

NOTES

<sup>1</sup> For detailed calculations of over-representation for different distributions of votes among parties see C.-G. Janson *Mandattildelning och regional röstfördelning*. Stockholm, Idun, 1961.

<sup>4</sup> For an analysis of the political situation prior to the 1965 election see S. Rokkan "Norway: Numerical Democracy and Corporate Pluralism" in R. A. Dahl ed. *Political Oppositions in Western Democracies*. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1966.

<sup>5</sup> For detailed calculations see S. Rokkan and H. Valen "Stortingsvalget 1965 i søkelyset" *Aschehougs Leksikonserie* 4(4), 1965: 170-176.

<sup>6</sup> For a detailed analysis of statistics through 1961 see S. Rokkan and H. Valen "Regional Contrasts in Norwegian politics", pp. 162-238 in E. Allardt & Y. Littunen eds. *Cleavages, Ideologies and Party Systems*. Helsinki, Westermarck Society, 1964.

<sup>7</sup> S. Rokkan, H. Valen and A. Amundsen "Stortingsvalget 1965. Et første sett analyser av resultatene". *Samtiden*, 74(8) 1965: 463-480.

<sup>8</sup> For a discussion of these concepts of electoral analysis, see S. Rokkan and H. Valen "The Mobilization of the Periphery" pp. 111-158 in S. Rokkan ed. *Approaches to the Study of Political Participation*. Bergen, Chr. Michelsen Institute, 1962, also S. Rokkan "Electoral Mobilization, Party Competition and National Integration", to be printed in J. LaPalombara and M. Weiner eds. *Political Parties and Political Development*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1966.

<sup>9</sup> The texts of the alternative proposals are in "Grunnlovsforslag fremsatt på 108. ordentlige Storting" *Dok. nr. 15* (1963-64). Oslo, Arnesen, 1964, pp. 13 sqq.

## FINLAND: DOMESTIC POLITICS DURING 1962-65

This paper is a review of Finnish internal politics since 1962, with special reference to cabinet formations and the split in both the Social Democratic Party and the trade union movement. 1962 was selected as the starting point because both presidential and parliamentary elections were held in the beginning of that year. As the Finnish parliamentary procedure presupposes the resignation of the government when a new president is elected or the ruling president is re-elected, the first quarter of 1962 also involved a change of cabinet.

### The Presidential Election, February 15, 1962

The President of Finland is not directly elected by the people. The actual election is done by the Electoral College of 300 electors chosen by universal suffrage. The Electoral College that was to choose the new president a month later was elected on January 15-16, 1962. Four electoral "blocs" or alliances put up their own candidates: Urho Kekkonen (a bloc consisting of the Agrarians and non-Socialist representatives of various shades of political color), Paavo Aitio (the Communists), Rafael Paasio (the Social Democrats) and Emil Skog (the Social Democratic Opposition). The result was a great victory for the president regnant, whose election bloc won 145 of the 300 mandates. In fact, the victory was even greater, because the 54 electors returned by the Swedish People's Party, the Finnish People's Party and the Conservatives declared that they would support the re-election of President Kekkonen or, which amounted to the same thing, that they would vote for a non-left wing candidate. When the Electoral College convened on February 15, President Kekkonen received 199 votes, while the other three candidates shared the remaining 101 votes. A glance back at the presidential elections six years earlier raises the question of how the presidential candidate who was elected in 1956 by the smallest possible majority (151-149) now enjoyed a virtual landslide. The explanation lies not in domestic politics but in foreign policy. At the negotiations with President Kekkonen in Novosibirsk, arising out of Soviet demands for military consultations under the 1948 Pact of Friendship, Co-operation and Mutual Assistance, Mr. Khrushchev stated: "In his day, we supported Paasikivi when the object of Paasikivi's policy was peace and friendship. Our attitude to President Kekkonen's policy is the same. We set equally great store by it. . . . We trust you." The consequence was that Attorney General Olavi Honka, whose candidature for the presidency

NOTES

<sup>1</sup> For detailed calculations of over-representation for different distributions of votes among parties see C.-G. Janson *Mandattildelning och regional röstfördelning*. Stockholm, Idun, 1961.

<sup>4</sup> For an analysis of the political situation prior to the 1965 election see S. Rokkan "Norway: Numerical Democracy and Corporate Pluralism" in R. A. Dahl ed. *Political Oppositions in Western Democracies*. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1966.

<sup>5</sup> For detailed calculations see S. Rokkan and H. Valen "Stortingsvalget 1965 i søkelyset" *Aschehougs Leksikonservice* 4(4), 1965: 170-176.

<sup>6</sup> For a detailed analysis of statistics through 1961 see S. Rokkan and H. Valen "Regional Contrasts in Norwegian politics", pp. 162-238 in E. Allardt & Y. Littunen eds. *Cleavages, Ideologies and Party Systems*. Helsinki, Westermarck Society, 1964.

<sup>7</sup> S. Rokkan, H. Valen and A. Amundsen "Stortingsvalget 1965. Et første sett analyser av resultatene". *Samtiden*, 74(8) 1965: 463-480.

<sup>8</sup> For a discussion of these concepts of electoral analysis, see S. Rokkan and H. Valen "The Mobilization of the Periphery" pp. 111-158 in S. Rokkan ed. *Approaches to the Study of Political Participation*. Bergen, Chr. Michelsen Institute, 1962, also S. Rokkan "Electoral Mobilization, Party Competition and National Integration", to be printed in J. LaPalombara and M. Weiner eds. *Political Parties and Political Development*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1966.

<sup>9</sup> The texts of the alternative proposals are in "Grunnlovsforslag fremsatt på 108. ordentlige Storting" *Dok. nr. 15* (1963-64). Oslo, Arnesen, 1964, pp. 13 sqq.

## FINLAND: DOMESTIC POLITICS DURING 1962-65

This paper is a review of Finnish internal politics since 1962, with special reference to cabinet formations and the split in both the Social Democratic Party and the trade union movement. 1962 was selected as the starting point because both presidential and parliamentary elections were held in the beginning of that year. As the Finnish parliamentary procedure presupposes the resignation of the government when a new president is elected or the ruling president is re-elected, the first quarter of 1962 also involved a change of cabinet.

### The Presidential Election, February 15, 1962

The President of Finland is not directly elected by the people. The actual election is done by the Electoral College of 300 electors chosen by universal suffrage. The Electoral College that was to choose the new president a month later was elected on January 15-16, 1962. Four electoral "blocs" or alliances put up their own candidates: Urho Kekkonen (a bloc consisting of the Agrarians and non-Socialist representatives of various shades of political color), Paavo Aitio (the Communists), Rafael Paasio (the Social Democrats) and Emil Skog (the Social Democratic Opposition). The result was a great victory for the president regnant, whose election bloc won 145 of the 300 mandates. In fact, the victory was even greater, because the 54 electors returned by the Swedish People's Party, the Finnish People's Party and the Conservatives declared that they would support the re-election of President Kekkonen or, which amounted to the same thing, that they would vote for a non-left wing candidate. When the Electoral College convened on February 15, President Kekkonen received 199 votes, while the other three candidates shared the remaining 101 votes. A glance back at the presidential elections six years earlier raises the question of how the presidential candidate who was elected in 1956 by the smallest possible majority (151-149) now enjoyed a virtual landslide. The explanation lies not in domestic politics but in foreign policy. At the negotiations with President Kekkonen in Novosibirsk, arising out of Soviet demands for military consultations under the 1948 Pact of Friendship, Co-operation and Mutual Assistance, Mr. Khrushchev stated: "In his day, we supported Paasikivi when the object of Paasikivi's policy was peace and friendship. Our attitude to President Kekkonen's policy is the same. We set equally great store by it. . . . We trust you." The consequence was that Attorney General Olavi Honka, whose candidature for the presidency

was supported by the Social Democratic Party, the Conservatives and a majority of the Swedish and Finnish People's Parties, withdrew his name in November 1961.

Only three weeks after the Electoral College had been elected the Finnish people went to the polls again, this time to elect Parliament. The General Elections were actually not due until July 1962, but on November 14, 1961, the President had used the right vested in him to dissolve Parliament.<sup>2</sup> The result of the General Elections was as follows (with the distribution of seats in the previous parliament shown in parantheses:

Agrarians	53 seats	(47)
Communists	47 „	(50)
Social Democrats	38 „	(37)
Conservatives <sup>3</sup>	33 „	(29)
Swedish People's Party	14 „	(14)
Finnish People's Party	13 „	( 8)
Social Democratic Opposition	2 „	(14)
Small Farmers' Party	0 „	( 1)
	<hr/>	
	200 seats	(200 seats)

The result was that the narrow left-wing majority (101-99) of the outgoing Parliament was turned into a non-Socialist majority of 113-87 in the new Parliament. The victory of the non-left wing, however, was at least partially technical. This group won 54 per cent of the votes cast, which should have given them only 108 mandates. The five additional seats were won because the non-left wing parties entered into numerous election blocs among themselves, while the three left-wing parties fought separately. The defeat hit the Social Democratic Opposition hardest of all.

### First Version of the Karjalainen Government

The problem of forming a government turned out to be much harder than the clear election result would suggest. The Miettunen Cabinet resigned on March 1, 1962, the day President Kekkonen was installed in office for a second six-year term<sup>4</sup>. After soundings in Parliament by the Speaker, Kauno Kleemola (Agrarian), on March 12 the President of the Republic invited Professor Veli Merikoski, former chairman of the Finnish People's Party, to form a government. Professor Merikoski succeeded fairly quickly in reaching agreement on the composition of the cabinet, but his efforts went aground on the question of a government program. He relinquished the task on March 14, and Foreign Minister Ahti Karjalainen (Agrarian) took it on. Agreement on the basis of the government was soon reached: it was to comprise a coalition of all the non-Socialist parties represented in Parliament (except the one-man Liberal Party) plus the larger of the two central trade union federations (SAK = Confederation of Finnish Trade Unions). The demand for co-operation from SAK came from the Agrarian Party, which considered it necessary that the inclusion of the right wing in office should be counterbalanced by including SAK. It was not until the government crisis had lasted six weeks that on April 13 Karjalainen succeeded in his task. The composition of the cabinet was as follows: Agrarians 5 portfolios, SAK 3, Conservatives 3, Finnish People's Party 2 and Swedish People's Party 2 portfolios.

The power relations within the cabinet gave a majority to the Agrarians and SAK. The new government commanded 114 votes in Parliament, i.e. all the non-left wing members (excluding the Liberal) and the two Social Democratic Opposition members who were *de facto* represented by the inclusion of SAK.

The Karjalainen Cabinet, based on a stable parliamentary majority, withstood the attacks mounted by the Social Democrats and Communists. The reason for the resignation of the government in August 1963 was the withdrawal of the three SAK ministers. Since this removed the basis for Agrarian participation, the resignation of the trade union members resulted in a government crisis.

### **Second Version of the Karjalainen Government**

After seven weeks of fruitless negotiations, on October 17, 1963, the President of the Republic informed Premier Karjalainen that he did not accept the government's resignation. This settled the issue and at this turn of the month the cabinet was made up by appointing two more ministers representing the Agrarian Party and a third, nonpartisan minister.

However, the strain of the debate on the Budget bill appeared to be too great. As not all the coalition parties approved of the government's proposal for balancing the Budget, the cabinet submitted its resignation on December 17, 1963.

### **Lehto's Caretaker Cabinet**

As the government had failed to achieve agreement over such an essential issue as the balancing of the Budget, the creation of a new majority government was obviously going to be a very difficult task. However, this time the crisis was not protracted. On December 18, 1963, President Kekkonen appointed a caretaker cabinet under Reino R. Lehto, a most senior Permanent Under-secretary of state. The Lehto Cabinet was intended to be a temporary solution, but it remained in office for almost nine months, while the parties presented in former majority coalition cabinets tried to reach an agreement concerning the conditions and program for a new majority coalition of non-Socialist parties.

### **The Virolainen Government**

On September 13, 1964, Finland once again had a government with a parliamentary majority, under the leadership of Johannes Virolainen (Agrarian). The new cabinet is based on the four non-Socialist parliamentary parties and thus commands 112 of the 200 seats. There had been negotiations to form a new majority cabinet in the spring, but on June 10 Virolainen gave up the attempt. He resumed his efforts on September 8, and within five days succeeded in forming a government. The reason why these autumn negotiations bore fruit so quickly was probably that a dissolution of parliament was imminent had the talks failed again.<sup>5</sup> There was no change in the power relations represented by the preceding majority cabinet, except that the non-party portfolio went to a minister who was closely connected with the Finnish People's Party and later officially has declared his affiliation with this party.

### **Changes in Party Names**

Like the corresponding parties in Sweden and Norway, the Finnish Agrarians have been much concerned with a change of name. At their extra party congress on the 17th October, 1965, it was decided by 1,038 votes to 127 to change the name of the party to Centre Party. The reason for this is primarily to be found in the rapid

changes which are taking place in the social structure. The following table shows the distribution of the population between urban districts (small market towns and larger) and rural districts. (The figures show population in thousands at the end of the year.)\* The relative decrease of agricultural occupations is even more marked.

	Urban Communes	Rural Communes	Total	Per cent Urban
1900	333	2,323	2,656	12.5
1920	507	2,641	3,148	16.1
1930	715	2,748	3,463	20.6
1940	992	2,703	3,695	26.8
1950	1,302	2,728	4,030	32.3
1960**	1,707	2,780	4,487	38.4

\* *Statistical Yearbook of Finland*, 1963, p. 5.

\*\* Taking into account the administrative changes of 1. 1. 1961.

Support for the Agrarian Party in elections has been more or less unilaterally restricted to rural areas. (In the general election of 1962, the party received a good 90 per cent of its votes from rural communes.) In view of continuing urbanisation, it is clear that the party would have had difficulty in holding its own as a purely rural party. At their extra party congress, the Agrarian leader, Johannes Virolainen, emphasised the fact that many of those who move to the larger population centres continue to be attracted to the policies pursued by the Agrarian Party. But it could be imagined that a 'Centre Party' would have more pull with the inhabitants of densely populated areas than would an 'Agrarian Party'.

The autumn of 1965 brought with it yet another event of political significance to the Centre. On the 4th of October, the executive committees of the Finnish People's Party and the Liberal League announced that they had agreed on a recommendation concerning the fusion of the two parties. On the 31st October, the delegates of the two parties unanimously accepted the recommendation of their executive committees that the parties be amalgamated to form a new liberal party. The congresses of the parties concerned convened on the 21st November. The Finnish People's Party voted unanimously for fusion, but a certain amount of opposition to the project could be detected at the Liberal congress. On the 29th of December the new "Liberal People's Party" came into existence.

The split between the two liberal parties dates from 1951, when the liberal National Progressive Party became the Finnish People's Party. Those members of the Progressive Party who did not accept this change formed the Liberal League. They did not manage to get a seat in parliament until 1962, and then only in an electoral bloc with the Conservative Party. The differences between the two liberal parties have lain not so much in ideology as in practical politics. Thus, the Finnish People's Party has participated in a number of governments, whereas the Liberal League's attitude has been one of strict opposition.

### The Social Democratic Split

If we compare the recent situation with that in the 1950's, what immediately attracts attention is that the Social Democrats have not held office since January 13, 1959. What makes this all the more noticeable is the fact that in the 1950's (and especially in the first half of that decade), the Social Democratic Party took part in the cabinet along with the Agrarian Party in no less than six majority governments.<sup>6</sup>

It is difficult to pinpoint the specific origin of the split in the Social Democratic movement. The first visible signs of the splintering, which subsequently divided the movement into two parties, became prominent at the 1955 Party Congress.

The Party's doctrinal journal, *Sosialistinen Aikakauslehti*, was then criticized for having too much of a pro-Eastern bias. Behind the criticism were persons who later played a leading role in the Social Democratic Opposition, or Social Democratic Federation of Workers and Small Farmers, to give its official title. Today, this party seeks to give the impression of being the counterpart of the radical left parties in Denmark and Norway.<sup>7</sup>

At the extraordinary Party Congress in April 1957, the tension within the party was too great to permit continued unity. The minority group was then known as the Skog Phalanx after its figurehead, Emil Skog, former party chairman and cabinet minister. Once the party veteran Väinö Tanner had been elected chairman by a narrow majority, the minority did not accept the places that the new party leadership was prepared to place at the disposal of the opposition. The next step in the Social Democratic schism came in the formation of the first government of Sukse-lainen, the Agrarian Party chairman, in September 1957. Five representatives of the Social Democratic Opposition (four of them members of Parliament) took office in the cabinet against the express decision of the parliamentary group of the party. This led to expulsions from the group and the party. In the 1958 General Elections, the Social Democratic Opposition succeeded in winning three seats for candidates who fought under this designation. But another eleven members who had been returned as Social Democrats left the party and joined the Opposition, bringing the strength of its parliamentary group up to 14. However, in the 1962 General Elections, when the Opposition fought everywhere under its own banner (except in Åland, where it had no candidates), only two candidates were returned. Following this defeat, the capacity of the Social Democratic Opposition for parliamentary manoeuvres was seriously reduced. A two-man group is not a major factor in cabinet formation.

### **The Position of the Social Democratic Opposition Since 1962**

Once the opposition group had been reduced to insignificance, the situation seemed to be favorable for reconciliation. However, the position of the Social Democratic Opposition was stronger than its influence in Parliament indicates. The Opposition controlled the larger of the two central unions, the Confederation of Finnish Trade Unions (SAK) and the Workers Athletic Federation (TUL). The participation of SAK in the government has already been mentioned. Like the Social Democratic Party, SAK also split and thus suffered a considerable reduction in strength. One of the dominating socio-economic problems in Finland today is this split in the trade union movement. The problem will be considered below in greater detail.

The unfortunate consequences of the Social Democratic split made both factions begin to realize the importance of achieving a reconciliation. An end to the quarrel seemed to be within sight when the two factions took a decisive step towards reunification in March 1964. The leaders of both factions unanimously accepted the proposed reconciliation agreement, which had been worked out by a joint team of negotiators over the course of half a year. However, it seemed that some of the obstacles could not be overcome, particularly the situation in the union movement. The Social Democratic Opposition had its Party Congress in May 1964, and Emil Skog, now in favor of reconciliation, was replaced as chairman of the party by Aarre Simo-nen. Pekka Martin, chairman of the Workers Athletic Federation, was elected vice-chairman, and he, too, was not one of those who had actively sought reconciliation. The Opposition meeting voted in principle in favor of reconciliation, but the issue was in fact just shelved. Emil Skog made a fruitless intervention, suggesting that both

factions should exclude the trade unions from their efforts to achieve an understanding.

Since the moves towards reconciliation failed, the Opposition has been split into two main factions. One, where the official leadership favors co-operation (e.g. an electoral bloc) with the Communists, while the other is more disposed towards co-operation with the Social Democratic Party itself. In the communal (local government) elections of October 1964, this division resulted in an electoral bloc between the Social Democratic Opposition and the Communists in over 40 communes. Where party leadership had less influence, the alliance was with the Social Democrats. Looking ahead to the General Election, which will be held on March 20–21, 1966 the Social Democratic Opposition leaders have publicly announced electoral blocs with the Communists. The group led by the former chairman, Emil Skog, opposes co-operation with the Communists, and is said to be returning to the parent party.

### **The Split in the Trade Union Movement: Background**

The split in the Social Democratic movement was mirrored in the trade union movement which, like the Social Democratic Party, split into two rival factions. The split in the union movement began in connection with the General Strike of March 1–20, 1956, which led to secessions and threats of secession. In October 1958, the unions which had walked out of or had been excluded from SAK founded the Trade Unions' Association for Co-operation AYJ which had a good 20,000 members. This was intended to be a temporary solution, the object being the subsequent reunification of the trade union movement. On January 1, 1959, Eero Antikainen, the chairman of SAK, resigned, and in February 1959, Reino Heinonen, chairman of the Union of Communal Workers was elected chairman. Many saw this as the beginning of the end of the split in the union movement. But the optimism seemed to be premature. The vice-chairman of SAK, Vihtori Rantanen, announced in November 1959 that he and his five supporters in the Executive Committee of SAK would no longer participate in the non-communist cabals of the Confederation. The practice had been for the non-communist group to decide on matters among themselves and then form a united front within the Executive Committee or at the meeting on the question of the moment. Therefore Vihtori Rantanen's announcement meant in practice that his group of six members (out of 17) reserved themselves the right to vote with the three Communists on the Committee against the Social Democratic majority group of eight committee members, thus placing the latter in the minority.

The new constellation of Rantanen supporters (who stand very close to the Social Democratic Opposition) and Communists first made itself seriously felt at the Executive Committee meeting on February 8, 1960, when by a vote of 9–8 the committee decided to refer to the SAK Delegation the right to decide on applications for readmission from those unions which had seceded from SAK. It is true that the SAK Delegation did decide in May 1961 to accept the readmission applications of the unions belonging to the Organization for Co-operation, but on conditions which in practice excluded reunification. A few days later, Reino Heinonen resigned his chairmanship of SAK. This was soon followed by a walk-out of several unions, e.g. the Union of Locomotive Engineers and Stokers, the Union of Woodworkers, etc. In 1961, the Finnish Trade Unions Federation (SAJ) was founded, with a modest initial membership. But this was to some extent offset by the fact that certain key unions joined SAJ, particularly the Seamen's Union and the Transport and Automobile Workers Union.

### **The Unions Since 1962**

In the course of 1962 there were some additional changes in the power relations of the trade unions. In September, the Communal Workers' Union decided to secede from the SAK. The electrical trade workers decided to join SAJ in November, and the country's oldest union, the Printers and Bookbinders, followed suit in December. Since then, there has been no major change involving the transfer of a complete union from one central federation to another or the resignation of a union from either group.

One of the events on the major political front of the union movement was, without doubt, the entry of three SAK ministers into the Karjalainen Cabinet on April 13, 1962. One reason why the partial strike of civil servants from February 28 to March 28, 1963, was so difficult to resolve can be well envisaged against the background of SAK participation in the government. The party on strike, the Federation of Salaried Employees, was not actually associated with SAJ, but one of its member unions did belong to it. It can be assumed that the government was therefore less disposed to compromise with the strikers weakened. The strike also paralyzed rail transport through the participation of the locomotive engineers and stokers, and as this threatened foreign trade the government took measures to break the strike by the quick training of new locomotive engineers. The Seamen's Union, however, stated that it would refuse to handle goods brought to the harbors by strike-breakers. After this, the time was ripe for compromise and the strike ended on March 28, 1963.

Just as in the Social Democratic movement, there have been exhortations towards unity in the trade union movement. In June 1965, the representatives of 18 non-communist unions published an appeal for marshalling the union forces. Among the signatories were representatives of SAK and SAJ as well as of unions which at present are not affiliated with either of the central organizations. The resolutions concluded on the hope that a co-ordinated wage movement could lead to organizational unity in the trade union movement. Unions that did not participate in the negotiations resulting in the publication of the resolution in June have since come out in support of the opinions expressed in it. But, although the majority of the unions pronounced to be in favor of a united trade union movement, this cannot be taken to mean that a reconciliation is imminent.<sup>8</sup>

It is obvious that SAJ requires guarantees that democratic methods shall prevail in the search for unified federation. In the absence of such guarantees, one of the main factors in the secession from SAK remains.

It would be a hazardous venture to give any accurate membership figures for the two central organizations. According to their own statement (December 31, 1964), SAK has a good 230,000 members, and SAJ somewhat over 100,000. In addition, there are the unions which left SAK but did not join SAJ. The total membership of the unions not affiliated with the central organizations is around 100,000.

### **Conclusion**

Political power relations in Parliament since the 1962 elections have been unequivocal in that the non-left wing groups have had a clear working majority (plurality). Several significant measures have been passed by the government and Parliament since 1962. It may suffice to mention here the reform of the turnover tax system. A general turnover tax of 10 per cent was imposed from the beginning of 1963, with certain detailed exceptions. The old system had comprised completely different tax scales for various necessities, complicating calculations and introducing other difficulties. Another important achievement was the national health insurance reform. Premium payments for this began on April 1, 1964. The first benefits were distributed on September 1, 1964.



On the debit side of the government and Parliament must be entered the depreciation of the value of money. The entry for 1964 must be an inflation of no less than 10 per cent.

The Municipal Elections of October 1964 gave some indications of the existence of a certain dissatisfaction with the management of national affairs by the non-left wing parties. The Social Democrats made strong gains, the Communists held their ground. The percentage distribution of votes cast in the 1962 General Elections and the 1964 Municipal Elections are compared below:

	Non-left wing parties	Social Democrats	Communists	Other
1962*	54.1 %	23.9 %	22.0 %	
1964**	50.1 %	27.7 %	22.0 %	0.2 %

\* Official Statistics of Finland (XXIX A:28) General Election in Finland. 1962.

\*\* Official Statistics of Finland (XXIX B:2), Municipal Election. 1964.

Not since the introduction of the unicameral system of representation in 1906 have the left-wing parties reach such a high percentage of the votes cast in an election. The election result as well as public opinion polls predict the possibility of left-wing gains in the General Election, which is due in March 1966.

Magnus Lemberg

The Swedish School of Economics in Helsinki

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> *Helsingin Sanomat*, January 8, 1962.

<sup>2</sup> Under Section 3 of the Representation of The People Act, the President of the Republic may dissolve the Parliament and call for new elections "if he finds it necessary". The constitution does not, thus, expressly define the various situations in which the Parliament may be dissolved.

<sup>3</sup> Including one Liberal who was returned in an electoral bloc with the Conservatives.

<sup>4</sup> Miettunen's minority Agrarian Cabinet assumed office in July 1961 after Prime Minister Sukselainen handed in his resignation. Sukselainen had headed a minority Agrarian Government from January 1959.

<sup>5</sup> *Nordisk Kontakt* 11/64, p. 655.

<sup>6</sup> Kekkonen II (Jan. 17–Sept. 20, 1951), Kekkonen III (Sept. 20, 1951–July 9, 1953), Törngren (May 5–Oct. 20, 1954), Kekkonen V (Oct. 20, 1954–March 3, 1956), Fagerholm II (March 3, 1956–May 27, 1957), Fagerholm III (Aug. 29, 1958–Jan. 13, 1959).

<sup>7</sup> For example, the Social Democratic Federation of Workers and Small Farmers sent a congratulatory cable to the Socialist People's Party (SF) of Norway on its "election victory" 1965.

<sup>8</sup> According to information supplied by Orvo Lahtinen from SAJ and Väinö Montonen from SAK.