

Legislative priorities and public opinion: representation of partisan agendas in the Canadian House of Commons

Erin Penner, Kelly Blidook and Stuart Soroka

ABSTRACT Oral questions are a central feature of the Canadian parliamentary system, and a valuable indication of legislators' issue attentiveness. Here, we consider parties' behaviour in Question Period, with a particular interest in opposition parties' representation of the public's (and publics') issue priorities. We do so using a content analytic database of oral questions covering three Parliaments from 1988 to 1999. We begin with some descriptive analyses of the distribution of oral questions across issues and parties, and then explore what drives parties' attention to issues. Combining the oral questions database with public opinion data, we examine the relationship between the issue priorities of both parties and partisans. In doing so, we examine two different foci of representation: a generalized national constituency, and each party's partisan constituency.

KEY WORDS Agenda-setting; issue attentiveness; oral questions; parliamentary behaviour; political representation; public opinion.

Question Period is the most visible part of the Canadian parliamentary process. Indeed, for most Canadians, Question Period *is* Parliament. It provides a summary indication of those issues most salient to Canadian elected officials; it is a primary venue for 'position-taking' on the part of government and opposition members alike; it is a central means by which the executive is kept in check by Parliament; and last but certainly not least, it plays a starring role in nightly newscasts. Nevertheless, in spite of its promotional and institutional centrality to parliamentary federal politics, political scientists know relatively little about oral questions, in the Canadian House of Commons or elsewhere.

We are interested here in two topics in particular: (1) to what extent are public issue priorities reflected in the content of oral questions?; and (2) if public issue priorities *are* reflected in oral questions, which public tends to be represented, and by whom? The answers are a critical indication of the nature and quality of representation in the Canadian Parliament. Importantly, they also serve to address the question of whether oral questions have any important function in the Canadian Parliament: do they represent vacuous symbolic politicking, or substantive, perhaps even representative, policy-relevant discussion?

Note that our focus on issue attentiveness differs from the typical focus in studies of representation. Both theoretical and empirical discussions of representation are most often concerned with the representation of public policy preferences (e.g. Erikson *et al.* 2002; Page and Shapiro 1992; Soroka and Wlezien 2004; Wlezien 1995). Here, we draw on work by Baumgartner and Jones (1993, 2002) and others, emphasizing the importance of issue *attentiveness*. Our study also differs from much work on representation in that we explore the extent to which representation by Canadian legislators is centred on *generalized* versus *particularized* constituencies – specifically, a general Canadian public versus narrower partisan constituencies.

We begin, however, with a discussion of past work on the legislative representation of various geographic and partisan constituencies, followed by a brief description of the data on which our analyses are based. These sections provide the theoretical and empirical background to the subsequent analyses, exploring the extent to which generalized and/or particularized (partisan) opinion drives change in issue attentiveness in Parliament. In sum, we suggest that Canadian legislators represent a combination of national and partisan issue priorities: on the one hand, there is evidence of partisan representation cross-sectionally in terms of a broad ‘taxes-versus-spending’ dimension; longitudinally, however, party and partisan agendas tend to move very closely together, and representation of shifts in issue attentiveness over time is essentially generalized. Our results speak to the nature of representation and policy-making in Canada and, possibly, in other parliamentary systems. They also indicate the potential importance of considering a combination of particularized and generalized constituencies in work on issue attentiveness and policy agenda-setting.

‘GENERALIZED’ AND PARTICULARIZED’ ISSUE PRIORITIES

For any single representative (or body of representatives), political representation will typically be of several constituencies¹ simultaneously. Some of these constituencies may be more *generalized*, such as a national electorate. Alternatively, they may be more *particularized*, such as partisans, or those of a particular class, region or religion.

The extent to which a representative focuses on any one constituency will largely be a function of its electoral importance. That is, the importance of a particular constituency depends on factors such as constituency size, distribution and reliability of support, each of which can contribute to a candidate’s chances at (re-)election or a party’s efforts at winning a greater share of legislative seats (see e.g. Fiorina 1974; Mayhew 1974). Of course, electoral systems play a conditioning role. Single Member Plurality (SMP) systems producing winner-take-all governments will likely increase pressures for generalized representation; conversely, Proportional Representation (PR) systems producing coalition governments may be more conducive to particularized representation, even when it does not lead to a majority or plurality of votes.

In short, particularized constituencies can matter, in some cases, a great deal. However, much of the policy agendas research dealing with representation focuses exclusively on generalized representation – that is, the representation of a national agenda by a national legislature. Here, we explore the possibility of a more particularized (partisan) representation in Canada, a country which presents an interesting test case. Observers of Canadian politics typically argue that Canadian party and legislative behaviour is characterized by brokerage politics, where partisan preferences are sacrificed in the pursuit of the median voter (e.g. Clarke *et al.* 1996; Johnston 1986; Scarrow 1965). However, recent considerations of the Canadian party system suggest a more particularized party system since the 1993 federal election, when the appearance of regionally based parties may have encouraged an increasing degree of particularized representation by all parties (e.g. Carty *et al.* 2000).

Teasing out the focus of representation may be comparatively easy in Canada. In parliamentary systems, where the legislature and executive are fused, the need for a government to hold the confidence of the legislature can result in relatively strong party cohesiveness, or ‘party discipline’ (Diermeier and Feddersen 1998; Huber 1996). This is particularly true for Canada. A party’s representative focus, then, may be more reliably mimicked by individual party members in parliamentary systems, where, above all else, party will be the principle driver of individual MPs’ legislative behaviour.²

Particularized (partisan) representation thus seems likely in Canada, and we test for it below. First, however, we review the importance, and measurement, of Parliamentary Question Period.

PARLIAMENTARY QUESTION PERIOD

The practice of asking oral questions in the Canadian House of Commons developed rather haphazardly. While Question Period (QP) has existed almost from Confederation (1867), it was not officially codified until 1964 (*Journals*, 20 April 1964, p. 225), and its relatively unsystematic institutional development certainly contributed to the form that QP currently takes. Even now, QP is an unfettered environment in which opposition and government party members can ask government ministers almost anything; moreover, answers are almost always provided, or at least attempted.

Whether this type of parliamentary institution is desirable is another matter entirely. Oral questions in the Canadian House of Commons can catch governments off guard, eliciting unprepared (and perhaps more truthful or damaging) responses; they can also be driven by morning media headlines. Both of these attributes contribute to the spectacle that is Question Period, and have thus cast doubt on the forum’s representational purpose. Existing research does, however, suggest that Question Period has important institutional functions. This work suggests, for instance, that Question Period is valuable as (1) a means of ensuring that the government is held accountable to Parliament, (2) an opportunity for the opposition to both criticize government policies and

suggest alternatives, and (3) a chance for backbench MPs to gain both experience and publicity (e.g. Docherty 1997; Franks 1987; outside Canada, see also Chester and Bowring 1962; Franklin and Norton 1993). These notions are buttressed by empirical work suggesting the substantive significance of oral questions in politics and policy-making (e.g. Crimmins and Nesbitt-Larking 1996; Howlett 1998; Soroka 2002a, 2002b). In short, though they often seem chaotic and discordant, even attention-seeking and absurd, oral questions contain relevant information about representatives' political and legislative priorities.

The current analysis supports the established argument that, practically speaking, oral questions are important. Several caveats are in order, however. First, oral questions are not actual policy. They do not reliably indicate the direction of policy and, indeed, are not even a measure of the government's legislative priorities. The vast majority of oral questions are asked by opposition parties, so the extent to which these questions reflect government issue priorities is a function of whether opposition parties decide to enquire about those issues. In many cases, they do – we believe that the general parliamentary agenda is often captured by Question Period content. However, it need not be. As such, it should be kept in mind that opposition parties' issue priorities are the focus here; government priorities can only be explored indirectly. Consequently, oral questions have only an indirect and perhaps tenuous link with policy. In fact, they likely reflect an agenda that is more symbol than substance. This is not necessarily a disadvantage – much of politics is symbolic, and oral questions may provide a valuable indication of this aspect of the policy-making process.

QP is thus a potentially important policy venue. In fact, it is one of the few venues in which the representational activities of individual legislators and parties, particularly the allocation of attentiveness across policy issues, can be explored. A growing body of work on policy agenda-setting emphasizes the significance of attentiveness, or issue salience, to the policy process. Specifically, this work argues that attentiveness is a critical prerequisite for major policy change (see e.g. Baumgartner and Jones 1993, 2002; Jones 1994; Kingdon 1995). We embrace this perspective below, and address representation in terms of the link between public issue attentiveness and issue attentiveness in oral questions.

THE DATA: DATASET DESIGN AND GENERAL TRENDS

Our analyses rely on a content analytic database of all oral questions asked in the House of Commons from December 1988 (the opening of the second Mulroney government) to December 1999 (the middle of the second Chrétien government). This database includes about 19,000 oral questions, spanning three Parliaments. Issue codes were drawn from the US *Policy Agendas* project, though several codes were adjusted to reflect Canadian rather than US policies (e.g. Canada Pension Plan), and several others were added to accommodate uniquely Canadian political issues (e.g. National Unity).³ Questions (and answers) differ in length considerably, and our goal was to capture the amount of time dedicated to each issue. As such, the analysis is based on proportional measures – the number

of column cms on a given topic each month, as a proportion of all column cms each month, either for the entire Parliament or for individual parties.

The resulting series for the four issues focused on here – health care, education, national debt, taxes – are shown in the first four panels of Figure 1. Each graph includes the unadjusted monthly series (dotted line), along with a lowess-smoothed trend line (bandwidth = 3). Based on opinion polls (see below), health care is one of the most salient issues in Canada, and its rise on the parliamentary agenda may already be seen in the mid- to late 1990s. Education has been less salient in Canadian federal politics, and our data illustrate its comparatively lower priority in QP. Movements in both debt and taxes illustrate well-known trends over the time period. For debt, punctuations occur when March budgets are introduced. As well, a prolonged period of higher salience is observed in the mid-1990s, when the Chrétien Liberal government made cutting the deficit a major priority. The heightened salience of taxes in 1989 to 1990 reflects the debate surrounding the introduction of the national Goods and Services Tax (GST).

Fundamental to our analysis are the data shown in the final panel of Figure 1. Rather than examine attentiveness for parties and partisans issue by issue, we rely on a single issue dimension – drawn from recent work by Fournier *et al.* (2005) – which greatly simplifies our comparison of multiple party and partisan agendas. The issue dimension measures the trade-off between preferences for fiscal restraint and preferences for government spending; more precisely, it is the relative salience (percentage of total QP agenda) of health or education minus the relative salience of taxes or debt/deficit issues. While the QP and MIP data do not technically capture preference (but rather attentiveness), the four issues which this measure uses are essentially unidirectional. That is, during this period in Canada, attention to health or education almost always meant *increasing* spending in those domains, while attention to taxes or debt/deficit almost always meant *decreasing* taxes or spending. Note that the measure represents not just an empirical convenience but also a theoretical conviction. The policy agendas literature asserts that issue attentiveness is finite – giving more attention to health care, for example, necessarily means giving less attention to other issues. It follows that attentiveness to health care and education, or taxes and debt, represents not just issue attentiveness per se, but issue preference. Thus the measure neatly summarizes the relative priority attached to increasing versus limiting spending/policy.⁴

The general trend in the taxes-versus-spending dimension is illustrated in the bottom panel of Figure 1. The fact that attention to taxes and debt almost always outweighs attention to health care and education is emblematic of the time period, where Canadian governments were preoccupied with taxes and debt/deficit issues. Specifically, there was an initial bias towards decreased taxes during the second Mulroney Conservative government. There was then a swing towards increased spending preceding the election of the first Chrétien Liberal government, followed by a move towards decreased taxes as that government focused on eliminating budget deficits. By the late 1990s, these budget deficits were eliminated, and the House increasingly focused on social spending priorities, particularly health care.




Figure 1 Issue attentiveness in Parliament, monthly

REPRESENTATION OF ISSUE PRIORITIES IN QUESTION PERIOD

To what extent does movement in the parliamentary taxes-versus-spending dimension reflect a similar movement in a public dimension? Moreover, to what extent does it reflect generalized Canadian public issue priorities, or more particularized partisan issue priorities? These questions are explored here by comparing the parliamentary data with public opinion time series drawn from quarterly enviro-nics omnibus surveys. Public opinion is indicated by the ‘most important problem’ (MIP) question, which taps the salience of particular issues for the public.⁵ The proportion of respondents citing health care and education issues is subtracted from the proportion citing taxes and debt issues to identify a public taxes-versus-spending dimension directly comparable with the parliamentary measure. The resulting taxes-versus-spending opinion measure is plotted alongside the parliamentary data in Figure 2. Opinion is available only quarterly, so parliamentary data here are also aggregated by quarter. Again, the series are lowess-smoothed; bandwidth = 2 for public and .4 for Parliament.

The figure shows a striking similarity between the two series. That is, there is a strong relationship between the issue priorities of the Canadian public – at least where the balance between these four issues is concerned – and the issue priorities in Question Period. Recall that this is not the same as a strong relationship between policy and preferences. Indeed, recent work examining the actual policy outcomes of governments suggests that the opinion–policy relationship in Canada is comparatively mild (Soroka and Wlezien 2004). In that work, representation does appear greater for more salient issues, however, and we are looking only at relatively salient issues here. However, Figure 2 also investigates a different form of representation. Symbolic behaviour in Question




Figure 2 Taxes-versus-spending dimension, public and Parliament, quarterly

Period, principally by opposition parties, seems to be relatively strongly related to the issue priorities of the Canadian public.

It is nevertheless notable that the public and parliamentary agendas seem to diverge around 1997. This trend in the parliamentary series has more to do with a shift in the balance of power across parties in the legislature than it does with a shift in the issue focus of (aggregated) individual legislators. Both right-wing parties – Reform and PC – have more seats following the election in 1997; the Reform Party forms the official opposition, and the overall QP agenda moves to the right as a consequence. Whether the public and parliamentary agendas continued to move apart requires more data than we currently have available. In the meantime, we take this divergence as a sign that the individual party agendas may be quite different and are certainly worth investigating more closely.

In order to do so, we disaggregate our results by party/partisanship. For Parliament, this means building a separate measure for each party (i.e. using oral questions asked by the party). For the public, the MIP data are disaggregated by intended vote to find partisans' issue priorities. Note that using intended vote presents some difficulties, since we cannot adequately discern whether parties are representing the changing priorities of the same partisans over time, or whether partisans are changing their vote based on parties' changing priorities. It is likely that both are happening, and while much of the movement is likely partisan- rather than party-driven, this cannot be adequately explored here. Nevertheless, the measure should provide a reasonably accurate portrayal of the preferences of those that identify with each of the different parties.

Before plotting the issue dimension over time, Table 1 shows means values for attentiveness by each party and corresponding partisan group. Both the left-leaning NDP and its partisans predictably devote more of their attentiveness

Table 1 Parliamentary attentiveness and public opinion

	<i>Parliament</i>				
	<i>Lib</i>	<i>PC</i>	<i>NDP</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>BQ</i>
Health	4.1	3.0	9.2	4.5	3.0
Education	0.9	2.7	1.5	0.1	0.9
Debt	1.4	3.8	1.8	4.2	1.9
Taxes	3.2	9.0	2.5	5.8	3.9
	<i>Public opinion</i>				
Health	4.4	4.1	5.4	2.9	2.4
Education	1.0	0.9	0.8	1.0	0.2
Debt	6.4	8.8	5.0	15.4	7.0
Taxes	5.2	5.1	4.7	7.7	3.1

Note: Cells contain mean values for attentiveness to each (as a percentage of attentiveness to all issues), including all quarterly data from 1991(q1) to 1999(q4).

(9 per cent and 5 per cent respectively) to health issues than any other group. The fiscally conservative Reform Party is more attentive to debt issues than the other parties; they also devote considerable attention to taxes, trumped only by the other fiscally conservative party, the PCs. Reform attentiveness tends to reflect their partisans' concerns as well – Reform voters dedicate 15 per cent of their overall attention to the debt and 8 per cent to taxes, significantly more than other partisan groups. The Liberals – both parliamentary and public – occupy a middle space across the four issues in question, reflecting their status as a pan-national brokerage party. Patterns in BQ party and partisan attentiveness are more elusive, partly because the party is preoccupied with national unity issues that are not captured in our issue dimension.

Table 1 thus reveals few unexpected patterns. Moreover, it suggests a considerable degree of representation of partisans' issue priorities by parties in Question Period. Figure 3 partly buttresses this finding. The figure shows the taxes-versus-spending issue dimension, by party and intended vote, over time. The first panel shows that there is not as wide a range of preferences between groups of partisans as one might expect. Indeed, the major difference is between Reform Party voters and all other voters. Still, differences between other partisans are discernible, and their ordering from taxes to spending is roughly similar across the time period. New Democratic Party (NDP) partisans lean further towards spending, and Reform partisans furthest towards restraint. Over the time period examined here, there is a 15- to 30-point difference between NDP and Reform voters. That said, the closeness of preferences in terms of both distance and trend over the period indicates that similar forces are affecting most voters; the average position of all voters seems to lean towards fiscal restraint in the middle period and towards spending in the later period.⁶

The second panel of Figure 3 shows results for parties. The relative ordering of parties is similar to that of partisans (albeit more clearly later in the period), providing initial evidence that parties are representing their partisan constituencies' issue priorities. Again, the Reform Party is the most clearly differentiated. In the 1993 to 1997 period, Reform is 10 points further to the restraint side than the NDP, and after 1997 the gap is 15 points. Apart from the big swings early in the period by the Liberals and NDP (attributed to their heavy focus on the controversial Goods and Services Tax (GST)), the NDP remains on the spending side of the dimension for virtually the entire period, while the Liberals hold relatively close to the zero point. The Progressive Conservative (PC) Party maintains a centre-right fiscal position over much of the time period. The Bloc Québécois' generally centre-left views do not seem to be represented in the first half of the period examined here. The Bloc was a new party during these years, however, with a stark focus on national unity; little attention was paid to any of these four issues, except for the criticism directed at specific applications of the GST and, more generally, the national debt. Over time (and particularly after the 1995 Québec referendum), the Bloc comes to focus on a greater range of issues and moves to a more centre-left position on the taxes-versus-spending dimension.




Figure 3 Taxes-versus-spending dimension, in public and Parliament, quarterly, by party/partisanship

Although the ordering of parties on the spending–restraint dimension is roughly similar to the ordering of partisans, the trend over time in Parliament seems less pronounced than in opinion. That is, public opinion has moved towards spending relatively dramatically since the mid-1990s, yet the same trend is barely evident in QP content. Whether this difference reflects a lack of representation is not clear. The public can simply ignore issues they are not interested in, while legislators will usually need to pay at least some attention to many issues at any given time. Thus, the swings evident in public opinion should perhaps not be expected, at least not to the same extent, in QP content.

The relationships between both general and partisan public and parliamentary issue priorities can be examined more formally. Indeed, this can be accomplished using a simple time-series cross-sectional (TSCS) model, where each party is a panel. The model is as follows:

$$QP_t^i = \alpha + QP_{t-1}^i + MIP_{t-1}^{All} + MIP_{t-1}^i + \varepsilon, \quad (1)$$

where QP_t^i is the taxes–spending dimension as represented in Question Period for party i , MIP^{All} is the same dimension as evident in public opinion data for all respondents combined, and MIP^i is the dimension calculated for respondents voting for party i only. MIP^{All} thus captures the extent to which a party's legislative agenda follows general public priorities, while MIP^i captures the extent to which that party's agenda follows its own partisans' priorities. (The model also includes a lagged version of QP (at $t - 1$) on the right-hand side, since the distribution of attentiveness in any one period will be partly determined by the distribution of attentiveness in previous periods.⁷)

Results for this model are shown in Table 2. The model is estimated in three stages: the first stage includes only MIP^{All} ; the second includes only MIP^i ; the last includes both variables. Results in the first column show no significant effect of MIP^{All} on the parties' QP agendas. The second column, however, shows a significant effect of partisan agendas (MIP^i) on parties' QP agendas. A coefficient of .215 implies the following: if 5 per cent of any one partisan constituency moves from being principally attentive to taxes/debt issues to being principally attentive to health/education issues, then the balance between these two issue categories in the related party's oral questions should shift by about 1.08 per cent in the same direction. This effect is statistically significant, though rather small in magnitude. In the final model, including both MIP^i and MIP^{All} , MIP^i remains significant – indeed, its magnitude increases somewhat. Notably, MIP^{All} remains insignificant.⁸

These results should be interpreted carefully. The aforementioned effect of a 5 per cent shift in partisan preference is worded in terms of a shift over time; however, there are several clues that the power of the MIP^i coefficient comes from cross-sectional (across parties) rather than longitudinal variation. First, MIP^{All} is not significant even on its own, and Figure 3 does not suggest that there should be large differences in overtime trends between the generalized MIP^{All} measure and the more particularized MIP^i measure. Figure 3 also does not suggest that there are

Table 2 Parliamentary activity and public opinion, TSCS analysis

<i>Independent variables</i>	<i>Dependent variable: QPⁱ</i>		
QP _{t-1} ⁱ	.224*** (.073)	.203*** (.074)	.202*** (.074)
MIP _{t-1} ^{All}	.131 (.165)	–	–.139 (.213)
MIP _{t-1} ⁱ	–	.215* (.123)	.287* (.155)
Constant	1.737 (1.707)	2.651* (1.489)	2.167 (1.740)
R ²	.088	.109	.112
N	150	148	148
Panels	5	5	5

Notes: Cells contain OLS regression coefficients from a TSCS estimation with panel-corrected standard errors, with standard errors in parentheses and standardized coefficients in italics. *p < .10; **p < .05; ***p < .01.

large overtime differences between the different parties' *MIPⁱ* agendas. Indeed, there are strong correlations between the generalized and partisan taxes-versus-spending dimensions. The Reform Party *MIPⁱ* has the lowest correlation with *MIP^{All}* at .72; the Liberal Party *MIPⁱ* has the highest at .91.

The greater effect of *MIPⁱ* on issue attentiveness in *QP* is thus not so much the product of different partisan trends over time as it is a function of ongoing differences in the *level* of each partisan (and party) series. In other words, durable partisan differences in the taxes-versus-spending dimension – as shown in Table 1 as well as Figure 3 – are clearly represented in parties' behaviour in *QP*; short-term shifts in partisan issue attentiveness appear to play a lesser role. This subtle difference between representation across time and representation across space is critical. In Parliamentary Question Period, durable partisan differences in issue attentiveness are clearly represented, but short-term trends in partisan issue attentiveness over time have a relatively weak effect, if any effect at all.

CONCLUSIONS

Are public issue priorities reflected in the content of oral questions? Preceding evidence suggests the answer is yes – parties' agendas vary in a manner that reflects public issue attentiveness. That this suggestion is true is, at a minimum, evidence that Question Period can be an important representational forum – important in the sense that representation of public attitudes can and does happen there, though the extent to which this content is linked to subsequent policy-making may admittedly be another matter. Still, evidence that questions are at least partly linked to public issue concerns lends support to the idea that oral questions play a valuable role in the Canadian Parliament.

More importantly, our results suggest two things about the character of the representation of public issue priorities in Parliament. First, representation during this period seems to be more particularized – specifically, partisan – than generalized. Perhaps this is not surprising: the appearance of two new parties in the 1990s – one of them with a strong grassroots orientation and the other with a strong anti-centralist orientation – likely increased the presence of, and the pressure for, particularized representation. Second, to the extent that representation of public issue attentiveness exists in QP, cross-partisan differences clearly trump overtime trends. That is, at any given time, parties' behaviour in QP broadly reflects differences in the issue priorities of their partisans. Over time, the link between public attitudes and QP content seems a little more tenuous, at least over the short term, where our taxes-versus-spending measure is concerned.

While the particular trends shown here are restricted to Canada, the general findings (a) that representation exists in oral questions, and (b) that representation of issue attentiveness can reflect a number of different constituencies, are of course not restricted to the Canadian case. Similar phenomena will exist across democracies, though political institutions will play an important structuring role. In the US, a division of executive and legislative power and less party discipline may mean that individual members of Congress find less incentive to represent a broad, national constituency, and a stronger incentive to represent the issue priorities (partisan or more generalized) of their narrower geographic constituency. More proportional systems in Continental Europe, where smaller parties can govern in coalitions and thus may have a lesser incentive to move towards the median voter, may foster stronger representation of partisan interests; indeed, far narrower partisan interests which show differences not just in cross-sectional levels of issue attentiveness but also exhibit quite different overtime trends. And across all systems, the proportion by which a given candidate or party won an election will affect their representational strategy – their efforts to 'expand' or 'protect' their electoral base (Fenno 1978).

In short, the representation of issue attentiveness will almost always reflect a number of different constituencies, both generalized and particularized. Thus, the strategy employed above can and should be applied widely. This more nuanced approach to issue attentiveness agendas has the potential to enrich our understanding of the mechanics and nature of representation not just in Canada, but elsewhere as well.

Biographical notes: Erin Penner has completed her MA in the Department of Political Science at McGill University, Montréal, Canada, and is a PhD candidate at the University of British Columbia, Canada. Kelly Blidook is a PhD candidate in Canadian and Comparative Politics at McGill University. Stuart Soroka is Associate Professor and William Dawson Scholar in the Department of Political Science at McGill University.

Addresses for correspondence: Erin Penner, 2642 Oxford St. (BSMT), Vancouver BC, Canada V5K 1N3. email: erin.penner@mcgill.ca/Kelly Blidook, Department of Political Science, Leacock Building, 855 Sherbrooke St,

West Montreal, Quebec, Canada H3A 2T7. email: kelly.blidook@mcgill.ca/
Stuart Soroka, email: stuart.soroka@mcgill.ca

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was supported by the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) and the Fonds québécois de la recherche sur la société et la culture (FQRSC). The authors are grateful to the Canadian Opinion Research Archive (CORA) at Queen's University and the Library of Parliament for providing some of the necessary data. Previous versions of this paper were presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, London, Ontario, 2–4 June 2005, and at 'New Directions in Comparative Public Policy: Policies and Institutions', a conference held at the University of Aarhus, Denmark, 1–2 July 2005. We are indebted to conference participants for their comments and guidance, particularly to Frank Baumgartner, Bryan Jones, Peter John and Christoffer Green-Pedersen.

NOTES

- 1 Note that we use 'constituency' here in a general sense – that is, a subset of the population, rather than a geographic electoral unit.
- 2 These pressures may be lessened in presidential systems (see e.g. Aldrich and Rohde 2000; Cox and McCubbins 1993; Kiewit and McCubbins 1991).
- 3 A list of Canadian topic codes is available from the authors; US topic codes are available via the Policy Agendas Project website (www.policyagendas.org) at the University of Washington.
- 4 It is worth reiterating that this condition is not expected to be the case in general. We assert that the measure is a reasonable summary for Canada during this period, and the forthcoming analysis supports this supposition.
- 5 The question reads, 'What do you think is the most important problem facing Canada today?'
- 6 This shift in public preferences is supported by past research on the representation of spending/saving preferences in Canada during this time period. See Soroka and Wlezien 2004.
- 7 Statistically speaking, this lagged variable also of course accounts for autocorrelation in the dependent variable.
- 8 This model was also estimated with the Bloc Québécois excluded, as it could be argued that the party has no clear reason to represent a generalized Canadian interest, insofar as it may differ from a generalized Québec interest. This made no difference to the results.

REFERENCES

- Aldrich, J.H. and Rohde, D.W. (2000) 'The Republican revolution and the House Appropriations Committee', *The Journal of Politics* 62(1): 1–33.
- Baumgartner, F.R. and Jones, B.D. (1993) *Agendas and Instability in American Politics*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Baumgartner, R. and Jones, B.D. (2002) *Policy Dynamics*, Chicago, IL, and London: University of Chicago Press.

- Carty, R.K., Cross, W. and Young, L. (2000) *Rebuilding Canadian Party Politics*, Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Chester, D.N. and Bowring, N. (1962) *Questions in Parliament*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Clarke, H.D., Jenson, J., Leduc, L. and Pammet, J. (1996) *Absent Mandate: Canadian Electoral Politics in an Era of Restructuring*, (3rd edn), Vancouver: Gage Educational Publishing Company.
- Cox, G.W. and McCubbins, M.D. (1993) *Legislative Leviathan: Party Government in the House*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Crimmins, J.E. and Nesbitt-Larking, P. (1996) 'Canadian Prime Ministers in the House of Commons', *Journal of Legislative Studies* 2(3): 145–71.
- Diermeier, D. and Feddersen, T.J. (1998) 'Cohesion in legislatures and the vote of confidence procedure', *The American Political Science Review* 92(3): 611–21.
- Docherty, D.C. (1997) *Mr. Smith Goes to Ottawa: Life in the House of Commons*, Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Erickson, R.S., MacKuen, M.B. and Stimson, J.A. (2002) *The Macro Policy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fenno, R.F. (1978) *Home Style: House Members in their Districts*, Boston: Little and Brown.
- Fiorina, M.P. (1974) *Representatives, Roll Calls, and Constituencies*, Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Fournier, P., Cutler, F., Soroka, S.N. and Lyle, G. (2005) 'Who responds to election campaigns: the two-mediator model revisited', paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, June, London Ontario.
- Franklin, M.N. and Norton, P. (eds) (1993) *Parliamentary Questions*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Franks, C.E.S. (1987) *The Parliament of Canada*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Howlett, M. (1998) 'Predictable and unpredictable policy windows: institutional and exogenous correlates of Canadian federal agenda-setting', *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 31(3): 495–524.
- Huber, J.D. (1996) 'The vote of confidence in parliamentary democracies', *American Political Science Review* 90(2): 269–282.
- Johnston, R. (1986) *Public Opinion and Public Policy in Canada: Questions of Confidence*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Jones, B.D. (1994) *Preconceiving Decision-making in Democratic Politics: Attention, Choice, and Public Policy*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Kiewit, D.R. and McCubbins, M.D. (1991) *The Logic of Delegation*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kingdon, J. W. (1995) *Agendas, alternatives, and public policies* (2nd edn.), New York: Longman.
- Mayhew, D. (1974) *Congress: The Electoral Connection*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Page, B.I. and Shapiro, R.Y. (1992) *The Rational Public: Fifty Years of Trends in Americans' Policy Preferences*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Scarrow, H.A. (1965) 'Distinguishing between political parties – the case of Canada', *Midwest Journal of Political Science* 9(1): 61–76.
- Soroka, S.N. (2002a), *Agenda-setting Dynamics in Canada*, Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Soroka, S.N. (2002b). 'Issue attributes and agenda-setting by media, the public and policy-makers in Canada', *International Journal of a Public Opinion Research* 14(3): 264–285.
- Soroka, S.N. and Wlezien, C. (2004) 'Opinion representation and policy feedback', *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 37(3): 531–60.
- Wlezien, C. (1995) 'The public as thermostat: dynamics of preferences for spending', *American Journal of Political Science* 39(4): 981–1000.