

**2015 Bell Chair Graduate Student Conference:  
Canadian Democracy at a Crossroads?**



**DAY 1 – Thursday, February 12, 2015**

Carleton University, 1125 Colonel By Drive, Ottawa, ON  
 A) Senate Room - 608 Robertson Hall  
 B) Alumni Boardroom – 617 Robertson Hall

Program	
8:30 am [A]	Registration opens
9:00 am [A]	Welcome remarks from William Cross, the Hon. Dick and Ruth Bell Chair for the Study of Canadian Parliamentary Democracy
9:15 am [A&B] [1:15]	<p><b>Panel 1A – Local Government and Democratic Initiatives</b></p> <p><b>Chair &amp; Discussant – Dr. Gary Levy</b></p> <p>Gary Levy retired in 2013 after 33 years as Editor of the Canadian Parliamentary Review produced by the Canadian Region of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. He also worked for the Library of Parliament as a researcher and later as Seminar Co-ordinator. He taught Political Science at the University of Western Ontario during the early 1990s and lectured occasionally at Ottawa University and the University of British Columbia (summer session). He served as a consultant to the 1982-83 Special Committee on the Standing Orders (Lefebvre Committee), the 1985 Special Committee on Reform of the House of Commons (McGrath Committee), the 1990 Special House of Commons Committee on the Meech Lake Accord (Charest Committee), and various other House and Senate Committees. In 1988-89 he was a Donner Foundation Fellow with the Americas Society in New York City. He is co-editor, with Graham White, of Provincial and Territorial Legislatures in Canada, University of Toronto, 1989. He worked in an administrative capacity for the Senate of Canada between 1995 and 2000 with the Special Committee on Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide, the Special Committee on the Pearson Airport and the Standing Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce.</p> <p><b>Presenter 1 – Ashley DePaola, “Best Practices for Open Government Implementation in Guelph, Ontario” – University of Guelph, MA Student</b></p> <p>The paper presents a case study of the City of Guelph, Ontario’s efforts to engage the public and various stakeholders in the development of their Open Government Action Plan. Data from semi-structured interviews, government documents, and field notes from roundtable discussions and public events were used in the analysis. One objective of this project is to help other municipalities in the development of their own Open Government Action Plans. Findings suggest that several different types of engagement mechanisms should be used to attract a wider population to share their ideas with the City. As shown in Guelph’s example, cities that plan to implement an open government need to be innovative in their capacity to deliver, translate, and provide messaging to attract people to engage in the community. Through an assessment of Guelph’s roundtable discussions and ChangeCamp hosted in the spring of 2014, it is clear that these mechanisms have allowed for Guelph resident ideation to be implemented into Guelph’s Open Government Action Plan. Although Guelph’s Open Government Action Plan incorporated some of the ideas mentioned at the ChangeCamp, there was a general consensus that there needed to be more immediate follow up to all of the individuals that were involved in the various methods of public consultation as well as more inclusion of hard-to-reach populations in the engagement process. Most individuals were unaware of whether their ideas were actually going to be implemented.</p> <p><b>Presenter 2 – Laura G. Pin, “Global Austerity and Local Democracy: Participatory Budgeting in Hamilton and Guelph, Ontario” – York University, PhD Student</b></p> <p>Concerns about Canada’s perceived democratic deficit, declining citizen participation in politics and increased elite decision-making, has sparked renewed interest among academics in theories of deliberative democracy. Proponents of deliberative democracy argue that public debate, actualized through equalizing institutional mechanisms, can transfer real power to citizens. Critics contest that</p>

deliberation merely exacerbates inequalities among participants and serves to legitimate existing power structures, rather than transform them. This paper investigates whether deliberative strategies have the potential to reinvigorate Canadian democracy through an examination of participatory budgeting at the municipal level. Participatory budgeting is “a democratic process of deliberation and decision-making whereby people who are impacted by a budget allocate its resources” (Pinnington et al. 2009). Paradoxically, participatory budgeting has become popular concurrent with municipal budget cuts in the wake of global austerity. This paper assesses whether, in a context of neoliberalism, participatory budgeting can re-inscribe citizen priorities into the budgetary process. Through a comparative analysis of two municipal initiatives, Participatory Budget Ward 2 (PBW2) in Hamilton, ON and the Neighbourhood Support Coalition (NSC) in Guelph, ON, this paper addresses whether participatory budgeting represents a local challenge to global austerity or the legitimization of neoliberal policies through new channels of governance.

**Panel 1B – Policy and decision-making in Canada**

**Chair & Discussant – Dr. Christina Gabriel**

Christina Gabriel is an Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science and the Institute of Political Economy. Her specific research interests focus on citizenship and migration, gender and politics, regional integration and globalization. She is the co-author of *Selling Diversity: Immigration, Multiculturalism, Employment Equity and Globalization* (2002) and is a co-editor of *Governing International Labour Migration: Current Issues, Challenges and Dilemmas* (2008). She has contributed chapters and articles on issues such as migration, border control, transnational care labour and North American regional integration.

**Presenter 1 – David Said, “Judicial Supervision – The Intersection of Influence and Outcomes in Policy” – McMaster University, MA Student**

The relationship amongst institutions has continued to play a pivotal role in shaping the nature of policies central to citizens and non-citizens alike. However, the phenomenon of influence and power that institutions constitutionally wield over one another in administrative agencies has been an increasing issue that is largely under-explored. More so, is the issue of installing legitimate regulatory mechanisms that ensure and preserve democratic values and practices that hold government agencies accountable. This study explores the relationship between judicial and executive institutions by examining the degree of influence the courts exercise in decisions in the Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada. Using a precedent tracing approach, this paper will analyze the presence and authority of Supreme Court decisions in the determination of refugee protection cases. As administrative bodies exercise a broad range of discretion and are loosely guided by ‘soft-laws’, it is unlikely that the courts would have a high degree of influence in such agencies due to an absence of obligation to do so. The shortage of judicial influence arguably offers a nuanced explanation to the inconsistent outcomes amongst board members and the absence of and requirement for a legitimate remedial mechanism. Expanding on the dialogue theory, this paper seeks to provide a different perspective on the judicialization of public policy.

**Presenter 2 – Wesley Petite, “Deepening Democracy through Public Participation” – Carleton University, PhD Student**

The challenge of institutionalizing sincere democratic governance is a global problem. This problem is present in both developing and developed countries as different elite groups can be found to exert undue influence over government decision making. The way that this problem is avoided or responded to vary but all are based on creating a regulatory environment for public representatives and bureaucrats. One innovation that came as a result of the 1985 renewal of democracy in Brazil, was the institution of specific federal transfers to municipal governments to create a budget for capital investments determined through deliberation with the public themselves. My paper explores how this practice is playing out after 20 years of implementation in the city of Belo Horizonte as well as similar projects being experimented with in the Hamilton, Ontario and Vallejo, California. The situation of the municipality within the national constitution, and resources available at this level of government, is found to be a

	<p>significant distinction. All cases involve engaged publics interacting with forms of representational democracy and bureaucracy in an effort to deepen democracy. How these publics educate each other, how funds are dispersed, and how projects are implemented are all fundamental to the potential of participatory budgeting to take root in Canada.</p>
10:30 - 10:45 am [A]	Coffee Break
10:45 am [A&B] [1:15]	<p><b>Panel 2A – Design of Parliament</b></p> <p><b>Chair &amp; Discussant – Dr. Lori Turnbull</b></p> <p>Lori Turnbull is interested in all things related to parliamentary democracy in Canada. Her work is focused on parliamentary processes and institutions, public management, and political and public service ethics. Her work has been published in <i>Canadian Public Administration</i>, <i>How Ottawa Spends</i>, the <i>Canadian Political Science Review</i>, the <i>Journal of Parliamentary and Political Law</i>, and the <i>Canadian Parliamentary Review</i>. Her book <i>Democratizing the Constitution: Reforming Responsible Government</i> (co-authored with Peter Aucoin and Mark D. Jarvis) won the Donner Prize (2011) for the best book on public policy written by a Canadian and the Donald Smiley Prize (2012) for the best book written on government and politics in Canada.</p> <p><b>Presenter 1 – Michael Burton</b>, “Some are Fairer: The Legislative and Constitutional Rules and Norms that Determine the Size of the House of Commons” – University of Alberta, PhD Student</p> <p>The four iterations of the <i>Fair Representation Act</i> show the important role that partisan politics and political timing play in making decisions regarding the number and distribution of seats in the House of Commons. Parties in government and opposition attempt to use redistributions of seats to their own partisan advantage and their opinions and strategic orientation evolve as their partisan needs change. As such, when it comes to how many seats we have in the House of Commons, the process is clearly not independent from partisan concerns. This paper answers the following research question: What led to the repeated changes in the government’s planned seat allocation to the provinces of Alberta, British Columbia, Ontario and eventually Quebec between 2006 and 2012, and what explains the allocation ultimately confirmed by the passage of Bill C20, <i>The Fair Representation Act</i>? I will argue that changes in the partisan political landscape over the course of the federal Conservative’s terms in office directly influenced the different iterations of <i>the Fair Representation Act</i>, as well as how and why both the New Democratic Party and the Liberal Party chose to oppose it.</p> <p><b>Presenter 2 - Atchariya Fletcher</b>, “Provincial Perspectives on Senate Reform” – Carleton University, MA Student</p> <p>With the stalemate that the 2013 Reference case brought, it has become very clear that Senate reform is no longer a constitutional issue for the federal government alone. While the federal government referred this to the Supreme Court, the provinces submitted their arguments as to why the parts of the Constitution pertaining to the Senate could not be amended without their consent. They are interested in the future of the Senate. This paper approaches the question of Senate reform from the view that the Senate is at a crossroads. Reform is the middle road between the status quo and abolition, and while it seems the most sensible path forward, there is uncertainty in how to proceed. With many unknown consequences, such as the potential conflict between premiers and senators in determining who speaks for the provinces or coming to a consensus on a path towards reform, it seems unclear how (or if) the provinces will proceed. This paper questions how the Senate today reflects the provinces’ perception of their “vested interest” in it, and muses about whether the Senate can be reformed to better reflect the present role of the provinces in Canadian federalism.</p> <p><b>Presenter 3 – Gordon Thomas</b>, “Montesquieu and the Canadian Senate: A fusion of principles in a mixed regime” – Carleton University, PhD Candidate</p> <p>Employing Montesquieu’s theory on the nature of regimes and their guiding principles, I analyze Canada’s founding debates on the design of its Senate. For Montesquieu, in contrast to the nature of a</p>

regime, the principle of a regime is the cause of its motion, or the source of political action in it. In a republic, this is virtue, and in a monarchy it is honour. Republics for Montesquieu exist in two forms: democracy and aristocracy. Each has a particular virtue that pertains to it, breaking the principle of virtue into two relational principles. In a democracy, this is the love of equality, and in an aristocracy, it is moderation. In this paper, I argue that Canada’s Senate is premised on an attempt to take the three principles that Montesquieu isolates as pertaining to each regime and fuse them in the upper chamber. Seen in this way, the Senate therefore embodies three principles rather than the single ideal of aristocratic restraint or dual balance of regional equality. As such, Montesquieu’s thought assists in making sense of the purpose of Canada’s upper chamber, and illuminates one of Canada’s, often missed, contributions to the constitutional design in a mixed regime.

**Panel 2B – Indigenous Politics**

**Chair & Discussant – Dr. Jennifer Adese**

Jennifer Adese is of the Otipemisiwak/Métis that come from the region of Wabamun, Manitou Sakahigan (Lac Ste. Anne), St. Albert and Amiskwaciywaskahigan (Beaver Hills House/Edmonton), and also of the enfranchised Treaty 6 reserves of the Michel First Nation and Papaschase First Nation. She attended Lakehead University and obtained a BA (Political Science – Pre-Law) and an HBA (Political Science), along with minors in Women’s Studies and Anihshiniimowin. She eventually went on to complete a Masters degree in Cultural Studies & Critical Theory (CSCT) and a Ph.D. in English at McMaster University’s Department of English & Cultural Studies. Jennifer joined Carleton University in September 2012 as the inaugural New Sun Visiting Aboriginal Scholar. Jennifer has published articles on representations of Indigeneity by Indigenous peoples and by settler-states, Métis identity and racialization, and on racism and marginalization in the context of creative city policies.

**Presenter 1 – Minh Do, “The Feedback Loop between Institutional Reticence and Aboriginal Resistance regarding the Crown’s Duty to Consult” – University of Toronto, PhD Student**

The duty to consult is a constitutional obligation between the Crown and Aboriginal peoples, whereby any proposed government action that may adversely affect Aboriginal rights or rights claims must be accompanied by consultation. The current legal and policy framework that guides consultation with Aboriginal peoples is disputed by Aboriginal communities. My paper argues that the institutional framework for understanding the duty to consult presents Aboriginal peoples with little opportunity to contest the terms of consultation; as such, Aboriginal contestation towards consultation erupts in the creation of crisis situations. However, framing grievances to produce moments of political crises ultimately undermines future prospects for necessary institutional reforms to transform current consultative practices. I will use the political process model and historical institutionalist approaches to discern how institutions constrain Aboriginal peoples’ demands for reforming the terms of consultation. My research will investigate the Idle No More and Rexton Shale Gas protests as case studies to demonstrate how Aboriginal peoples resist against current interpretations of consultation, given existing institutional constraints. These two cases will be analyzed within the theoretical framework provided by the political process model and historical institutionalism to reveal the consequences of relying on crisis situations for future practices of Aboriginal resistance.

**Presenter 2 – Brad Wiebe, “Taking their proper place in the affairs of their native land”: (Post)Colonial Discourse(s) in the 1960 House of Commons Debate over Indian Enfranchisement – Carleton University, MA Student**

Universal suffrage in Canada is a young legal reality, with on-reserve Status Indians receiving the right to vote in federal elections as late as 1960. In keeping with postwar (re)conceptualizations of Canadian nationhood and State efforts to construct a distinct, common identity, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration Ellen Fairclough introduced legislative amendments to remedy the longstanding disenfranchisement of First Nations peoples and to continue the “modernization” of the Indian Act begun a decade earlier. While some understand this enfranchisement as empowering and as an act of decolonization, others would suggest that it represented a more insidious and colonial method of

	<p>assimilating First Nations and of subsuming Indigenous sovereignty. As a contribution to this discussion, this paper interrogates some of the underlying ideological assumptions of Members of Parliament at the time through a deconstruction of their debate on the topic. The MPs’ discourse reveals a blatant paternalism towards First Nations. Their interventions in the debate are inflected with images of Indians’ socioeconomic uplift into “modernity” and their attainment of a new, “proper form” of citizenship. Almost unanimously MPs endeavoured to construct a single, inclusive Canadian identity based in an enfranchised, middle-class citizenry situated under the Canadian State’s legislative supremacy.</p> <p><b>Presenter 3 – Eric Van Rythoven, “Trauma, Shame, and the Limits to Securitizing Aboriginal Protest in Canada” – Carleton University, PhD Candidate</b></p> <p>In the last five years journalists and academics have revealed an increasing concern within the Federal government over the militancy of aboriginal protest. Based on their supposed potential for domestic extremism, security agencies have identified indigenous social movements as a threat to national security and built an expansive surveillance regime to monitor their activities. What is puzzling however is this labeling of national security remains entirely internal to government with no attempt to publicly securitize aboriginal groups and build a broadly-based public legitimacy for this threat image. In this article I argue the reluctance of the government to publicly securitize aboriginal protest can be traced to the diffusion of collective memories of aboriginal trauma throughout Canadian popular culture. Focusing on representations of residential schools, missing aboriginal women, and the perennial poverty of reserves I suggest circulations of shame effectively inhibit the broader Canadian public from viewing indigenous groups as dangerous. Sensitive to these optics the government has carefully avoided publicly securitizing aboriginal protest. In drawing these connections the article illustrates how memory, trauma, emotions and their circulation throughout popular culture limits public practices of threat construction.</p>
<p>12:00 - 1:30 pm [A]</p>	<p>Lunch service</p>
<p>1:00 - 1:45 pm [A]</p>	<p><b>Keynote address by Jill Vickers</b> <b><i>Scaling Silos and Building Bridges: Can the Experiences of ‘Outsiders’ be Incorporated into ‘Normal’ Political Science?</i></b></p> <p>Jill McCalla Vickers’ work shows a lifetime dedication to the endeavour of combining research on women and politics with engagement in political life. Educated at Carleton University, The State University Of New York (Buffalo), and the London School of Economics, Dr. Vickers joined the faculty of Carleton University in 1971, where she rose to the rank of Professor. At Carleton, she also served as Director of the School of Canadian Societies, Chair of the Inter-Faculty Committee on Women’s Studies, president and negotiator for the faculty union, and Associate Vice-President (Academic). Among her many achievements, she was named a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada in 2003, and Carleton University awarded her a Chancellor’s Professorship the same year . After her retirement in 2007, she was named Distinguished Professor of Political Science and Emeritus Professor at Carleton. Dr. Vickers is a renowned authority in the politics of women’s rights, comparative approaches to women’s participation, and the relationship between gender and nationalism. She is the author of numerous books and articles, among them <i>Politics as if Women Mattered: a Political Analysis of the National Action Committee on the Status of Women</i>, co-authored with L. Pauline Rankin and Christine Appelle (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1994); <i>Re-inventing Political Science: A Feminist Approach</i> (Halifax: Fernwood Press, 1997); and <i>Gender, Race and Nation: A Global Approach</i>, co-authored with Vanaja Druharajan (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002).</p>
<p>2:00 pm [A&amp;B] [1:00]</p>	<p><b>Panel 3A – The State, Cities and Regions: the scale of decision-making</b></p> <p><b>Chair &amp; Discussant – Dr. Raffaele Iacovino</b></p> <p>Raffaele Iacovino’s teaching and research interests include Canadian and Quebec politics, federalism, citizenship and immigration, and citizenship education. A native of Montreal, Quebec and a graduate of McGill University, he joined the Department of Political Science at Carleton University in the in the</p>

	<p>summer of 2009. Recently, he held the position of Invited Professor of Quebec Studies in the Quebec Studies Program at McGill University. He was also a Postdoctoral Fellow at the Canada Research Chair on Democracy and Sovereignty at l'Université du Québec À Chicoutimi, and, most recently, Skelton-Clark postdoctoral fellow of Canadian Affairs in the Department of Political Studies at Queen's University.</p>
	<p><b>Presenter 1 – Achsah Turnbull, “The Impact of the Division of Powers of Canadian Federalism on Abortion Access in New Brunswick” – University of Toronto, PhD Student</b></p> <p>The closure of the Henry Morgentaler clinic in Fredericton, New Brunswick in July 2014 has left an important void in reproductive health services in New Brunswick. The nearest abortion clinic in Canada for New Brunswick women to procure an abortion is in Quebec. Quebec is regarded by many scholars as providing the best access to reproductive health services in Canada. This paper will aim to discern why two provinces in such proximity, can have such divergent policies on reproductive health services. It will be argued that the division of powers under Canadian federalism has led to this disparity. Analyzing the impact of the division of powers has gained increasing importance since the recent change in reproductive health access in New Brunswick. Reports are showing that some clinics in Maine now have more patients from New Brunswick than from the United States. A new government in New Brunswick, led by Brian Gallant and the Liberal Party, presents an opportunity for change in New Brunswick. Thus, after establishing why the division of powers has led to a disparity in abortion access, this paper will highlight some measures that may be taken to overcome the obstacles created by the division of powers.</p>
	<p><b>Presenter 2 – Rod Leggett, “Proximity and Governance in Quebec” - Carleton University, PhD Candidate</b></p> <p>In January 2014 the Quebec legislature enacted legislation, Act to Ensure the Occupancy and Vitality of Territories, which may encourage decentralization of governance in the province. Specifically, the Quebec state commits to strengthening “the efficiency and coherence of government actions benefitting communities in matters of occupancy and vitality”. (CQLR 0-1.3) This law marks a new period of social reflection on governance in Quebec as public discourse has arrived at a consensus that the centralized administrative state created in the 1960s no longer adequately respond to 21st century challenges. This paper marks the beginning of my research that will examine the constellation of politico-institutional tensions which are emerging in Quebec between 1) the established institutional interests and the embedded practices and regulations of centralization, 2) the political will by actors of civil society to shift decision-making to the periphery, 3) the presence of Quebec’s communitarian political culture, 4) the distinct and minority status of Quebec’s place in the Canadian federation, 5) the influence of the overarching international pressures brought about by globalization and finally, 6) we examine this constellation under the normative assumption that augmented civic engagement and diminished administrative interventionism is necessary for the health of a liberal democracy.</p>
<p><b>Panel 3B – Canadian Party Politics</b></p>	
	<p><b>Chair &amp; Discussant – Dr. Rand Dyck</b></p> <p>Rand Dyck taught Canadian and Provincial Politics for over 30 years at Laurentian University, and then moved to Ottawa where he was appointed as Adjunct Professor at Carleton. He has received several teaching awards and is kept busy revising three widely used texts: Canadian Politics: Critical Approaches (6th ed., 2011); Canadian Politics: Fifth Concise Edition, (2012); and Studying Politics: An Introduction to Political Science (4th ed., 2012). He has also taught at Memorial University, the University of Victoria, and Laurentian University @ Georgian.</p>
	<p><b>Presenter 1 – Rob Currie-Wood, “Sharing the Wealth: Riding Association Fund-transfers in the Conservative Party of Canada” – University of Calgary, MA Student</b></p> <p>We know little about local-level political party financing or the distribution of financial resources amongst electoral district associations, despite their critical roles in nominating and electing candidates to the House of Commons. This paper closes the literary gap by examining the relationship between local party wealth, competitiveness, and riding association fund-transfers inside the Conservative, Liberal, and</p>

	<p>New Democratic parties. The primary objective is determining why electoral district associations distribute their own resources to others, especially when we conceive these organizations to be solely concerned with electoral contests inside their own district boundaries. We may also capture glimpses for how political parties view the contemporary competitive environment in Canada. Demonstrating each party’s internal distribution of financial resources provides solid indications for which districts are contestable and which are not. Preliminary findings indicate financial fluidity is greatest in the Conservative Party of Canada, even though Liberal riding associations raise comparable amounts of money in both election years. In a sense, Conservative grassroots organizations share the wealth in order to fund constituency campaigns in less supportive areas of Canada. Association fund-transfers are likely emerging campaign tactic employed for overcoming Canada’s diverse and competitive electoral environment.</p>
	<p>Presenter 2 – <b>Matt Thompson</b>, “Shades of Blue: Analyzing the Platforms of Federal Conservative Parties” – Carleton University, PhD Candidate</p> <p>Since the merger of the Progressive Conservative party of Canada and the Canadian Alliance into the Conservative Party of Canada, there has been debate on whether the new party bears closer resemblance to either of its predecessor parties. The literature has explored this question through analysis of the policy record and organizational structure. Campaign platforms, are acknowledged in the literature to be an important document that can be used to gauge a party’s policy position, yet an analysis of the CPC’s platforms compared to the platforms of its predecessor parties has not been performed. This paper will answer the question of whether the campaign platforms of the CPC indicate a closer policy to position to either of its predecessor parties. The paper begins by establishing the areas of policy difference between the PC and Alliance parties through a literature review. Utilizing the methodology used in comparative research on party platforms, this paper will perform a content analysis of the Reform/Canadian Alliance and PC platforms from the 1993, 1997 and 2000 federal elections in comparison to the CPC platforms from the 2004, 2006, 2008. The findings make the important contribution of situating the new CPC party in relation to its predecessors.</p>
<p>3:00 - 3:15 pm [A]</p>	<p>Coffee Break</p>
<p>3:15 pm [A&amp;B]</p>	<p><b>Panel 4A – Debates in Canadian Military Policy</b></p>
<p>[1:00]</p>	<p>Chair &amp; Discussant – <b>Dr. Norman Hillmer</b></p> <p>Norman Hillmer is Professor of History and International Affairs at Carleton University. He was a gold medalist in his graduating year at the University of Toronto and received his doctorate from Cambridge University, where he studied under Professor Nicholas Mansergh and held Commonwealth, Canada Council, IODE, and Mackenzie King scholarships. Dr. Hillmer was Visiting Professor of Modern Commonwealth History at Leeds University, 1978-1979, and from 1981 to 1990 Senior Historian at the Department of National Defence, working primarily on the multi-volume official history of the Royal Canadian Air Force. His 29 books and numerous articles concentrate on themes in politics, diplomacy, peacekeeping and defence, and immigration. He is the author of <i>“Negotiating Freer Trade: The United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, and the Trade Agreements of 1938”</i>, with Ian M. Drummond, and <i>“Canada’s International Policies: Agendas, Alternatives, and Politics”</i> (with Brian W. Tomlin and Fen Osler Hampson), as well three books with J. L. Granatstein: <i>“For Better or for Worse: Canada and the United States into the Twenty-First Century”</i>; <i>“Empire to Umpire: Canada and the World into the Twenty-First Century”</i>; and <i>“Prime Ministers”</i>, a national bestseller. From 1997 to 2000, Dr. Hillmer was coeditor, with Margaret MacMillan, of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs publication, <i>“International Journal”</i>; he was then coeditor, 2000–2004, of the <i>“Canada Among Nations”</i> series of the Norman Paterson School of International Affairs at Carleton. His work has been translated into Chinese, Japanese, French, Russian, and Swedish, and he has won several teaching, publishing and research prizes, including the Canada–Japan Prime Minister’s Award and, twice, the Marston LaFrance Research Fellowship. Professor Hillmer’s latest publication is a biography of Dr. O.D. Skelton, which will be released by the University of Toronto press this year.</p>

	<p><b>Presenter 1 – Gabriel Boulianne Gobeil, “What are you waiting for? Understanding Canada’s decade-long wait for armed unmanned aerial vehicles” – University of Ottawa, MA Student</b></p> <p>All the experts agree: drones are here to stay and while the United States (US) pioneered their use in military campaigns, it is no longer the only player in this technological race. Numerous nations are reinforcing and even replacing their manned military arsenal with armed unmanned systems. In fact, Canada has contemplated the idea of purchasing its own fleet over the past decade for their potential use in Arctic governance, surveillance missions, and counterterrorism. However, without well-defined military objectives, it is still unclear how Canadian drones would contribute to the country’s agenda, rendering their acquisition premature. Nonetheless, Canada has expressed enthusiasm towards armed drones, which begs the question of why it still does not operate a fleet. This paper first analyzes the context that led the US to arm its drones, identifying factors that catalyzed this technological militarization. It subsequently investigates the Canadian situation, demonstrating that the lack of important contextual elements has impeded Canada’s ability to obtain deadly drones. It argues that unlike the US, Canada has failed to leverage 9/11 as a way to justify its acquisition of armed drones, concluding with a discussion on the types of event that would push Canada towards the appropriation of drones.</p>
	<p><b>Presenter 2 – Dominika Kunertova, “The Politics of Burden-sharing: The Canadian Share of NATO’s Burden in the Cold War” – Université de Montréal, PhD Candidate</b></p> <p>After the Second World War, Canada entered the world scene as a middle power ready to take on its responsibilities towards a new international order. This paper addresses Canadian foreign security and defence policy with regards to the birth of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and its security role for Canada during the Cold War: <i>why and how did Canada contribute to NATO?</i> The paper looks, first, at the Canadian footprint in NATO – Article 2 of the Treaty – and, second, at the Canadian approach to burden-sharing. The first part reconstructs the archival documents to understand the decisions made in Ottawa to contribute to NATO. The second part focuses on politicians’ sense-making of the ambiguous concept of burden-sharing in the Canadian political discourse. The interpretive policy analysis clarifies what a burden and its fair-share meant to Canada. The paper shows that Canadian political elites tended to emphasize the political means over the military ones, which was reflected in the nature of Canadian contributions to NATO’s burden. It reveals that Canadian political elites had strong preferences for building and maintaining firm democratic and economic foundations of NATO. The paper concludes on “the <i>politics</i>, not economics,” of burden-sharing in NATO.</p>
<p><b>Panel 4B – Political Consequences of Canadian Foreign Investment</b></p>	
	<p><b>Chair &amp; Discussant – Dr. Laura Macdonald</b></p> <p>Laura Macdonald is a Professor in the Department of Political Science and the Institute of Political Economy at Carleton University, and currently Director of the Institute of Political Economy. She is also a member of the McLeod Group. She has published numerous articles in journals and edited collections on such issues as the role of non-governmental organizations in development, global civil society, citizenship struggles in Latin America, Canadian development assistance and the political impact of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) on human rights and democracy in the three member states. She has also done work on social citizenship in North America and the impact of NAFTA on security, immigration and border control policies. Current projects include: a) a research project funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada titled “From minor player to major actor: The role of Canada in Latin America” and b) research on federal Mexican and Mexico City social policies.</p>
	<p><b>Presenter 1 – Julia Calvert, “Contested Capital: Canada’s Foreign Investment Strategy and Extractivism in Latin America” – Carleton University, PhD Candidate</b></p> <p>The 2014 Global Markets Action Plan reiterated Canada’s commitment to advancing the most ambitious trade plan in Canadian history. At the centre of this plan is the aim to promote Canadian direct investment abroad as a means to facilitating greater access to global value chains (GVCs) on behalf of</p>



	<p>Canadian business. The increasing prioritization of investment promotion in Canadian foreign policy is in part a response to global shifts towards integrative trade. Yet the way in which this priority is materializing in Canada’s foreign policy practice cannot be explained in reference to global economic restructuring alone. An increasing amount of state resources are being directed towards aiding the expansion of extractivist GVCs in which Canadian firms are dominant. This is particularly true for Canada’s engagement in Latin America, where the operation of extractive firms have had important repercussions for local communities and economies. In this paper I employ a critical political economy perspective in exploring the determinants of the shift towards investment promotion and how it has materialized in Canada’s engagement in Latin America. I also discuss the consequences of the expansion of Canadian extractivist GVCs in the Americas with reference to specific cases in Central and South America.</p>
	<p>Presenter 2 – <b>Sorin Mitrea</b>, “States of Depoliticization: The Trans-Pacific Partnership and the Political Economy of Discretion” – McMaster University, PhD Candidate</p> <p>International trade and investment agreements are increasingly ‘constitutionalist,’ insulating themselves from political discretion and ‘locking in’ significant and long lasting effects on citizens, the state, and capital. Thus far, the economic and political consequences of foreign investment in Canada (e.g. legal protections for foreign investment) have been forcibly removed from ‘normal’ democratic accountability measures (e.g. limiting discussion of these arrangements in parliament) by the executive (Kelsey, 2013; Savoie, 1999). How does the treatment of these ‘new constitutionalist’ economic agreements in parliament highlight the tensions between the centralization of executive power, political discretion, depoliticization (i.e. limiting democratic politics), and accountability? This paper will address these questions through an examination of the Trans-Pacific Partnership’s (TPP) treatment in Canada’s parliament. By limiting discussion of the TPP, the executive continues a trend in Canadian (and other) democratic politics of increasing the centralization of political power. However, this case is complicated by another dimension: the passing of new constitutionalist arrangements limits the policy scope of governments by entrenching investor rights and interests (Bearce &amp; Bondanella, 2007). This invites a discussion of the relationship between political discretion, constitutionalism, private authority, and democratic accountability in a period marked by the proliferation of international trade and investment agreements.</p>
<p><b>4:15 pm</b></p>	<p><b>Conference proceedings close for the day</b></p>
<p>6:30 to 9:00 pm</p>	<p><b>Evening reception at Three Brewers (240 Sparks Street, Ottawa, ON K1P6C9)</b></p>

**DAY 2 – Friday, February 13, 2015**

Carleton University, 1125 Colonel By Drive, Ottawa, ON

A) Senate Room - 608 Robertson Hall

B) Alumni Boardroom – 617 Robertson Hall

Program	
9:00 am [A&B] [1:15]	<p><b>Panel 5A – Economic barriers to democracy</b></p> <p><b>Chair &amp; Discussant – Dr. Laura Macdonald</b></p> <p>Laura Macdonald is a Professor in the Department of Political Science and the Institute of Political Economy at Carleton University, and currently Director of the Institute of Political Economy. She has published numerous articles in journals and edited collections on such issues as the role of non-governmental organizations in development, global civil society, citizenship struggles in Latin America, Canadian development assistance and the political impact of NAFTA on human rights and democracy in the three member states. She has also done work on social citizenship in North America and the impact of NAFTA on security, immigration and border control policies. Current projects include: a) a research project funded by SSHRC titled “From minor player to major actor: The role of Canada in Latin America” and b) research on federal Mexican and Mexico City social policies.</p> <p><b>Presenter 1 – Jillian Curtin, “Macroeconomic Stability in Canada and the Theory of Optimum Regime” – Carleton University, PhD Candidate</b></p> <p>The 2008 financial crisis brought the issue of financial stability to the forefront of domestic and global politics. Financial stability in Canada is a laudable, yet ill-defined policy goal. This emphasis on stability has brought new prominence and responsibilities to independent organizations like the Bank of Canada (BoC) and the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions (OSFI). Jan Tinebergen’s theory of optimum regime argues that as markets liberalize, policy-making becomes depoliticized. Power over policy-making gradually shifts toward institutions of “benevolent” technocrats whose mandate is to maximize social welfare. This theory is often referenced when justifying the independence of central banks. (Maman and Rosenhek 2009: 218) This paper examines the shift in macroeconomic governance in Canada. It explores the institutional arrangements developed in Canada in order to achieve the goal of financial stability. It unpacks the increasing shift in power in economic governance toward “benevolent” technocrats and away from Parliament. Specifically, it examines the newest policy trend gaining steam in the area of financial stability at home and abroad: macroprudential regulation. It puts forward the argument that a formal adoption of macroprudential regulation in Canada would increase the powers of technocratic institutions and give them increased powers to act without the democratic oversight of Parliament.</p> <p><b>Presenter 2 – Kathryn Wesley, “Economic Inequality and Participation in Canadian Federal Elections 1980-2011” – Memorial University, MA Candidate</b></p> <p>Economic inequality in Canada has been steadily increasing for the better part of the last three decades. For instance, the Gini coefficient increased 19 percent between 1981 and 2010 (Sharpe and Capeluck 2012). Simultaneously, turnout in Canadian federal elections declined from an historic average of approximately 75 percent to a participation rate of 60 percent, constituting a drop of more than 10 percent in 20 years. This pattern invites the question, does economic inequality depress political engagement? I hypothesize that as economic inequality increases over time, participation rates will decline in all but the most affluent income groups. Furthermore, I expect the provinces with higher levels of inequality to have lower turnout rates. These expectations are based upon E.E. Schattschneider’s “theory of relative power” (1960). Building on work conducted on turnout in American gubernatorial elections (Solt 2010), I address my research question through a cross-sectional and time series analysis of provincial turnout in Canadian federal elections for the years 1980-2011.</p>

	<p><b>Panel 5B – Civic participation</b></p>
	<p><b>Chair &amp; Discussant – Dr. Jon Pammett</b></p> <p>Jon H. Pammett, Professor of Political Science, is one of Canada’s premier specialists on survey research. He participated in the design of the Canadian National Election Studies of 1974, 1979 and 1980, and other surveys of more recent elections and referendums. These have resulted in numerous books and articles, including <i>Political Choice in Canada and Absent Mandate: Interpreting Change in Canadian Elections</i>; he is co-editor, with Chris Dornan, of <i>The Canadian General Election of...</i> series, most recently <i>The Canadian General Election of 2011</i> (Dundurn, Toronto). Pammett has led Canada’s participation in the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) since 1998. He has edited, and contributed to, books using ISSP data on Social Inequality in Canada and Environmental Attitudes in Canada and Around the World. Pammett’s research on the nature of democratic participation includes a number of reports and articles for Elections Canada, including <i>Explaining the Turnout Decline in Canadian Federal Elections: A New Survey of Non-Voters and Confronting the Problem of Declining Voter Turnout Among Youth</i> (with Lawrence LeDuc).</p>
	<p><b>Presenter 1 – Maxime Heroux-Legault, “Heterogeneity in Voting Behaviour in Canada” – University of Toronto, PhD Student</b></p> <p>Two models of vote choice appear to contradict each other. The spatial model (Downs 1957) relies on the idea that voters hold positions of their own and vote for the candidate whose positions are closest to theirs. The valence model (Stokes 1992), in contrast, argues that voters do not have strong positions on the issues, and instead vote for the candidate they believe is the most competent. These two models appear contradictory. Strangely, they both find empirical support in studies examining the vote of Canadian voters. The paper tries to resolve this tension in these conceptual models. It is hypothesized that the spatial and valence models each accurately describe the behavior of a subset of the electorate. The spatial model describes the behaviour of individuals who have a high degree of political sophistication, while the valence model describes the behaviour of voters who do not. This finding has important implications for studies of voting behavior. It shows that models of voting cannot be expected to apply equally to all voters. On the contrary, when designing a model, researchers should be careful to state to which subset of the population the model should be applied.</p>
	<p><b>Presenter 2 – Mark Johnson, “Political Education Campaigns on Electoral Reform: Evaluating the Ontario Experience” – Carleton University, MA Student</b></p> <p>In the age of fragmented audiences, fast-paced lives and six-second sound bites, mounting an effective public education campaign can prove exceptionally difficult, particularly when complex subject matter is involved. Prior to Ontario’s 2007 referendum on choosing an electoral system, Elections Ontario embarked on such a campaign to teach the populace of the choice it faced, but a number of factors stood in the way. Using a qualitative approach of document analysis, this research paper compares the political education drive of Elections Ontario to the public information campaign model established by Weiss and Tschirhart (1), with supporting research from several additional communication scholars. The campaign successes and failures are analyzed, as is the reasoning behind why the effort is widely considered to have fallen short. Finally, this paper considers the challenge of educating a disinterested or distracted public on such intricate issues as electoral reform.</p>
<p>10:15 - 10:30 am [A]</p>	<p>Coffee Break</p>
<p>10:30 am [A&amp;B] [1:15]</p>	<p><b>Panel 6A – Voting and Political Ambition</b></p> <p><b>Chair &amp; Discussant – Dr. Alexandra Dobrowolsky</b></p> <p>Alexandra Dobrowolsky holds the rank of Professor of Political Science. She completed her PhD at Carleton University in 1996, and then a Postdoctoral fellowship at Dalhousie University in 1997. She worked as an Assistant Professor in Political Science at York University from 1997-2000. She joined the</p>

	<p>Saint Mary's University Political Science Department in 2000. Her research, writing and teaching deal with the theories and practices of representation, mobilization, citizenship, and democratic governance. Her recent work explored changing citizenship regimes in relation to social policy, as well as to security and immigration in Canada and Britain. She is currently examining the impact of the devolution of Canadian Immigration Policy on equality and multiculturalism.</p>
	<p>Presenter 1 – <b>Semra Sevi</b>, “Extending Voting Rights to Canadian Expatriates” - University of Toronto, MA Candidate</p> <p>While Canada is not a multicultural paradise, it has been built by successive waves of immigrants and has earned a global reputation as a safe haven for immigrants and refugees. Despite some frictions, immigrants are a constituent part of Canada; ironically, so are emigrants. With over 2.9 million Canadian citizens living abroad, expatriate voting rights remain an important but neglected citizenship issue. The presence of large numbers of recent immigrants and of many Canadians living abroad raises the question of how the “political nation” is constituted, and how one of the basic rights of membership in the political community, the franchise, is granted. Enfranchisement is not, of course, unconditional. The Canadian government requires aspiring voters to hold Canadian citizenship, have reached the age of majority, and provide proof of their identity and address. Until the late 20th century, the franchise has also been contingent on evidence of mental competence and character (for those reasons, the mentally incompetent and convicted felons have been disenfranchised for most of Canada’s history as a polity). Recent immigrants can achieve the franchise in Canada if they live in the country long enough to qualify for citizenship and meet the other criteria for eligibility. Surprisingly, those who already have it but choose to live abroad have a shaky claim on the same right. This is problematic. It is clear the right to vote is one of the central rights in a democracy so to restrict or deny this franchise to Canadians who live and work abroad is an encroachment on a fundamental right of citizenship. By comparison to other settler countries, Canada has onerous requirements for those of its citizens overseas who wish to vote. Unlike many countries with comparable diasporas, Canada does not have a system of direct parliamentary representation for its expatriates. Instead, they vote in the last riding in which they lived. Moreover, Canada only grants the right to vote for its citizens abroad who intend to return to Canada within their first five years abroad, after which they are disenfranchised. Due to the growing size of the Canadian expatriate population, this system should be reconsidered. This paper will begin by evaluating the liberalization of immigration, multiculturalism and citizenship policies all of which have a bearing on electoral voting rights. It will then examine the Canadian case of disenfranchising expatriates and how this is playing out in the countries politics. Followed by analyses of the nativist appeal and examination of alternative systems and concluding remarks.</p>
	<p>Presenter 2 – <b>Holly Ann Garnett</b>, “Advance Voting in Canada” – McGill University, PhD Student</p> <p>With turnout continuing to decline in Canada, Elections Canada and provincial election management bodies have provided additional opportunities for advance voting in the past decades as a possible way of encouraging more citizens to vote. However, there is little empirical research outside of the American context as to whether these early voting methods are effective in increasing turnout, particularly among segments of the population who are traditionally less likely to vote. Is early voting merely making it more convenient for people who would vote anyway or does early voting attract voters who would not normally turn out to cast a ballot? This paper will use data from the 2006 and 2008 Canadian Election Studies, as well as surveys from the Making Electoral Democracy Work Project for the 2011 Ontario and 2012 Quebec provincial elections to analyze the socio-demographic and attitudinal correlates of advance voting, in an attempt to better understand the effectiveness of early voting in Canada.</p>
	<p>Presenter 3 – <b>Scott Pruyers</b>, “Political Ambition and Negative Stereotypes” – Carleton University, PhD Candidate</p> <p>Gender gaps in political behaviour are not a new phenomenon (Gidengil, 2007). One gender gap that has been relatively understudied, however, is the gap in political ambition. While the literature is limited, there is evidence to suggest that women are less politically ambitious than their male counterparts. Lawless and Fox (2010), for example, find that women are more likely than men to undervalue their own</p>

qualifications and underestimate their chances of winning. One potential explanation that has been largely unexplored in the literature is that negative stereotypes about women’s political ability and political knowledge may be responsible for low levels of ambition. Negative stereotypes have been shown to create cognitive burdens that decrease intellectual performance in a number of tasks such as math and standardized tests. Applying a multidisciplinary approach and an experimental research design, this paper examines the effect of negative stereotypes on political ambition. A sample of 450 undergraduate students completed an online survey on political ambition and political knowledge where participants were randomly assigned to a stereotype threat condition or a non-threat condition. If negative stereotypes are in fact responsible for low levels of political ambition among women, we expect women in the non-threat condition to have levels of ambition comparable to their male counterparts.

**Panel 6B – Acts of Conscience or Representation? Considerations of the action of MPs in the House of Commons**

**Chair & Discussant – Dr. Gary Levy**

Gary Levy retired in 2013 after 33 years as Editor of the Canadian Parliamentary Review produced by the Canadian Region of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. He also worked for the Library of Parliament as a researcher and later as Seminar Co-ordinator. He taught Political Science at the University of Western Ontario during the early 1990s and lectured occasionally at Ottawa University and the University of British Columbia (summer session). He served as a consultant to the 1982-83 Special Committee on the Standing Orders (Lefebvre Committee), the 1985 Special Committee on Reform of the House of Commons (McGrath Committee), the 1990 Special House of Commons Committee on the Meech Lake Accord (Charest Committee), and various other House and Senate Committees. In 1988-89 he was a Donner Foundation Fellow with the Americas Society in New York City. He is co-editor, with Graham White, of Provincial and Territorial Legislatures in Canada, University of Toronto, 1989. He worked in an administrative capacity for the Senate of Canada between 1995 and 2000 with the Special Committee on Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide, the Special Committee on the Pearson Airport and the Standing Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce.

**Presenter 1 – Feodor Snagovsky, “Do Motives Matter? The Electoral Fortunes of Party Switchers in the Canadian House of Commons” – University of Ottawa, MA Student**

This paper seeks to explain the phenomenon of party switching or floor crossing in the understudied case of the Canadian House of Commons. It uses Müller and Strøm’s “Policy, Office or Votes?” framework at the individual level of analysis and a mixed methods approach that combines interview data, document analysis and econometrics to assess the effects of individual and institutional variables on the decision to switch parties. The results inform a wider discussion regarding individual political behavior as well as the role, influence and evolution of political parties in the Canadian state. The research demonstrates that the electorate is adept at recognizing opportunism and rewards MPs who switch parties on principle, while punishing those that switch for more self-centered reasons.

**Presenter 2 – Monika Smaz, “Free voting in the House of Commons, 1867-2014” - Université de Montréal, PhD Student**

The paper offers a new perspective on the use of free vote in the Canadian Parliament between 1867 and 2014. Despite the emphasis on parliamentary reforms in recent decades and the introduction of new legislative procedures, research on free voting remains highly restricted in Canada. Aside from a few studies (Pothier 1979; Franks 1991; 1997; Atkinson and Thomas 1993; Overby 1996; Docherty 1997; Overby and al 1998;. 2011; Longley 1999; Plumb 2013), we do not find any empirical and theoretical evidence to understand why party leaders allow free votes in the House of Commons. The proposed research will include the theoretical and methodological framework of my thesis project, as well as some preliminary results to explain this procedure in the Canadian context. This communication should increase our knowledge of legislative representation in the Parliament, in addition to contributing to the public debate on parliamentary reforms to facilitate democratic representation not only in Canada, but also in other parliamentary systems as well.

	<p>Presenter 3 – <b>Paul Thomas</b>, “Cooperation in a time of conflict – exploring the growth of all-party groups in Canada since 2004” – University of Toronto, PhD Candidate</p> <p>All-party Caucuses and Parliamentary Friendship Groups (together known as all-party groups or APGs) are informal parliamentary bodies that are formed by backbench politicians from all parties who share an interest in a policy field or relations with a given country. Examples include the caucuses on Aerospace and Palliative Care, and the friendship groups for Azerbaijan and Brazil. While such groups have existed in Canada for decades, their numbers have grown sharply in recent years, rising from fewer than 50 in 2004 to nearly 100 at present. Using both a statistical analysis of participation trends and interviews with over 40 parliamentarians, lobbyists, and journalists, this paper explores what factors are behind this growth. It finds that the increase has largely resulted from a convergence of interests between backbench MPs and lobbyists. For MPs, APGs cannot only be used to engage with their constituents, but also provide a path to influence and prestige for those passed over for formal promotion. Meanwhile, APGs offer lobbyists a way to raise an issue’s profile, disseminate information, and secure policy change. In this way, the creation of APGs has become a modular strategy that has been transferred between those working in different policy fields.</p>
<p>11:45 - 12:45 pm [A]</p>	<p>Lunch service in Senate Room</p>
<p>12:45 - 2:00 pm [A] [1:15]</p>	<p><b>Professional Development Panel featuring Dr. William Cross and Dr. Martin Geiger</b></p> <p>Discussant – <b>Dr. William Cross, Carleton University</b></p> <p>William Cross is the Hon. Dick and Ruth Bell Chair for the Study of Canadian Parliamentary Democracy in the Department of Political Science at Carleton University. Dr. Cross is a student of Canadian and comparative political institutions and his work emphasises the connections between civil society and political parties and legislatures. His recent work includes studies of party leadership selection, intra party organization and youth participation in politics. Dr. Cross’ writing has appeared in many of the top-rated political science journals and his recent books include <i>The Challenges of Intra-Party Democracy</i> (Oxford University Press 2013) and <i>Politics at the Centre: The Selection and Removal of Party Leaders in the Anglo Parliamentary Democracies</i>(Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012). The latter of which received the 2013 <i>Donald Smiley Prize</i> from the Canadian Political Science Association. Since 2000, he has served as director of the Canadian Democratic Audit and in 2004-05, he was Director of Research for the New Brunswick Commission on Legislative Democracy. Dr. Cross joined Carleton in 2005 after teaching for eight years at Mount Allison University in Sackville, New Brunswick where he held the Edgar and Dorothy Davidson Chair in Canadian Studies. Prior to that, he was a SSHRC post-doctoral fellow at the University of British Columbia.</p> <p>Discussant – <b>Dr. Martin Geiger, Carleton University</b></p> <p>Martin Geiger is Assistant Professor of “Politics of Human Migration and Mobility” at Carleton University. He holds a cross-appointment in the Department of Political Science, the Institute of European, Russian and Eurasian Studies and the Institute of Political Economy. His research, teaching and writings focus on migration and mobility from an interdisciplinary perspective. Primary concerns are the multitude of state and non-state actors involved in governing cross-border mobility today, the various modes and ‘tools’ that have been invented to ‘manage’ flows of people, and the real-life effects these interventions have on persons crossing borders, societies and political systems. Martin Geiger is the founding editor of the peer-reviewed ‘Mobility &amp; Politics’ series with Palgrave Macmillan (co-editors: Parvati Raghuram, UK, and William Walters, Carleton University). He joined Carleton as a faculty member in July 2014. He is an active member of Carleton’s ‘<a href="#">Migration &amp; Diaspora Studies</a>’ initiative. He also contributes to the activities of the <a href="#">Centre for European Studies</a>, Carleton’s EU Centre of Excellence (co-coordinator, with Achim Hurrelmann, of the research group on ‘Social Integration and Citizenship’). Martin Geiger is a Corresponding Member and a former Senior Researcher of the renowned European migration research centre ‘<a href="#">IMIS</a>’ (University of Osnabrück, Germany). During his time in Osnabrück, he was the local coordinator of ‘<a href="#">MISOCO</a>’, a multi-university, EU-funded Erasmus Mundus Master Program on</p>

**2015 Bell Chair Graduate Student Conference:  
Canadian Democracy at a Crossroads?**



	International Migration and Social Cohesion. Prof. Geiger previously has also worked as a migration researcher and project manager for the European Migration Centre in Berlin and Florence (Italy). He has held Visiting Scholar and Visiting Researcher appointments at universities and research centres in Europe and North America. For his research on migration management and border security, he received among others a Government of Canada ' <a href="#">Banting</a> ' Fellowship and a prestigious PhD research grant awarded by the German National Academic Foundation (Studienstiftung des deutschen Volkes).
2:00 - 2:15 pm [A]	<b>Closing remarks from William Cross, the Hon. Dick and Ruth Bell Chair for the Study of Canadian Parliamentary Democracy</b>
2:15 pm [A]	<b>Conference proceedings close</b>
2:15 – 3:15 pm	<b>OC Transpo to Parliament Hill</b>
3:30 – 4:15 pm [0:45]	<b>Tour of Parliament Hill</b>