

just for women but also for sexual orientation minorities” (192). Yet other aspects of Wynne’s record were much less transformative.

In the final section, the book’s attention shifts to the west. Tracy Summerville analyzes the leadership of Rita Johnson and Christy Clark. Although both women were selected to head parties in British Columbia fraught with controversy, Clark managed to lead her party to its fourth consecutive win in 2013, becoming the province’s first popularly elected female premier (204–5). The last two chapters concern Alberta. Clark Banack finds premier Alison Redford did not “move the needle” much on women’s issues during her time in the premier’s office from 2011 to 2014, perhaps owing to the constraints imposed by her right-wing caucus (239). Melanee Thomas underscores that Rachel Notley’s victory in the 2015 election made Alberta the first province to elect a woman-led government twice in a row. Premier Notley actively used the levers of the state to improve women’s political representation and entrench gender identity rights within provincial law (264).

This engaging book will be a popular addition to class curricula, particularly those concerning provincial/territorial politics, gender and politics, intersectional studies, leadership studies and Canadian elections. The work helpfully exemplifies the many policy, party, identity and gender-based challenges each woman premier faced while in office. In answering whether they “do politics differently,” the analysts communicate these women premiers could have used their official powers more actively to ameliorate the many inequalities, injustices and barriers that women face. Bashevkin notes in her summary chapter: “Given that they were responsible for making these institutions work, women premiers tended to adopt many of the same repertoires as did the men who preceded and succeeded them” (287). As the editor observes, this volume opens up new scholarly terrain, and it ought to lead academics to engage the many questions it raises and test some of the answers it provides.

## Policy Transformation in Canada: Is the Past Prologue?

**Carolyn Hughes Tuohy, Sophie Borwein, Peter John Loewen and Andrew Potter, eds., Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2019, pp. 200**

Scott Edward Bennett, Carleton University ([scott.bennett@carleton.ca](mailto:scott.bennett@carleton.ca))

This edited book examines major aspects of Canadian public policy in light of changes between Canada’s 1967 centennial and its 2017 sesquicentennial. It contains a wide variety of material. One main theme is that Canada has developed a partially effective and resilient set of intergovernmental relationships. These relationships are not without challenges, but in general they have functioned reasonably well. Another major theme is that the centennial period was a time of big ideas and big programs, and this sort of expansive vision has not been consistently preserved over the intervening years in dealing with long-standing problems, as well as with more recently emergent issues.

There are four major sections to the book. The first is titled “Generational Prospects, Then and Now.” Here we find a great deal of useful analysis pertaining to the aging of the population and the reduction of opportunities for the currently young. The second part of the book is titled “The Economy, the Environment, and the Federation.” This section provides an informative picture of the engines that have driven, and may continue to drive, the economy in a time when many aspirational goals affect the economy in major ways. There is also an analysis of the imbalance between federal and total provincial expenditures and some of its implications

for the federation. Part Three is titled “Rethinking Sovereignty, Allegiance, and Rights.” Much of the material here examines how various policies relate to Indigenous peoples, but there is also considerable discussion of alternative conceptions of relational and diversity aspects of law. Part Four is titled “Canada’s Borders and Beyond.” It presents discussions of immigration policy, Canada’s international military involvement and the role of the provinces in international negotiations. The concluding chapter addresses whether Canada has reached policy gridlock. It brings together some of the main themes in the book. Briefly summarized, it expresses a concern over the capacity of the federal government to provide solutions to major problems on a level comparable to the big ideas and policies initiated in the past.

The book was written in part to show the changes in the policy challenges facing Canada in 2017 compared to 1967, as well as in the apparent ability of governments to respond to those challenges. It is an excellent book that provides an abundance of insights into a variety of policy areas. It could be a valuable part of readings for courses in Canadian government, federalism and, of course, Canadian public policy. It is particularly strong in showing the nexus of important policy challenges using insights from a wide variety of disciplines and theories.

The most conventionally significant consideration in using the book in some contexts is that it would generally need to be used in conjunction with sources covering the broad theories in well-defined fields within a discipline. For example, in a public policy seminar, it would need to be used in conjunction with texts on general types of policy theory. Having said that, it is true that some policy seminars do not include enough substantive material and analytic alternatives to flesh out the broad theories. So this work can make a valuable contribution.

When considering a work of this quality, I think it is also important to consider how it can best be discussed in a seminar. This is not so much to point out limitations as to suggest alternative approaches to relating policy visions to policy problems.

First, there could be discussion of the value in using a time of big ideas and large visions as a comparator for later periods. The 1960s and 1970s were, in some ways, a problematic break with a more incrementally focused Canadian pragmatism. The centennial era may have established a desire for policy change and scope that cannot be easily digested or maintained. Some would say that a major problem of Canadian governance is that there is too much emphasis on big, new ideas and aspirational visions and not enough on pragmatic action and implementation. Perhaps this is partly a result of being downstream from a time of great expectations. This is an area where some of the existing literature on policy theory and governance could be of use.

Another area of possible discussion is, What is the total set of design choices for federalism? Certainly a stronger federal government is a possible point on a spectrum, and this could be associated with a variety of fiscal and tax rearrangements. However, there are many possibilities, and it is useful to discuss those as they relate to the themes of this book. Indeed, if examined in detail, one might well see a place for a wider variety of subnational units just below the federal level. This is actually not inconsistent with some of the book’s content, though some would probably see it in terms of a variety of co-operating national units. In effect, I am suggesting that one logic of inquiry when considering the progress of a system of governance is to formally consider a wide variety of fully defined systems, some close to existing realities and some quite hypothetical.

Finally, it would be useful to consider the changing nature and quality of the country’s leadership class. What were Canada’s leaders like in 2017 compared to 1967 or prior to 1967? The characteristics, career incentives, communications systems, management systems and relationship to policy content of political leaders have changed somewhat over the years. It probably has a bearing on capacity to create and implement policy and to find the right balance between the practical and the visionary in relation to a changing civil society. Perhaps too much emphasis has emerged on aspiration and symbolism in order to serve the logic of political careers as opposed to the needs of Canadians.