

# Reviews/Comptes rendus

## BOOKS REVIEWED

**Bruce Ackerman and Anne Alstott** *The Stakeholder Society* reviewed by Dan Usher 566

**Gerard William Boychuk** *Patchworks of Purpose: The Development of Provincial Social Assistance Regimes in Canada* reviewed by Karen Swift 565

**Miles Corak (ed.)** *Government Finances and Generational Equity* reviewed by Norman Bonsor 564

**Leo Groarke (ed.)** *The Ethics of the New Economy: Restructuring and Beyond* reviewed by Patrick Basham 563

**David B. Perry** *Financing the Canadian Federation, 1867 to 1995: Setting the Stage for Change* reviewed by John Robinson 564

**Ariel Salleh** *Ecofeminism as Politics: Nature, Marx and the Postmodern* reviewed by Alicja Musznski 569

### **The Ethics of the New Economy: Restructuring and Beyond**

edited by Leo Groarke. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1998. Pp. iv, 332. \$29.95.

This edited volume of conference papers makes a modest contribution to our appreciation of the utility of applied ethics in discussing economic change. By applied ethics, the 31 contributors (mostly philosophers and ethicists) refer to the application of ethical inquiry to "real life situations and the issues they give rise to" (p. 245) illustrated by "reports from the front line of the new economy" (p. 7).

The 24 chapters include discussion of: the case against restructuring, the distinction between responsible and irresponsible restructuring, alternative methods of restructuring, the ethical issues raised by the consequences of restructuring, case studies of particular restructuring experiences, and how the negative social consequences of the restructuring economy can be minimized.

In the most provocative (and least convincing) chapter, Ken Hanly offers an anachronistic Marxist critique of the alleged corporate agenda behind government restructuring. According to Hanly, the push to dismantle the welfare state is a ruse to, first, provide tax cuts to corporations and wealthy individuals and, second, ensure an inexpensive supply of labour.

Hanly states that the government debt crisis cannot be solved by cutting taxes (which is partially correct, spending must also be cut). What is wholly incorrect is the accompanying, selectively justified, assertion that President Reagan's fiscal policy proved this point. Beyond North America, New Zealand is cited as a poor example of how to handle a debt crisis. This ignores widespread acclaim for their economic turnaround, orchestrated during the past 15 years, as documented, for example, by the OECD.

Similarly, voluminous empirical criticism of the minimum wage's adverse impact upon employment is discarded by reference to a single contrary study. Hanly believes that a greater role for private funding of universities is "forcing universities to abandon their cherished traditions of academic freedom and institutional autonomy ... (as) modern academics are loath to bite the hand that feeds them" (p. 49). However, are we sufficiently naive to accept that such a financial quid pro quo does not occur between academia and its public sector patron?

Norma MacRae's defence of employment equity programs is equally disingenuous. For MacRae, employment equity ensures the "appropriate" representation of designated groups within the workforce. Disappointingly, "appropriate" is neither defined nor explained. The reader is also asked to accept that the official absence of job quotas from this legislation has meant that *de facto* quotas do not exist. As Martin Loney has documented, they clearly do.

Darryl Reed, in detailing restructuring's negative externalities for developing nations, advocates bringing global capital under the "democratic control" of, for example, the United Nations and the European Union. This is surprising, given that, in practice, neither institution is a leading repository of the democratic spirit.

It is not until Wesley Cragg's concluding chapter that a defence of restructuring is presented. However, a couple of paragraphs describing Joseph Schumpeter's theory of the "creative destruction" at the heart of the capitalist economy hardly satisfies editor Leo Groarke's claim that "the book tries to present an informed account of different sides of the restructuring debate" (p. 7).

PATRICK BASHAM, Social Affairs Centre, The Fraser Institute

**Financing the Canadian Federation, 1867 to 1995: Setting the Stage for Change**

by David B. Perry. Toronto: Canadian Tax Foundation, 1997. Pp. xv, 376.

In Canadian budgetary matters, massive federal transfers of dollars to provincial governments were not intended by the founding fathers of the Canadian constitution. Indeed, they placed limits on grants to the provinces to discourage provincial extravagance. Since provincial governments now derive almost half of their revenues from federal grants, the constraint does not seem to have succeeded.

This, of course, illustrates the way a federal system works. The constitution imposes constraints on the members, but so do the separate and frequently different preferences of the members: an effective federal system is flexible enough to provide “diversity without disunion.”

The same flexibility has enabled the federal system to adapt the constitutional structure to economic change; not only that, but to changes in the role of government since 1867. Modern governments have moved away from the concept of government as the manager of the public household to a more activist role of expanding the range of government activity, and directing the economy toward goals selected by government itself.

David Perry’s book describes this expansion of the federal government. There is a short historical introduction, but the main focus is on the period since World War II. This, of course, was the period of enormous federal expansion based on federal-provincial transfers. Perry calls it “Ottawa Ascendant” but “Ottawa Imperialism” might be a better term, since the goal was to marginalize the provinces.

For scholars working in federal-provincial relations, it is difficult to keep up with all the programs spawned by federal activism, which not only were numerous but also were changed frequently, often

beyond recognition. People working in the field are familiar with the general trends, but they also know how time-consuming it is to track down accurate factual information. Perry’s detailed review of these programs and the changes over 40 years or so is therefore a welcome research tool which surely justifies the many hours of work that obviously went into it.

A cautionary note, however. In trying studiously to avoid taking sides on the issues he discusses, Perry gives the impression that the federal programs and their frequent modifications were somehow always effective and always in the public interest. In fact, some were disastrous: many were launched without adequate planning, the forecasting was inept, and the maladroit financing bears much of the responsibility for decades of budgetary deficits.

In Perry’s narrative, the “Ottawa Descendant” phase was when governmental activism spilled over onto the provincial governments. Government as a whole became bigger, and the provinces took over governmental functions for which they were better adapted. The provinces are just as much a part of the federal system as the federal government is, but there is little in this study about provincial responses to all this federal activity.

In summary, this study is a very useful review of Canadian federal-provincial economic relations from the federal side. What we need now is an equally detailed presentation of the system from the provincial (including the local) point of view.

JOHN ROBINSON, Department of Economics, York University

**Government Finances and Generational Equity**  
edited by Miles Corak. Ottawa: Statistics Canada and Human Resources Development Canada, 1998. Pp. vii, 147. \$35.00.

Generational accounting (GA) had its genesis in the work of Auerbach, Gokhale, and Kotlikoff in the

early 1990s. The interest in fiscal-based GA grew out of the concern that the very large deficits and increasing debt levels experienced in the US in the 1980s and early 1990s was creating a large fiscal burden which would be transferred to future generations. Generational accounting is distinguished from the typical annual budget deficit accounting in that it attempts to measure lifetime net tax burdens on different age groups. GA allocates existing taxes and expenditures to each age cohort and judges — given assumptions as to economic and population growth — whether or not the specific budget is “sustainable.” A budget is judged to be “sustainable” if the current generation pays taxes at a level that will pay for the publicly provided goods and services (including transfers) they consume.

This volume, in both English and French, addresses a number of Canadian generational issues. It is composed of seven original research papers by academic economists and economists working for Statistics Canada. There are overview comments by Laurence Kotlikoff, Lars Osberg, and John Helliwell.

Oreopoulos and Vaillancourt provide a succinct overview of the methodology of GA together with an empirical estimation that shows that current (1998) fiscal policy in Canada is roughly in balance (sustainable) across generations, a far cry from the situation that prevailed in the early to mid-1990s. Gunderson and Hyatt use GA methodology to look at the Ontario Workers’ Compensation program and show that the past unfunded liability means that past employers have shifted the cost of accidents to future generations. In an interesting paper, they raise the intergenerational equity issue which arises if these employers are no longer in operation in Ontario in the future. Chantel Hicks addresses the age distribution of the Canadian tax/transfer system and not surprisingly finds that in 1995 there were positive transfers to the young and old, especially so in the case of the old. Brian Murphy examines tax/transfer changes over the period 1984-95 and concludes that the net tax burden on the middle-aged have increased and that on the young and old de-

creased. Steven James and Chris Matier look at the general equilibrium effects of lowering the level of government debt, and Marcel Merette extends the debt-level issue to look at growth. M. Wolfson, G. Rowe, X. Lin and S.F. Gribble use a simulation approach to examine the impact of birth cohort, gender, and earnings on lifetime net taxes beginning with those born in the 1890s and extending to those born in the 1990s.

The best parts of the volume are the contributions from Kotlikoff, Osberg, and Helliwell. Kotlikoff preaches the gospel of generational balance and the important role that GA should assume in public policy formation. Osberg argues that GA should not be used as a policy tool since it is too crude, ignores the fact that the welfare of future generations is largely dependent on the stock of productive capital passed on to them by past generations and has little to say about the problems of valuing public goods and human capital. In addition, Osberg also notes that any discussion of generational equity requires knowledge of the way in which resources are transmitted within families. Helliwell, in a thoughtful paper, considers how GA would need to be extended if it were to be used as a comprehensive measure of what future generations are likely to inherit from existing and past generations.

NORMAN BONSOR, Department of Economics,  
Lakehead University

**Patchworks of Purpose: The Development of Provincial Social Assistance Regimes in Canada** by Gerard William Boychuk. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1998. Pp. xxii, 159. \$55.00.

*Patchworks of Purpose* is a readable, compact book, providing relevant history, theory, detailed information, and a useful framework for analysis of social assistance policy in Canada.

Dr. Boychuk’s central argument is that Canada does not have a unitary approach to social assist-

ance. Rather, each province has a particular history and trajectory, emphasizing different policy elements and social purposes. A five-part typology designed to capture these variations and their significance in relation to market and family relations is presented. While acknowledging the existence of broad trends characterizing social assistance programs generally, the author presents a strong argument that federal programs, notably the Canada Assistance Plan (CAP), have not had significant effects, over time, in homogenizing provincial systems nor in creating equity across the country. Substantial historical information from the ten provinces is marshalled in support of this argument. A compelling question is posed in the conclusion: Would observers be indifferent as to the time and place they would receive assistance if they needed it? Having read the evidence, I certainly would not be indifferent.

Although there are a few brief sections relying on complex computations and detailed descriptions to make the case for continuing provincial differences, the book generally is quite accessible and interesting. Poor Law history is usefully reviewed, as are major theorists, notably Titmuss, Polanyi, and Esping-Anderson, and the author shows how his own typology both draws on and differs from these sources. The author takes us in orderly fashion through the argument and the evidence, providing some fascinating glimpses of policy options along the way — from the draconian to the (all too occasional) efforts at redistributive justice through social assistance policy.

There are a few problems with the text. Given recent policy shifts in social assistance, it is frustrating that some data are now a little old, leaving the reader to wonder if the cited trends are misleading. At times there is a little too much rigidity in the categories and concepts presented, when pointing out the ambiguities and contradictions might serve the reader better. While the author's argument of provincial differences is convincing, the social and economic contexts helping to explain these differences are not given much attention.

Overall, this is a thought-provoking book which should be read by analysts and students of social assistance and, more broadly, of social welfare and public policy. The author makes a convincing case that historical specificity is crucial to understanding and reforming social policy. Certainly, readers yearning to return to the national standards supposedly protected by CAP will be challenged to reconsider this policy goal. Boychuk points out some advantages to provincial variations and dispels some current "myths" about the way welfare programs interact with related social and economic policies. Future directions, the author points out, are not fore-ordained by macro social forces but rather will be politically decided. To play an effective political role, the policy community would be well advised to arm itself with the kind of information and analysis provided in *Patchworks of Purpose*.

KAREN SWIFT, School of Social Work, York University

### **The Stakeholder Society**

by Bruce Ackerman and Anne Alstott. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.

*The Stakeholder Society* is a passionate political tract by two law professors at Yale recommending that the American people adopt two connected reforms: (a) the granting by the US federal government to each high-school graduate in his early twenties a stake of \$80,000 to finance study at university, start a business, put a down payment on a house, save for old age or spend in any other way as the recipient thinks best, and (b) the financing of the stake by two taxes on wealth, an annual wealth tax at a rate of 2 percent and a fixed estate tax of \$250,000, appropriating all of one's estate at death over and above an exemption of about \$50,000 until the entire tax is paid.

The purpose of these reforms is two-fold. The immediate purpose is to promote equality of opportunity.

Our primary focus is on the young and energetic, not the old and vulnerable. Our primary values are freedom and equal opportunity, not decency and minimum provision. We do not deny that old fashioned decency has a role to play ... For now it is enough to see that stakeholding is intended not as “welfare” reform but as an entirely new enterprise. Our first concern is not with safety nets but with starting points; not with misfortune, but with opportunity; not with welfare, but with economic citizenship (p.8).

A second and derivative purpose is to create a common bond among citizens.

Can we preserve a sense of ourselves as a nation of free and equal citizens? As young adults receive their stakes, they will have little doubt about America’s answer to this question. As they come forward to claim their eighty thousand dollars, each of America’s children will do more than gain the ability to shape their individual destinies. They will locate themselves in a much larger national project devoted to the proposition that all men are created equal. By invoking this American ideal in their own case, they link themselves not only to all others in the past who have taken steps to realize this fundamental principle but also to all those who will do so in the future (p.7).

The main proposal — to establish a stake — can be looked upon as a variant of the negative income tax. A simple negative income tax might consist of a universal demogrant (a fixed annual payment by the government to every citizen) coupled with ordinary taxation at a rate sufficient to cover the cost of the demogrant along with all the other expenditures of the government. The stake is like a capitalized demogrant. For a person who will live to age 80 and with a rate of interest of 6 percent, a stake of \$80,000 at age 21 is equivalent to an annual demogrant of \$5,000 for the rest of one’s life. For a person who can lend or borrow at that rate, the two instruments are absolutely identical. In practice, a stake could easily be converted to a demogrant by lending. Con-

version the other way would be more difficult, though by no means impossible. The recipient of the annual demogrant may use it to finance mortgage payments on a house he could not otherwise afford, while the lender may be content with the arrangement as long as the house serves as collateral. The demogrant could cover the interest on student loans. Banks may be willing to lend money for business ventures knowing that the borrower has a secure income. The stake and the demogrant are indistinguishable when the Treasury is prepared to play along by assigning some or all of the demogrant to the lender. The proposal can be interpreted as instructing the Treasury to do just that.

Oddly enough, though advice and assistance by economists is acknowledged, there is almost no reference in the book to the negative income tax, not to Friedman’s proposal, not to Moynihan’s advocacy 30 years ago, not to the term itself. The only reference I can find is to George McGovern’s proposal of a \$1,000 (which was not all that different from \$5,000 today) demogrant in the presidential election of 1972. This is mentioned toward the end of the book, though the authors do recognize the equivalence between the stake and the demogrant if the demogrant can be cashed out.

Accepting provisionally that the demogrant is a good idea, should it be designed to allow for cashing out by the recipient? There are arguments both ways. The option of cashing out allows the recipient to undertake a large and much-desired project that might otherwise be beyond his reach. Young men and women who do not go to university are treated on a par with those who do. Cry as they may about the burden of paying back student loans, the fact remains that Canadian university students are substantially subsidized by fees that fail to cover the full cost of their education, a subsidy accruing, if not to the children of rich parents, then to a class of people destined to become substantially better off than the general population. Our new Millennial Fund can only serve to magnify the disparity. A stake to everybody treats university students and the rest of the population alike.

On the other hand, once cashed out, a demogrant can no longer serve to alleviate misfortune by supplying a minimal standard of living to one who flunks out of university, loses his job, fails in business or spends his stake foolishly. An unfortunate by-product of the proposal would be the emergence of a class of what the authors call “stakeblowers” who waste their stake on extravagant expenditure and are soon no better off than they would have been had there been no stake at all.

This latter consideration raises a question that the authors do not discuss explicitly, though their answer to the question is plain enough: What present social policies is the negative income tax or the provision of a stake intended to replace? One usually thinks of the negative income tax as a superior replacement for a wide range of social policy. The establishment of a generous negative income tax might coincide with the abolition of welfare, unemployment insurance, public housing and the old age pension, especially if the demogrant is allowed to vary somewhat with age. You are out of a job. Too bad, you shall have to get by on your demogrant, just like someone who was never fortunate enough to find a job at all. You have no earnings and little kids to look after. Too bad, you too must get by on your demogrant and that of your children. Of course, this dismissal of misfortune requires that the demogrant be generous, perhaps \$10,000 for adults and \$5,000 for children. Also, it must make exceptions of the truly incompetent for whom guidance by the state or by private charity is the only alternative to starvation. The stakeholding proposal is not like that. The authors would finance the stake by new taxation of wealth, suggesting that other social policies and other taxes would not be significantly affected if the proposal were adopted, and implying a 15 percent (the author’s estimate) increase in the expenditure of the US federal government. Thus, stakeblowers can dip once into the public trough for their stakes, and a second time for their welfare cheques.

The authors seem too sanguine about the incentives that may arise from their proposals. In particular, the combination of an \$80,000 stake, a 2 percent wealth tax and an impediment to bequests is likely to reduce

saving substantially. Public provision of a large chunk of wealth coupled with a tax-induced discouragement of additional accumulation may not be the ideal combination at a time when the US saving rate is at an all-time low. A better case might be made at this time for a stiff capital gains tax or for Robert Frank’s proposal in *Luxury Fever* (The Free Press 1999) of a steeply-graduated consumption tax.

An estate tax at a marginal rate of 100 percent on the first \$250,000 and a marginal rate of zero percent thereafter is hardly conducive to equality in the distribution of wealth. If all but very large estates are to be appropriated in repayment for the stake, people will make sure to leave their heirs substantially more than \$250,000 or nothing at all. There will be recourse to reverse mortgages, *inter vivos* gifts to children, anything to eliminate one’s estate at death. Recognizing the problem, the authors would place limits on *inter vivos* gifts, but that would be an additional discouragement to saving unless, as I suspect would happen, clever ways are found to circumvent the rules.

Of the authors’ two objectives — to promote equality of opportunity and to create a common bond among citizens — I cannot see that the first would be significantly more advanced by their proposals than by an actuarially-equivalent negative income tax, and I am distinctly sceptical about the second. If public provision of primary and secondary education does not create a common bond, if public provision of security of life and property does not create a common bond, if the right to vote and other privileges of citizenship do not create a common bond, then I doubt very much whether public provision of a stake will do so either. If the book has any impact at all on public debate, it will, I hope, be in emphasizing the inequity in our treatment of likely-to-become-rich university students and of young people who do not go to university or to college, and in raising the question of the capitalization of the demogrant in the negative income tax.

DAN USHER, Department of Economics, Queen’s University

### **Ecofeminism as Politics: Nature, Marx and the Postmodern**

by Ariel Salleh. New York: Zed Books, 1997. Pp. xi, 208.

*Ecofeminism as Politics* is a difficult book to read, especially if the reader is sympathetic to one or more of the subtitled fields: ecology, critical thought, and/or postmodernism. The 12 chapters do not contain a sustained argument but rather can be read as a series of essays or personal reflections. The author notes: "This is a book of ideology critique, but its writing has been as much a personal and political journey as an academic one. In a sense, it is a collective biography from two decades of sharing the struggles of an international ecopolitical community" (p. xii). From her standpoint as a white Australian academic and single mother, Salleh finds much to condemn in Green politics, Marxism, feminism, and, especially, postmodernism.

Her starting point is the "state of the world" or the global ecological crisis which she identifies as the hegemony contained in "the ironically positivist formula Man/Woman = Nature" (p. ix). The other formula that she uses is what she calls the 1/0 metaphor implied in the logic of positivism and the "capitalist patriarchy." Within this logic, Man is assigned the value of 1 while Woman and Nature take up the category of 0 or of not-one. Within this logic, Salleh then plays around with the concept of essentialism. While at times she defends the ecofeminism standpoint in equating women with nature, at other points she contends that essentialism is the problem of rationalist Enlightenment thinking. There are many contradictions in this work. Others include her disdain for postmodernist thinking as simply the latest trend in deflecting responsibility from capitalist patriarchy. But she then uses its language, making her writing very abstract and laden with words that derive from postmodern thinkers like Kristeva and Irigaray.

Another contradiction concerns her insistence on north/south commonalities between women. "Sisters North and South have more in common than

many think, and that commonality increases as globalisation expands. Ecofeminists do not differentiate women by stratifications of class, race, age and so forth, since the nature-woman-labour nexus as a fundamental contradiction defies these conceptual boundaries. The 1/0 rule applies cross-culturally and for women it reads thus: maximum responsibilities, minimum rights" (p. 92). In particular, housewives in the north share commonalities with their "re/sisters" in the south (women labouring in subsistence farming and in hunting and gathering economies). The contradiction here lies in the abstractions. In some places Salleh privileges all women who bring children into the world while in others she is quick to deny charges of essentialism. She also condemns feminists who collaborate with the "men in suits" — women who practice birth control and pursue careers rather than raising children. The larger argument rejects patriarchal capitalism and its linear thinking in favour of a philosophy that prioritizes an ethic of caring (holding) for other humans and for all of nature — a philosophy of process rather than of profit.

There is much food for thought contained in this book. In particular, Salleh's connection of neocolonialism with postcolonialism with biocolonialism: "When transnational pharmaceutical companies extract DNA from human body tissues to make genetically engineered products, mining occurs without on-site infrastructure costs" (p. 154). The continuing colonization of the globe (for example, the creation of wilderness spaces for the enjoyment of Western eco-tourists) proceeds simultaneously within organisms (cloning, reproductive technologies, extraction of the DNA from members of remote tribes on the verge of extinction). Transnational corporations are the culprits. International bodies like the United Nations and conferences like the Rio Earth Summit are simply the latest expressions of capitalist patriarchy.

A merry-go-round of UN-sponsored summits — Cairo, Geneva, Copenhagen — grinds on, while the "development" goal now ravages life conditions in the South, just as it already has in the

industrialised North ... The US Chamber of Commerce has successfully vitiated the 1992 Global Warming treaty, using free-market instruments such as the North Atlantic Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) to reverse controls on gas emissions ... With slogans like “technology transfer” and “capacity building”, the Rio Earth Summit promoted a colonialism of exportable environmental repair and caretaker services, further breaking apart the integrity of rural communities in the Third World (pp. 133-34).

Public policy in general is condemned as following the positivist logic of 1/0 where the 1 signifies the minority of men in suits practising global depredation while the 0 encompasses the labourers (productive and reproductive — the majority of them women) and Nature — those who provide the raw material for exploitation. While Salleh criticizes Marx, at the same time she calls for the dialectical method and a re-valuation of the labour theory of value (yet another contradiction). There are many

facts interspersed throughout the essays, alarming facts that call upon us to develop alternative politics to the current processes of globalization by transnational corporations with profit as their only motive and creed. While Salleh’s underlying argument is a compelling one, she loses potential readers (and converts) by using a language and style that ultimately speaks to the already converted. This is a book that is largely self-indulgent (as the author herself acknowledges in the preface). But the issues she raises demand a much more coherent and persuasive treatment. In particular, we need to know how we can collectively work together to change the world. Perhaps that will be the author’s next venture — a careful analysis of how we can make the world a better place for future generations of humans and all the “others” with whom we share this earth.

ALICIA MUSZNSKI, Department of Sociology, University of Waterloo

## NEW BOOKS

**Donald L. Alexander (ed.)**. Telecommunications Policy: Have Regulators Dialed the Wrong Number? Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1997. Pp. Viii, 174.

**James Warner Bjorkman and Christa Altenstetter**. Health Policy. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishers, 1998. Pp. Xxii, 766. \$280.

**Mark Bovens**. The Quest for Responsibility: Accountability and Citizenship in Complex Organisations. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Pp. Xii, 252. \$22.95.

**Terry Nichols Clark and Michael Rempel (eds.)**. Citizen Politics in Post-Industrial Societies. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1998. Pp. Xv, 361.

**Lorne Foster**. Turnstile Immigration: Multiculturalism, Social Order and Social Justice in Canada. Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing, 1998. Pp. 190.

**Richard G. Harris (ed.)**. The Asia-Pacific Region in the Global Economy: A Canadian Perspective. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 1996. Pp. Xiv, 668.

**Walter Hettich and Stanley Winer**. Democratic Choice and Taxation: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999. Pp. Xi, 331. \$59.95

**Laura Jones (ed.)**. Global Warming: The Science and the Politics. Vancouver, BC: The Fraser Institute, 1997. Pp. Xi, 180.

**Michael C. MacMillan**. The Practice of Language Rights in Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998. Pp. X, 263.

**David McInnes**. Taking it to the Hill: The Complete Guide to Appearing before (and Surviving) Parliamentary Committees. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1999. Pp.x, 195. \$24.

**David T. McNab (ed.)**. Earth, Water, Air and Fire: Studies in Canadian Ethnohistory. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1998. Pp. 342. \$29.95.

**James R. Melvin, James C. Moore and Raymond Riezman (eds.)**. Trade, Theory and Econometrics: Essays in Honor of John S. Chipman. London/New York: Routledge, 1999. Pp. Xxii, 382. \$70.

**The North-South Institute**. Policy Alternatives for Equitable Development: Recovery from Crisis. Ottawa: The North-South Institute. Pp.v, 96.

**Filip Palda**. Home on the Urban Range: An Idea Map for Reforming the City. Vancouver: The Fraser Institute, 1998. Pp.vi, 117.

**Douglas Powell and William Leiss**. Mad Cows and Mother's Milk: The Perils of Poor Risk Communication. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press. Pp. Xi, 308. \$19.95.

**Jane Pulkingham and Gordon Ternowetsky (eds.)**. Remaking Canadian Social Policy: Social Security in the Late 1990s. Halifax, NS: Fernwood Publishing Co., 1996. Pp. Xi, 337.

**Richard A. Rajala**. Clearcutting the Pacific Rain Forest: Production Science and Regulation. Vancouver: UBC Press, 1998. Pp. Xxiii, 286.

**Arthur Ripstein**. Equality, Responsibility, and the Law. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999. Pp. Xii, 307. \$54.95.

**Daniel J. Robinson**. The Measure of Democracy: Polling, Market Research, and Public Life, 1930-1945. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999. Pp. Ix, 252. \$55.

**Rick J. Scheidt and Paul G. Windley (eds.)**. Environment and Aging Theory: A Focus on Housing. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1998. Pp. Xii, 192. \$59.95.

**Andrew Vincent (ed.)**. Political Theory: Tradition and Diversity. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Pp. Xi, 275. \$22.95.

**Jeremy Wilson**. Talk and Log: Wilderness Politics in British Columbia. Vancouver, UBC Press, 1998. Pp. Xxx, 452. \$29.95.