

Quill and Quire (February, 1974)

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND CANADIAN FEDERALISM: The History of a Dilemma, Howard A. Leeson & Wilfred Vanderelst, eds., Holt Rinehart & Winston, \$3.45 paper, 138 pp.

In recent years a growing number of Canadian professors and publishers have collaborated to collect and reprint material which has been out of print or inaccessible to the average student. Provided it is intelligently edited, free from factual errors and accompanied by a suitable introduction, this type of book can be very useful. It is questionable, however, if *External Affairs and Canadian Federalism* fulfills all these conditions.

To illustrate the contention that the existence of a mild form of chaos is a permanent condition in the Canadian federal system, the authors have chosen to reprint extracts from a number of documents relating to the development of Canadian independence from Great Britain, the case for and against provincial involvement in international affairs, and the particular problems related to Quebec's international aspirations since 1960. Each chapter is prefaced by a few introductory remarks which fail to tie together the various sections, and as a result the book, if read cover to cover, resembles a hodge-podge of speeches, treaties, learned articles, polemics, judicial decisions and government white papers.

Furthermore the usefulness of the book as an authoritative reference source is considerably reduced by a number of errors and omissions. For example, the extract reprinted from the 1969 Quebec Government's Working Paper on Foreign Relations is to be found on pages 13-19 of the document and not on pages 14-27 as indicated in this book. Another example relates to the short extract from the federal government's Federalism and International Conferences of Education. The relevant paragraph of the original document lists nine principles to guide attendance at international conferences, yet for some reason the authors reprint only six of them. Throughout the book important material is excluded without explanation and sometimes without even the traditional symbol of

deletion (...). A final comment depends perhaps on where one is located but it seems the collection includes too much material which is available in other collections or which is so recent as to be easily accessible. Gary Levy