, the PPC consisted of fourteen members, and was presided over by Manning and Harper. Murray Dobbin, Preston Manning and the Reform Party (Halifax: Formac Publishing Co. Ltd., 1992), p. 147.
Policy Committee and reduced to 159, eighty-eight from the constituency associations and seventy-one from the committee itself...These 159 resolutions, assembled in an "Exposure Draft," were sent to each constituency which was then expected to vote on them and submit the results to the committee.68

Upon tabulating the results, the PPC prepared a set of sixty resolutions to be voted on at the Assembly. The set ostensibly consisted of the resolutions which garnered most favour at the constituency level.69

"Of those final sixty resolutions," Dobbin claims, "just seven had originated with the constituencies."70 This result, he argues, would appear to have been engineered by the Party Policy Committee:

The Exposure Draft itself was heavily loaded in favour of the policies put forward by the Party Policy Committee. Resolutions were ordered according to policy area. In most policy areas there were two resolutions to choose from - usually one from the party and one from a constituency. But in fifty instances, only party resolutions were available for discussion...The structure of the draft also reinforced the authority of the committee's resolutions. Following the text of competing resolutions was a section called "Rationale." Most of the constituency resolutions had not come with an accompanying rationale, so for these resolutions the category was followed by the word "None" - a subtle hint that perhaps the policy had not been well thought out. In every case, the competing party resolution had a detailed rationale. Following that was the "Party Policy Committee's Remarks," most often criticizing the competing constituency resolution and making a recommendation on which resolution to support.71

The Party Policy Committee, evidently disdainful of the ideas emanating from the grass roots, recommended all but four of its own
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resolutions, and counselled members to reject all but two constituency resolutions.\textsuperscript{72}

At the Assembly itself Manning and Harper kept firm control of debate on the policy resolutions that were presented to the assembled delegates. In addressing policy resolutions, individual delegates who attempted to speak any longer than two minutes had their microphones automatically switched off. Manning and Harper, meanwhile, exercised extraordinary speaking privileges.

Throughout the policy discussions either Preston Manning or Stephen Harper were at the head table at the front of the meeting hall. They were permitted by the assembly chairman to intervene at any time and to speak to resolutions before any discussion from the floor had taken place.\textsuperscript{73}

Further evidence of elite-level manipulation of the grass roots can be discerned by way of reference to the leadership's use and abuse of party task forces. In the spring of 1990, the Party Policy Committee began to appoint a series of policy task forces, which were to explore and report on given policy issues as a means of guiding the PPC in its efforts to formulate resolutions for the pre-Assembly Exposure Draft.\textsuperscript{74} The task forces were composed of rank and file party members, and were publicly touted by the leadership as giving voice to the grass roots in the policy-making process.\textsuperscript{75} The task forces ultimately proved, however, to be somewhat less than idyllic manifestations of grass roots policy-
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making, as revealed by the terms of a leaked internal party memorandum. The memo in question, signed by the party’s policy development coordinator but drafted by Manning, was released to the press in November 1990 by disgruntled Manitoba party officials.76 Addressed to members of the Executive Council, the memo expressed the leadership’s dissatisfaction with the "unorthodox" ideas emanating from task force discussions.77 "The key problem, as described in the memo, was that ‘the Chairperson does not control the policy direction of the task force but rather acts as a facilitator and feels obligated to incorporate all views expressed by the task force members.’"78 Henceforth, individuals chosen from the PPC were to preside directly over policy discussions. The individuals who would lead discussions were to be in "100-percent agreement with existing party policy," and were to possess the capacity to "manage an idea."79

Indeed, the leadership has continuously demonstrated little tolerance of dissent or deviation from the party line from among those beneath it. In the summer of 1992, the hand of the leadership fell heavily on a group of Toronto party officials who deigned to criticize the Executive Council for allegedly "exerting too much control over the appointment of Ontario regional co-
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ordinators."80 The officials in question were subsequently reprimanded by party Chairman Cliff Fryers via letter. "Those who continued to criticize Reform's head office, Fryers warned, 'will become marginalized within the party and the constituencies involved will find the leader unavailable to them'."81 Fryers was also prominent in enforcing internal party unity during the recent election campaign in attempting to make senior campaign organizers sign loyalty oaths.82 "The oaths," according to the Globe and Mail, "were meant to prevent a repetition of the internal dissension that divided Reform during the referendum campaign on the Charlottetown accord..."83 The dissension was caused by Manning's appointment of Rick Anderson as an advisor to the leadership. Anderson's appointment was vehemently opposed by the party's director of policy, strategy and communications Tom Flanagan, "who viewed Anderson as too much of an Ottawa insider."84 In July 1993, Flanagan was unilaterally fired by Manning after Flanagan's refusal to pledge to muzzle his concerns about Anderson's appointment.85

The party's policy book contains an ingenious device for the enforcement of unity among Reform Party Members of Parliament. Notwithstanding its provisions calling for freer votes and the
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85 Ibid., and Cernitig, "The Paradox of Manning."
implementation of a recall mechanism, the policy book states that votes within caucus will "always [be] made public." As Dobbin points out, the publication of caucus votes will "actually [lessen] caucus democracy. In other parties, caucus votes are secret. Reform M.P.s faced with publicly disagreeing with their leader might think twice about such an action." The leadership has evidently taken other steps to help ensure caucus solidarity. The party's candidate recruitment process, devised largely by Manning, requires potential candidates to answer an extensive forty-page questionnaire, which includes an "orthodoxy check." "Each candidate is required to answer 'agree, disagree or modify', to every policy in the Blue Book." Prospective candidates must submit the completed questionnaire to Constituency Nominating Committees. The latter, upon interviewing aspiring candidates, are to advise the aspirants on whether they should contest candidate nominations. Those who are advised not to run are nonetheless free to do so, although their chances of winning are reduced by the committees' circulation of "a list of 'recommended candidates' to party members."

The evidence cited above would thus appear to question the efficacy of specifying the nature of the Reform Party's populism by
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way of reference to Canovan’s notion of populist democracy. The party’s espousal of direct democracy rings hollow in light of the leadership’s apparent attempt to manage the party’s affairs and membership in a manner that is fundamentally incongruent with the basic essence of populist democracy, which entrusts ordinary citizens with ultimate power in determining the substance of policy without the tutelage of political elites, and gives "the people" the power to control their elected representatives, rather than vice versa.

Having eliminated the first five of Canovan’s populism sub-species as appropriate means of delineating and conceptualizing the nature of the Reform Party’s populism, we are left to consider the applicability of politicians’ populism and reactionary populism.

III. The Reform Party, Politicians’ Populism and Reactionary Populism

...there is such a thing as "the common sense of the common people," and if a politician, a party or a government can tap into it and harness that power to the formulation and implementation of public policy, there is no more potent political force on the face of the earth."\(^{91}\)

Preston Manning

The...problem is that when you seek input from the bottom up, often the ideas are simple and low quality, or just slogans. They need a lot of fleshing out. But if people feel you’re listening to them, they’ll have faith in you, and then they’ll be very open to what you’re trying to

Stephen Harper

The quotations above betray a kind of instrumentalist view of the grass roots. It is a view that embraces the grass roots not out of idealism, or recognition of the intrinsic merit of doing so. Rather, it is a view that perceives the mobilization of the grass roots as a means to an end.

Preston Manning has not always been a grass roots politician, or, rather, has not always played the role of a grass roots politician. Viewing his political career as a whole, dating from his initial involvement in politics as a policy advisor to Alberta's Social Credit government during the late 1960s, one sees that Manning's engagement in grass roots, or "populist," politics emerges as a relatively recent endeavour.

According to Murray Dobbin, the Reform Party represents Manning's third major attempt at launching a new political party of the right. His first two attempts, carried out in collaboration with his father Ernest, Alberta's premier from 1943 to 1968, were largely secretive, elite-oriented affairs, apparently conducted with little pretext of popular mobilization or support.93

The first attempt occurred just prior to Ernest Manning's
retirement as premier in 1968. Under the aegis of an organization called the National Public Affairs Research Foundation, launched in secret by Ernest Manning in 1965 with the financial support of a group of corporate executives, Preston Manning and a small corps of researchers set to work at developing the principles of a political philosophy that the Mannings hoped would stem what they perceived as the rising tide of collectivism in Canada. The end result of their work was a political philosophy called "social conservatism," which proposed to "employ the tenets of free enterprise and the energy of entrepreneurs to solve the social problems to which socialists normally turned their efforts - and, to Preston Manning's mind, turned to the disadvantage of conservatives..." Social conservatism envisioned a society in which the free enterprise, capitalist system would remain fundamentally intact, while the need for collectivist, bureaucratically-administered social programs would be averted by means of the pursuit of social policy goals through private institutions, to which the administration of social programs would be contracted-out by the government. The social conservative philosophy, and the organizational means by which the Mannings hoped to give it life, were revealed in a short tract entitled Political Realignment: A Challenge to Thoughtful Canadians. In their book the Mannings called for "a national merger of Social Credit and Conservative forces with those of right-wing Liberals," to be accomplished
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through a reconstituted Progressive Conservative Party. The reconstructed party was to be "based on clearly defined social conservative ideals and principles." The process of reconstruction, however, was to be a top-down process. "Key Progressive Conservative leaders and supporters" were to launch the undertaking by establishing a committee, which would "prepare the formal statement of ideals and principles" of the reconstituted party. The new party, furthermore, was to be backed by "a modernized, responsible, national political party organization," which would employ "the latest scientific and organizational developments in the performance of its functions." At no point did the Mannings explain what the role of the grass roots would be in the new party. Indeed, Political Realignment harbours little, if any, populist rhetoric.

The Mannings' vision of a reconstituted Progressive Conservative Party never materialized. Their proposals were ignored by the Conservative establishment. Ten years later, however, the Mannings made a second attempt at launching a new conservative political party. In 1978, after holding a series of discussions with a small group of Western M.P.s, the Mannings
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formed an organization called the Movement For National Political Change. "The formation of the Movement," writes Dobbin, "first came to the attention of the media in September, 1978, when the organization produced a statement of its objectives." The Movement, he claims, "was a very private, if not secretive, organization." According to Preston Manning, who was executive director of the MNPC, the organization had a mailing list of "a core of between 250 and 300 people across the country. Some of these people," said Manning without elaborating, "are plugged into different groups." 

In its published statement, the Movement proposed to "either radically transform one of the existing federal political parties or produce a viable new political party capable of replacing one of the existing entities." According to Dobbin, the Movement's conception of "'a viable new political party' referred to a new conservative party of the right." 

The Movement ultimately failed to attain the one-thousand or so members that it hoped would eventually assemble for a national convention, and evidently died soon after its inception. Dobbin suggests that while the circumstances surrounding the Movement's
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death are somewhat hazy, it is probable that the Movement was an indirect victim of the National Energy Program and the early-1980s recession, each of which delivered a crippling blow to the Movement's "principal figures and financial backers," consisting largely of individuals representing the western Canadian energy resource industry.\textsuperscript{109}

Manning's appeal to the grass roots in helping him to build the Reform Party would thus appear to stand in stark contrast to his earlier efforts at forming conservative political movements. His earlier efforts scarcely permitted popular scrutiny let alone popular participation, and thus lend evidence to the notion that Manning's apparently grass roots, or "populist," approach in building the Reform Party is a kind of tactical manoeuvre, a means to the end of establishing what Dobbin and others claim Manning has wanted all along: a new conservative political party.\textsuperscript{110}

If Manning's "populism," then, is tactical in nature, it is conceivable that what we are dealing with is politicians' populism. Indeed, as the following discussion will show, Manning has appropriated many of the populist rhetorical themes and devices that Jimmy Carter employed so successfully during the 1976 Presidential election campaign.

Like Carter before him, Manning has attempted to capitalize on

\textsuperscript{109} Ibid., p. 87.
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acute public cynicism towards politicians by rhetorically
castigating the Canadian political establishment. Taking advantage
of widespread public distrust of Canada's political elites in the
wake of the Mulroney government's imposition of the Goods and
Services Tax and the failure of the government's elite-oriented,
backroom approach to the constitutional amendment process, as
embodied in the Quebec round of negotiations, "Manning has
successfully cultivated an anti-politician image." In his
appeals to a politically disenchanted public, Manning has attacked
with great regularity Canada's "old-line" politicians and parties,
and their "top-down" methods. His anti-politician rhetoric was
prominently displayed right from the outset of the recent election
campaign. During the early stages of the campaign Manning
emphasized the slogan "Let the People Speak," which apparently
symbolized his intention "to let the public say first what they
consider important rather than having the politicians tell them
what this election is about." While certainly unique, Manning's
appeal came across as somewhat odd, in light of the fact that his
party's election platform, which placed special emphasis upon
fiscal, justice, and parliamentary reforms - the very issues
that the party focused upon more or less throughout the campaign.
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was published almost ten months prior to the election. Meanwhile, on the nightly news during the campaign, Manning could be seen flaunting a Reform Party pamphlet, the cover of which brazenly stated, "So You Don’t Trust Politicians? Neither Do We." He also emphasized the need for restrictions on M.P.’s pension benefits and for the elimination of various perquisites enjoyed by parliamentarians at taxpayers’ expense.

Manning would also appear to follow Carter in terms of his espousal of "the common sense of the common people," and his attempt to portray himself as among the latter. Like Carter, Manning reveals himself to be an average, frugal, hard-working citizen, who, furthermore, "is not too clever to believe in God." In fact, Manning is alone among Canada’s federal party leaders in proposing to re-introduce a "spiritual dimension" to public life, claiming that "faith in the existence of God is still part of the worldview of the common people." He intends to apply his faith to politics not by imposing upon the Canadian public an explicitly religion-inspired agenda, but by "working Christianly with the urgent or existing public agenda." This ostensibly entails the pursuit of societal peace and harmony.
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through mediation and reconciliation.Indeed, worthy political leaders must be skilled at mediation and recociliation, he argues, "for the harmonization and reconciliation of conflicting interests...is at the heart of contemporary politics.""20

Manning evidently derives great pride from his own mediation skills,"2" as revealed during the English-language leaders' debate that was held prior to the election. Instead of engaging in debate Manning tried to moderate debate, calmly asking the other leaders to state or clarify their respective positions on certain issues, often without revealing his own position on such issues. At the same time, Manning's moderator role during the debate created the impression that he was somehow above partisanship and ideological squabbling, an impression that served to underscore yet another facet of Manning's non-political appeal. Not unlike Carter, who refused to be classified as either liberal or conservative and attempted to appeal to people of all ideological stripes by proclaiming himself a "populist," Manning argues that his vision of a "New Canada" is neither left nor right,"2 and that the party that he leads is a potential political home for people of diverse past partisan affiliations, from Conservatives to New Democrats."23 For, as he put it during the campaign, "the most
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fundamental thing about the Reform Party is that it's a populist party."

In several respects, then, Manning's political style and rhetoric would appear to manifest the form of politicians' populism which Canovan discerns from Jimmy Carter's 1976 Presidential campaign. However, there is, of course, much more to the Reform Party's populism than Manning's anti-political rhetorical appeal. We have yet to consider whether Canovan's notion of reactionary populism is a sensible characterization of the Reform Party's populism. The balance of the analysis will attempt to do so.

It will be recalled that reactionary populism witnesses "a clash between reactionary, authoritarian, racist, or chauvinist views at the grass roots, and the progressive, liberal, tolerant cosmopolitanism characteristic of the elite." To describe it even more succinctly, reactionary populism may be construed as a form of grass roots backlash against the pluralist ideals embraced by a political elite. The Reform Party would appear in a certain fundamental sense to represent just such a backlash, as embodied in the party's stark opposition to the pursuit by successive federal governments since the late 1960s, roughly, of policies which have served to enhance the pluralist character of Canadian society.
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Among such policies, Reformers have focused their wrath upon federal bilingualism, multiculturalism, and immigration policy.\textsuperscript{127} The terms of the party's opposition to federal policy within these three areas of concern, as expressed in the party's official policy book, are outlined immediately below. The analysis will then move on to reveal the latent intolerance which appears to underpin the party's aversion towards federal bilingualism, multiculturalism, and immigration policy initiatives, and thus bring the party's reactionary populist character to light.

As enunciated in the party's most recent comprehensive policy statement, \textit{The Blue Book, 1991}, the party's opposition to federal bilingualism, multiculturalism, and immigration policy is expressed for the most part with moderation and with little indication of underlying intolerance. With reference to official bilingualism, for example, as embodied in the Official Languages Acts of 1969 and 1988, and in sections 16 to 22 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the party registers its opposition by claiming that "comprehensive language legislation, whether in the nature of enforced bilingualism or unilingualism," constitutes an infringement of freedom of speech.\textsuperscript{128} Party policy also rejects the "two founding peoples" view of Confederation - ostensibly one of the key underpinnings of official languages legislation - "as an

\textsuperscript{127}For a different view of how Reform Party policy in these areas can be invoked as a means of characterizing the party's populism, see Patten, op. cit., pp. 23-5.
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inappropriate description of the regions outside Central Canada, [and] as unfair to the vast majority of unilingual Canadians..."129 At the same time, the party "in no way discourages personal bilingualism."130

The central statement of party policy regarding multiculturalism reads as follows:

The Reform Party of Canada opposes the current concept of multiculturalism and hyphenated Canadianism pursued by the Government of Canada. We would end funding of the multiculturalism program and support the abolition of the Department of Multiculturalism.131

Depending on one's interpretation, this evidently blunt policy statement, with its attack on "hyphenated Canadianism," may be taken as an expression of intolerance of ethnic diversity, or, if you like, as an expression of racism. "Assimilationist," however, is perhaps a better descriptive term. As Peter McCormick posits, assimilationism is "less aggressive than racism (in that if 'they' stay over 'there' there is no problem) and less vicious (if 'they' come here, 'they' should be willing to become like 'us')."132 Nonetheless, the apparent assimilationist thrust of the policy would appear to be softened somewhat by the policy statement which precedes it in the policy book:
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The Reform Party supports the principle that individuals or groups are free to preserve their cultural heritage using their own resources. The Party shall uphold their right to do so.\textsuperscript{133}

Thus, the party's opposition to official multiculturalism emerges in part as a means of expenditure reduction, which appears to sit well with the party's overall fiscally conservative agenda.\textsuperscript{134}

Unlike federal immigration policy, which, for the last two decades or so has reflected a "mixture of compassion and pragmatism,"\textsuperscript{135} Reform Party immigration policy appears to evince a predominantly pragmatic orientation.

The Reform Party supports an immigration policy which would be essentially economic in nature. Immigrants should possess the human capital necessary to adjust quickly and independently to the needs of Canadian society and the job market.\textsuperscript{136}

Family class immigration, which provided almost half of all immigrants to Canada during the 1980s,\textsuperscript{137} would presumably be curtailed by "restricting sponsorship privileges to members of immediate families, that is, wives or husbands, minor dependent children, and aged dependent parents."\textsuperscript{138} Family members who do
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not fall within these categories would have to apply for immigration as independents, and thus be subject to the "human capital" criterion.\textsuperscript{139}

As outlined skeletally above, the Reform Party's proposed changes to federal policy in the areas of bilingualism, multiculturalism and immigration come across in a relatively benign and moderate manner. In and of themselves, they appear to betray little in the way of intolerance or chauvinism. However, upon a more detailed consideration of the implications of such changes and of what they appear to represent or symbolize within Reform Party circles, a different view emerges.

An examination of some of the views and policies that have been espoused by various notable groups and individuals who have publicly supported, or possess ties to, the Reform Party begins, if only tentatively, to provide one with a much less flattering perspective on what it is that the party's opposition to federal bilingualism, multiculturalism, and immigration policy may be predicated upon.

One of the more prominent and, indeed, controversial individuals associated with the Reform Party, Bill Gairdner, claims that through its bilingualism, multiculturalism, and immigration policies the federal government has willingly perpetrated, as a chapter heading in Gairdner's polemical work \textit{The Trouble With}
Canada reads, "The Silent Destruction of English Canada." A Reform Party member, Gairdner "was one of the key-note speakers at the Reform Party's 1991 Assembly, and has been featured at many of the party's rallies in Ontario." The 1991 Assembly evidently provided Gairdner with an audience that was enormously receptive to his views, for as Dobbin testifies, "hundreds of [delegates] lined up to buy [his book] and to have it autographed."

In his book Gairdner interprets federal bilingualism initiatives as means by which federal political elites have attempted to implement a "master plan for the francization of Canada." At the same time, he argues that federal multiculturalism has sown seeds of national disunity by emphasizing and promoting cultural differences among Canadians. Instead, Canada needs "to find a national cultural system that works; then to encourage everyone to assimilate to it, thus gradually losing their prior differences. The English culture and system of government have been just such a solution, as Canada's peaceful development until very recently attests." As for federal immigration policy, Gairdner laments the decision by the Pearson government in 1967 to introduce the "points system" of immigrant
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admission, from which the previous system's ethnic and racial criteria were purged.\textsuperscript{146} Citing figures which indicate that a large majority of Canadians believe that immigration policy should serve to preserve Canada’s current ethnocultural composition,\textsuperscript{147} he calls for the replacement of Canada’s present "universal" immigration system by a variant of the old "control" system that was shelved in 1967.

After all, surely any nation has the right to defend itself against demographic capture, or, if you prefer, against passive racial or cultural take-over. One way I can think of to stop it is to use quotas: any year’s crop of immigrants must reflect the current racial, cultural, and religious composition of the nation. We currently have 1 percent Chinese? Then only 1 percent of the immigrants can be Chinese. Now, I don’t like quotas for anything, but in the face of outsiders determining the fate of our nation by numerically overwhelming a "neutral" selection system, I’d use them. I might even argue that we should use them to redress the present trend. Otherwise, we may become subordinated to people and cultures unlike our own through reliance on a system designed to eliminate cultural bias.\textsuperscript{148}

By the "present trend" Gairdner refers to the rapid post-1968 increase in immigration from "non-traditional" sources as a percentage of total annual immigration. Non-traditional sources include all sources outside of Europe, the United States, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa.\textsuperscript{149}

Also numbered among the more extremist Reform Party
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"connections," as Dobbin refers to them, are the Northern Foundation, the Alliance for the Preservation of English in Canada (APEC), and the Heritage Front.\textsuperscript{150}

Although officially non-partisan, the Northern Foundation offers free advertising space in its quarterly publication to "conservative" organizations such as the Reform Party (the party has, in fact, taken advantage of such space).\textsuperscript{151} Link Byfield, the publisher of the staunchly pro-Reform Party Report newsmagazines, is a director of the Foundation.\textsuperscript{152} John Carpay represents another link between the party and the Foundation. The current Reform Party M.P. for Burnaby-Kingsway, Carpay is a former editor of the Foundation's quarterly publication.\textsuperscript{153}

The Foundation claims that "common-sense Canadians" are found in three groups: "economic conservatives, moral conservatives, and social conservatives" who appreciate "Canada's British and Christian heritage and oppose forced bilingualism, destabilizing immigration policies and government-promoted official multiculturalism."\textsuperscript{154}

Like the Northern Foundation, Ontario-based APEC is not officially linked to the Reform Party.\textsuperscript{155} Nonetheless,
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significant informal ties exist. According to Dobbin, despite the Reform Party hierarchy's disavowal of APEC, "Reform Party headquarters, and more specifically Preston Manning, were willing to allow Apec people to occupy key posts in its Ontario organization at its most sensitive, early stages." APEC members have also made their presence felt within Party circles on Vancouver Island. Members of the organization have been elected to sit on several Vancouver Island constituency executives. One such member, Bill Rumley, who was elected to serve as president of the party's Esquimalt- Juan de Fuca riding association in 1991, goes so far as to claim that "most Reform Party of Canada members in B.C. also belong to APEC."  

As one might surmise in light of its name, APEC, like the Reform Party, opposes official bilingualism. "Both call for a language policy based on freedom of speech and reject any comprehensive language policy; both call for an end to bilingual criteria in the federal civil service." Each organization also takes the position that the right to communicate in French within Canada's governing institutions should essentially extend no further than the terms of section 133 of the Constitution Act, 1867. Their respective policy stances appear to differ
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primarily in terms of the way in which each approaches the on-going Canada-Quebec constitutional crisis. The Reform Party's position on this issue will be dealt with later on in the analysis. For the moment, it is perhaps sufficient to say that the party takes a somewhat less inflammatory and blatantly confrontational stand vis-à-vis Quebec than APEC does. Like the Reform Party, APEC asserts that Quebec should not be granted special constitutional status within Confederation. APEC, however, declares that should Quebec leave Confederation, as it undoubtedly would if confronted by a federal linguistic and constitutional regime in accordance with APEC's policies, the province would be very much reduced from its current territory. APEC's separate Quebec would be deprived of the huge northern area that was once part of Rupert's Land; would be obliged to provide a "corridor of sovereignty" between Ontario and the Atlantic provinces; and would be obliged to allow "regional referenda" on separation in eastern and western Quebec and other smaller areas. APEC quotes Section 42(1) of the Constitution Act (1982) to back its claim that Canada has the right to partition Quebec.

Indeed, APEC's chairman, James Morrison, goes so far as to claim that Quebec "should not be allowed to separate...The use of force in defence of the Constitution is legitimate self-defence."

Quebec; and both those Languages shall be used in the respective Records and Journals of those Houses; and either of those Languages may be used by any Person or in any Pleading or Process in or issuing from any Court of Canada established under this Act, and in or from all or any of the Courts of Quebec. The Acts of the Parliament of Canada and of the Legislature of Quebec shall be printed and published in both those Languages.
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The Heritage Front is perhaps the most extreme organization to publicly endorse the Reform Party, which, in the words of the Front's leader, has "given us some hope." The organization has as its goal an "all-white Canada," claiming that white people are "the most precious force on this planet." Dobbin quotes the Front's leader, Wolfgang Droege, as follows: "We believe that eventually white people will become a minority in this country because of our immigration policies...We are racial nationalists working for the interests of whites everywhere."

A look at some of the extremist policies and programs that have been put forth by various groups and individuals who have publicly supported or have been associated with the Reform Party thus creates the impression that the party's opposition to federal bilingualism, multiculturalism and immigration policy represents, to some degree, an appeal to reactionary sentiment. To be fair, the Reform Party hierarchy has gone to some lengths in publicly distancing the party from certain of the above, as well as other, extremist groups and individuals. Perhaps the most that one can say with reasonable certainty is that extremists have been attracted to the party due to its opposition to aspects of federal bilingualism, multiculturalism and immigration policy. To go any further than this requires a more in-depth look at Reform Party policy in these areas. The party's immigration policy will be
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reconsidered first.

During the election campaign the party’s immigration policy generated considerable controversy, some of which would appear to have been deliberately caused by Manning himself. Amidst discussion of immigration issues during the English-language party leaders’ debate, for example, Manning made a special effort to distinguish his party’s policy from the respective policies of the other parties as far as how many immigrants Canada should admit on an annual basis. With some coaxing from Manning, each of the other leaders expressed their parties’ support for the current annual immigration figure, which stands at approximately 250,000. Manning, in turn, stated that the Canadian economy could not accommodate 250,000 immigrants per year, calling for the annual total to be reduced to 150,000. Following Manning’s performance, the party’s immigration policy, which, it will be recalled, "has as its focus Canada’s economic needs," became the target of harsh criticism for its "unspoken insinuation that most immigrants are a drain on the economy." The criticism intensified with the publication, within about a week and a half of the leaders’ debate, of extreme immigration policy statements that were made by two Reform Party candidates. The party’s candidate in York Center, John Beck, stated on CBC television that immigrants were "overpowering," and were "taking jobs away from us, the Gentile
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Meanwhile, the party’s Capilano-Howe Sound nominee, Herb Grubel, was reputed to have posited at an all-candidates debate that "over the past 15 years immigrants have been a net drain to the Canadian economy."\(^{169}\)

According to John Conway, a professor of sociology at the University of Regina and a well-known observer of populist movements, the Reform Party’s immigration policy "is intended to appeal to those who are concerned about the increase in Third World immigration. Of course, [Reformers] can’t say that, but they clearly imply that when they talk about the first criterion being an economic one."\(^{170}\) Indeed, it is quite conceivable that if it were to be implemented, the party’s immigration policy would serve to reduce immigration from the developing world as a proportion of total immigration. Once again, under a Reform Party government, immigrants would be selected on the basis of whether they "possess the human capital necessary to adjust quickly and independently to the needs of Canadian society and the job market."\(^{171}\) It takes no great leap of the imagination to come up with the notion that the individuals who will most likely "possess the human capital necessary to adjust quickly and independently" will hail from societies and cultures which most closely resemble Canadian society.


\(^{170}\)Cited in Sharpe and Braid, p. 127.

\(^{171}\)The Blue Book, 1991, p. 34.
and culture. While there are, of course, many dissimilarities between Canadian society and culture and those of the so-called traditional sources of immigration, which include Europe, the United States, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, these would seem very few, indeed, when compared to the societal and cultural differences which lie between Canada and the many and diverse nations of the developing world. Thus, basic reasoning allows one to infer that individuals from the latter would stand a lesser chance of acquiring what it takes to "adjust quickly and independently" than individuals from the traditional sources of immigration. To be sure, in order to qualify as an independent-class immigrant under current federal immigration guidelines, candidates must meet certain "human capital" criteria in terms of "job-related skills, age, language skills, and education." However, unlike Reform Party policy, federal policy places greater emphasis on family reunification. Such an emphasis serves to encourage immigration among qualified candidates from developing countries and other non-traditional sources, such as Hong Kong and Taiwan, since such candidates are given the opportunity to remain with their families - no small incentive in light of the importance of kinship and collective responsibility among family members to many cultures, especially South and East Asian cultures, which lie outside the orbit of traditional immigration sources. In contrast, with its much stricter limitations on sponsorship privileges, Reform Party policy, accedes Simon Fraser University economics professor Don De Voretz, "would effectively shut off family
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reunification as an avenue for immigration." Bill Gairdner quite possibly points to an additional inhibition to non-traditional immigration should the party's tighter sponsorship guidelines be implemented. For "we do know," states Gairdner in typically brash fashion, "that non-traditional immigrants tend to have larger families than those from traditional sources."

Aside from whether Reformers in general terms view their party's immigration policies as means of curtailing non-traditional immigration, it is abundantly clear that many within the party view with adversity a federal immigration policy that has helped to increase Canada's ethnocultural diversity. Until it was reworded for the current edition of the Blue Book, party policy insisted that "immigration policy should not be 'explicitly designed to radically or suddenly alter the ethnic makeup of Canada, as it increasingly seems to be'" In its efforts to re-work this statement as a means of presenting a more moderate immigration policy for the current Blue Book, the Party Policy Committee apparently received little help from rank and file party members. Prior to the 1991 Assembly, the PPC was forced to sort through a veritable "flood of extremist resolutions on immigration." According to Dobbin,

Eighteen constituency resolutions were included in the Exposure Draft. All were extreme in one respect or
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another...One that would prove very controversial would have "encourage(d) immigrants to settle in less populated areas..." The policy committee "sympathized with the objective..." but rejected it as being "unenforceable." Another would have denied immigrants protection under the Charter of Rights.177

Yet another exclaimed, "RESOLVED that we should maintain ethnic/cultural balance as of September 1990."178

Turning to the party's multiculturalism policy, it was mentioned earlier that the party's proposal to abolish the federal Department of Multiculturalism comes across as a means of trimming federal expenditures - a justifiable rationale, perhaps, in light of the current fiscal crisis, and an understandable one given the party's staunchly conservative fiscal policy orientation. At the same time, there is some question as to whether the money to be saved from such a move would be enough to outweigh the potentially negative symbolic message that would be sent to "ethnic Canadians" should the Department be unceremoniously done away with. In 1991 - the year in which the party's current policy book was published - the federal Department was given a budget of $26.8 million, only 22 percent, or $5.9 million, of which was "funnelled into 'culture,' including the visual and performing arts and heritage language programs."179 The rest of the Department's funding was "allocated to immigration settlement and community participation (including
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programs for official-language instruction to counselling centres for new Canadians) . . . (and to programs to improve intercultural understanding and eliminate discriminatory barriers (through education, promotion, and race relations training)." 180 To repeat, as far as its fiscal rationale for the Department's abolition is concerned, party policy, as expressed in the Blue Book, cites the need to end funding of "culture" only. Indeed, in a separate policy document, which outlines the party's deficit-reduction strategy in greater detail, it is stated that the programs to which the larger portion of the Department's budget is allotted "would be preserved and moved to appropriate federal departments." 181 Thus, according to the Reform Party's plan, the savings to be derived from the Department's abolition - about $5.9 million - is relatively minimal.

If the party's fiscal rationale for the Department's abolition appears, at best, shaky, then one is left with the impression that the party's purposes in proposing to do away with the Department reduce to the desire to bury "the current concept of multiculturalism and hyphenated Canadianism pursued by the Government of Canada," and the "valorization of difference" which, according to Patten, Reformers see at the heart of the concept. 182
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As Patten explains, the "belief that there exists a unitary national culture or a single way of living which can be identified as mainstream Canadian life is important to Reformers." Prior to the current policy book’s publication, party policy "called on the government to 'promote, preserve and enhance the national culture and...encourage ethnic cultures to integrate into the national culture.'" While one might argue that this assimilationist orientation reflects just the sort of melting-pot mentality which is definitely not part of Canada’s national culture, but a part, rather, of the American, from which Canadians have striven for decades to distinguish themselves, it is perhaps the case that after a prolonged period in which Canadians have endured constitutional crises, threats of secession, uprisings among aboriginal peoples, inter-provincial animosities, and so on, Canadians must, in order to remain Canadians, focus upon "the common ground which supposedly characterizes that which unites us." Alternatively, it is also the case that glorification of "the national culture" may be taken to extremes, resulting in the repression of differences. Indeed, it would appear that in their efforts to command attention to their conception of Canada’s national culture, Reformers have taken to the extreme, as embodied in party policy regarding the "distinctive heritage and tradition of the RCMP..."
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When the federal Solicitor General's Ministry revealed to the Canadian public in March, 1988 that it intended to alter the dress code of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in order "to accommodate minorities such as male orthodox Sikhs, who are required to wear turbans and refrain from cutting their hair," an explosion of controversy ensued. 187 By the time of the federal government's eventual promulgation of the alterations in March, 1990, "the image of the Mounties had become a touchstone for racial and religious intolerance in Canada." 188 Many Canadians registered their opposition to the dress code changes via petition to Parliament. Parliamentarians were asked by petitioners to "preserve the distinctive heritage and tradition of the RCMP by retaining the uniformity of the dress code..." 189 Others registered their opposition in much less moderate terms. According to Daiva Stasiulis, associate professor in Carleton University's anthropology/sociology department,

more disturbing [than the petition-writing campaign] was the successful sale of pins and calendars which denigrated Sikhs, Chinese and Blacks. One pin which was reported to sell 30,000 copies around the country portrayed a white man, holding a Canadian flag and dwarfed by a Sikh in a turban, a Chinese man and a Black carrying a spear, bearing the words, "Who's the minority in Canada?" 190
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At its October, 1989 Assembly, held in Edmonton, the Reform Party effectively instituted itself as the political point guard of the essentially Alberta-based opposition to the proposed dress code changes. At the Assembly, delegates "overwhelmingly supported a resolution that Sikhs be barred from wearing turbans in the RCMP." Despite the fact that the dress code changes have now been in place for four years, party policy has maintained a vigil in opposition to them. Current policy reads as follows:

The Reform Party supports the preservation of the distinctive heritage and tradition of the RCMP by retaining the uniformity of dress code. Changes should not be made for religious or ethnic reasons.

While one cannot determine precisely the motives that lay behind the party's staunch opposition to the RCMP's dress code changes, the seemingly arbitrary nature of the party's position gives one the impression that intolerance may be an underlying factor. It is obvious, first of all, that to refuse to permit any exceptions to the terms of the dress code for religious reasons "would effectively, if inadvertently, preclude entry of Sikhs into the national police force." Having had seven years of public debate on the dress code changes, and thus having had ample opportunity to discern the potentially exclusionary nature of its policy, the party cannot but expect to be labelled intolerant in retaining it in its policy book. One is also struck by the
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seemingly anomalous character of the policy in relation to one of the salient themes that runs through party policy in its entirety. The Reform Party, its exponents claim, is about change. Some of the more notable changes that the party states that it wishes to make concern the fundamental character of one of the country’s most recognizable and venerable national symbols - Parliament. In proposing the creation of an "equal, elected and effective" Senate and the use of referenda, initiatives and recall measures, the party has set forth a package of reforms that encroaches fundamentally upon Canada’s parliamentary tradition. Yet, the party will not accede to some very minor changes to the RCMP’s dress code. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that while Reformers refuse to countenance any tampering with the RCMP’s uniform, "since it was first formed in 1873, the RCMP has altered its official uniform several times, including a major change from a brimless pill box to a broad-brimmed scout charge."\(^{194}\)

In the final analysis, the policy trade-off that the party faces with reference to its RCMP dress code policy is similar to the one that it faces regarding its proposal to abolish the Department of Multiculturalism. Just as Reformers must assess whether the money to be saved from abolishing the Department is worth the potentially negative symbolic message that such a move would send to ethnic minorities, Reformers must assess whether "the preservation of the distinctive heritage and tradition of the RCMP by retaining the uniformity of dress code" is of greater value than

a truly representative national police force, or, alternatively, is worth the alienation of certain ethno-religious groups, such as the Sikh community. In the end, for stated or apparent reasons that the above analysis portrays as somewhat irrational, the party has in each instance chosen policy options which provide further evidence to those who suspect that the party represents an appeal to the more reactionary and intolerant elements in Canadian society.

The ostensible rationale of party policy regarding official bilingualism would also appear to be of questionable soundness. It will be recalled that policy rejects "comprehensive language legislation" and calls for "a language policy based on freedom of speech," implying that official bilingualism somehow represents an attempt by the state to infringe free speech by forcing Canadians to speak languages that may not be customary to them. Indeed, as Therese Arseneau aptly points out, official bilingualism is commonly referred to within party circles as "enforced bilingualism." It is clearly the case, however, that official bilingualism does not represent an attempt by the federal government to force Canadians to speak in uncustomary tongues, to "force French down people's throats" as English Canadians angry at the Trudeau government's passage of the 1969 Official Languages Act


were fond of saying.\textsuperscript{197} As Trudeau was forced to explain ad nauseum in response to the coercive character that many Canadians erroneously discerned from his government's bilingualism initiatives, "[b]ilingualism is not an imposition on the citizens. The citizens can go on speaking one language or six languages or no language if they so choose. Bilingualism is an imposition on the state and not on the citizens."\textsuperscript{198} The whole point of bilingualism, in other words, is not to make the citizenry conform to the state's linguistic designs for the country, but to make the state conform to the linguistic needs of the citizenry. "What we want," stated Trudeau, "is that the institutions be bilingual. We want the government of all Canadians, the central government, to be able to communicate with the population."\textsuperscript{199} As George Radwanski ably explains,

The only instance where the Official Languages Act imposes anything on individuals is in the case of a limited number of public servants, and here, too, no right is infringed in principle. There is no basic right to work for the government or any other employer without having the proper qualifications, and in a country with two principal language groups it is reasonable to require knowledge of both languages for certain government jobs.\textsuperscript{200}

Official bilingualism, of course, represents much more than an attempt by the federal government to render itself more
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linguistically accessible to the Canadian populace as a whole. Of critical importance to an understanding of official bilingualism is a recognition of its symbolic aspect, or, more specifically, its function as a means of nation-preservation, if not nation-building. Under Trudeau, official bilingualism was the central component of the federal government's strategy in combatting the growing strength of Quebecois nationalism and the emergence of the separatist option. By means of official language legislation and the constitutional protection of francophone rights, each of which were to apply to the country as a whole, Quebecers, so the federal government's reasoning went, would come to view Canada as their own, and not simply the domain of English Canadians. In the process, the province of Quebec would be seen less and less as the protector of francophone rights, and the attraction of sovereignty would fade away. To be sure, with the passing of the Trudeau era and the advent of the Mulroney administration, the emphasis of the federal government's strategy in dealing with the separatist threat changed. Through its constitutional amendment initiatives, as embodied in the Meech Lake and Charlottetown Accords, respectively, the new government broke decisively with its predecessor in attempting to assuage Quebecois nationalists by acceding to the Quebec government's demands for more provincial autonomy and for the recognition of Quebec as a "distinct society" within Canada. Nonetheless, the Mulroney government maintained an unwavering commitment to official bilingualism, as shown by the passage of a new Official Languages Act in 1988, which served to
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strengthen the terms of the original Act.\textsuperscript{202}

The purpose of the foregoing discussion is simply to emphasize that over the past twenty-five years successive federal governments have attempted to a greater or lesser degree to employ official bilingualism as a means of stemming the separatist movement in Quebec. The discussion also serves to properly contextualize the Reform Party’s opposition to official bilingualism, which, when viewed as part of the party’s general policy orientation towards Quebec, emerges as a component of a program that appears to envision, and perhaps encourage, a fully separate Quebec.

According to Sharpe and Braid,

Preston Manning likes to tell Quebec to go off and define itself, then come to the bargaining table and see if it wants to live in his "New Canada." But Quebec has been saying "No!" to the Reform Party’s kind of Canada for more than a century.\textsuperscript{203}

In addition to opposing official bilingualism, the party denies the right of the government of Quebec to enforce language legislation of the kind embodied in Bills 101 and 178, as the party’s opposition to "comprehensive language legislation" and "enforced unilingualism" clearly implies. As mentioned earlier, the party also stands rigidly opposed to any form of "special status" for the province of Quebec. As party policy proudly exclaims, "We remained
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to the end the only federal party opposed" to the Meech Lake Accord. Sharpe and Braid point out that an internal party poll that was released to the press in late 1989 - just as the Accord ratification process was entering a decisive phase - "showed that 94 percent of Reform members wanted to scrap the Meech Lake deal entirely even if this caused Quebec's separation from Canada." Party policy goes on to explain that should Quebec persist in aspiring to be a province pas comme les autres, "Quebec and the rest of Canada should consider whether there exists a better political arrangement" between the two. For all intents and purposes, such an "arrangement" entails a complete severance of constitutional ties between Quebec and the rest of Canada. Manning has made it abundantly clear that his party will not countenance the kind of sovereignty-association that was sought by the Parti Quebecois during the 1970s and early 1980s. During the election campaign Manning reiterated "that Reform is the only party that will tell Quebecers that 'their choice is either separation or a new Canada, not the soft mushy ground of sovereignty-association in between. There is no support for that outside Quebec.'" He also emphasized that within his "New Canada," "any federal government negotiating Quebec independence 'would have only one objective - to maximize the benefits and minimize the costs to the
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Sharpe and Braid deftly summarize the relationship between the "Quebec problem" and the party’s policy and, indeed, popularity, as follows:

Manning is using against Quebec the same sort of hardball tactics Quebec has employed for years against the rest of Canada, to the disgust of so many people. This is emotionally pleasing to those who feel the urge to blow off the steam that has been building ever since the Official Languages Act was passed in 1969. The tactic is responsible for much of the party’s popularity. Manning continues to insist that his party is the only one that does not take as its starting point a reaction to Quebec. Yet it is clear that the Reform Party, from its creation in 1987 to its startling popularity today, is in large measure a hostile reaction to Quebec: to Quebec’s impact on the constitution, its influence in Ottawa, its contribution to the debt, and its language policies. The Reform Party was the only federal party that opposed Meech Lake from beginning to end. Manning owes his current employment to the very province the Reform Party claims not to consider as its starting point. Without Quebec, the Reform Party would not exist in its present form, just as the Bloc Quebecois and Parti Quebecois would not exist without English Canada.209

By its "present form" the authors refer to the fact that the party formally exists in all provinces but Quebec. The party’s conspicuous organizational absence in Quebec is apparently due to Manning’s conviction that given the on-going Canada-Quebec constitutional impasse, federal political parties cannot properly represent the interests of Canada and Quebec simultaneously. States Manning,
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Either you represent the rest of Canada in this or you represent Quebec. But you can't represent both... As long as you're playing for votes on both sides you can't be trusted by the rest of Canada to articulate its interests.210

Thus, in the final analysis, the Reform Party not only manifests an unwillingness to try to accommodate the expressed desires and aspirations of Quebecois as a means of keeping the latter within Canada: the party refuses to attempt to even represent Quebecois. One might therefore be justified in interpreting the Reform Party as one that has its sights fixed on becoming "the party of English Canada," the party that will either "put Quebec in its place" or, more likely, perhaps, purge Quebec from Canada altogether. Indeed, Dobbin argues that "from the time of the failure of the Meech Lake Accord, Preston Manning's strategy for his new party has been to position himself as the spokesperson for English Canada on the question of Quebec and the Constitution. He has gradually established his negotiating stance: he is the man who will 'stand up to Quebec.'"211

***

Precisely how, then, does the foregoing analysis of Reform Party policy regarding immigration, multiculturalism, and bilingualism (and by extension, Quebec) allow one to properly categorize the Reform Party as a manifestation of reactionary populism? To repeat, reactionary populism, as Canovan defines it,
an appeal to the people which deliberately opens up the embarrassing gap between "the people" and their supposedly democratic and representative elite by stressing popular values that conflict with those of the elite: typically, it involves a clash between reactionary, authoritarian, racist, or chauvinist views at the grass roots, and the progressive, liberal, tolerant cosmopolitanism characteristic of the elite.\textsuperscript{212}

Within the context of the preceding analysis, the role of the "elite" has been played by Canada's elected federal governing elites, who, since the late 1960s, roughly, have pursued policies which reflect a willingness to not only recognize diversity - in this instance, ethnocultural and linguistic diversity - but also encourage diversity and empower diverse groupings of citizens with means to "preserve and promote" their distinctiveness. In this sense, successive federal governments have evinced what Canovan refers to as "progressive, liberal, tolerant cosmopolitanism," which can alternatively be viewed as a form of pluralism. On the other hand, the Reform Party, which claims to represent the grass roots, or "the people," has appealed to Canadians to oppose the pluralist policies that have been pursued by the federal elites. At the same time, as the above analysis of party policy has suggested, this opposition can be viewed, at least in part, as an expression of intolerance or chauvinism, or an expression of unwillingness to accommodate deviation from some perceived national cultural norm.

\textsuperscript{212}Canovan, p. 229.
Summary and Conclusion

The preceding analysis has attempted to specify and conceptualize the nature of the Reform Party's "populism" by means of Margaret Canovan's typology of populisms. Upon describing Canovan's typology, the analysis turned to the matter of placing the Reform Party within Canovan's schema. To this end, the analysis began with a more or less peremptory rejection of the applicability of four of Canovan's populism sub-species: farmers' radicalism, intellectual agrarian socialism, peasants' populism, and populist dictatorship. Of the remaining three, after a somewhat more extended enquiry, populist democracy was also dismissed as an appropriate conceptual means of specifying the nature of the party's populism. It was found that despite the party's strong support for various direct democracy measures, the party hierarchy has apparently conducted party affairs in a manner which seems to do harm to the basic essence of populist democracy, which entrusts "the people" with ultimate power in formulating policy without the tutelage of political elites, and gives "the people" the power to control their elected representatives, rather than vice versa. Ultimately, it was argued that the party's populism can best be specified by way of reference to Canovan's notion of reactionary populism, as well as politicians' populism. On the one hand, it was posited that Manning's "populism" is in a sense tactical in nature, and that an examination of his populist rhetoric reveals remarkable similarity to the kind of tactical, "anti-political" populist rhetorical appeals that Jimmy Carter employed so successfully during the 1976 Presidential election campaign. On
the other hand, as the bulk of the analysis attempted to show, an in-depth consideration of party policy regarding multiculturalism and immigration, and bilingualism and Quebec provides evidence which suggests that recourse to Canovan's conception of reactionary populism provides a more substantial means of pinning down the Reform Party's populist character.

The fact that the Reform Party may be placed in two different categories within Canovan's schema may be cited as evidence of a critical flaw in Canovan's typology of populisms. Indeed, if a typology is of use only in so far as the phenomena that it is intended to organize can be located individually in no more than one conceptual box within a horizontal set of categories, Canovan's typology is perhaps of marginal utility. As pointed out in the section of the analysis which describes her typology in detail, additional examples of political phenomena that may be found in more than one of Canovan's populism categories include the U.S. People's Party and the Canadian Progressives.

Canovan, however, freely admits that her typology is far from "watertight," and diligently apprises the reader of instances where certain phenomena may be placed in more than one category. "Since the types suggested are analytical constructs," she accedes, "real-life examples may well overlap several categories."213

Notwithstanding its affront to typological purity, Canovan's
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schema provides a helpful means of sorting through and organizing the truly "bewildering variety of phenomena" that scholars have termed populist.\footnote{Ibid., p. 3.} In general, the seven categories yield remarkably distinct groupings of political phenomena, and equip the interested analyst with reasonably viable means of making useful comparisons among the various actors and entities that have heretofore shared the populist label, and of providing some sense of what the label means when it is applied to new phenomena, such as the Reform Party of Canada.
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