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WHITEHORSE - A former New Democrat who ***changed parties*** six months ago will be the Yukon's new premier as the Yukon Party was elected to a majority government last night.CP

The party won 12 of the Yukon's 18 ridings, including party leader Dennis Fentie's riding.

The NDP took five ridings while the governing Liberals, after taking an early lead, won only one riding with party leader Pat Duncan getting re-elected. For the first time since the Yukon adopted party politics in 1978, every party ran a full slate of candidates. Coupled with the Independents, this gave the Yukon a record number of 60 candidates.
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WHITEHORSE (CP) \_ A former New Democrat who ***changed parties*** six months ago will be the Yukon's new premier as the Yukon Party was elected to a majority government Monday night.

The party won 12 of the Yukon's 18 ridings, including party leader Dennis Fentie's riding.

The NDP took five ridings while the governing Liberals, after taking an early lead, won only one riding with party leader Pat Duncan getting re-elected.

CP

"The challenges ahead are many and enormous, so let us revel in our victory and start the hard work tomorrow,'' Fentie told his party election headquarters by speaker phone shortly after the sweep to a majority government became apparent.

Fentie, the first rural party leader to win a Yukon government, was in his town constituency of Watson Lake, a community of 1,500 about 450 kilometres southeast of Whitehorse.

Preliminary figures showed a 77 per cent turnout of the Yukon's 18,071 eligible voters.

Craig Tuton, the Yukon party campaign manager, said he expected the results.

"There was a lot of movement and we felt there was a lot of animosity toward the

present (Liberal) government,'' he said.

Tuton said voters were disappointed in the Liberals for calling an early election instead of trying to work with the other parties and their minority position.

"We'll form a strong opposition to keep this government accountable,'' said NDP Leader Todd Hardy. "This is what the Yukon people have given us.''

Speaking of Fentie, Hardy said: "We gave him his start in politics, I hope he

doesn't forget us.''

"This is not the result we had all hoped and we had all worked for,'' Duncan said during an emotional speech to campaign workers.

She said she has not thought about her future as now the only Liberal MLA in the legislature.

Duncan won a majority two years ago but three Liberals left the caucus in April to sit as Independents, reducing the Liberals to a minority government.

At dissolution, the Liberals held eight seats, the NDP had four, the Yukon party had two and there were three Independents.

Fentie left the NDP in May to join the Yukon party and was elected its leader a month later.

During one election campaign stop, someone in the audience noted that Fentie was convicted for trafficking narcotics in Alberta in 1976 and spent 17 months in jail. He received a complete pardon in 1996.

But Hardy came to his defence, saying Fentie \_ who has received a full pardon \_ had carried himself with honour and integrity.

Hardy was an NDP MLA from 1996 to 2000 but lost his seat in downtown Whitehorse in the last election.

For the first time since the Yukon adopted party politics in 1978, every party ran a full slate of candidates. Coupled with the Independents, this gave the Yukon a record number of 60 candidates.

There were six Independent candidates running in five ridings, including two members of the last legislature who left the Liberal caucus.

The legislature expanded to 18 seats from 17 with a redrawing of the riding boundaries earlier this year.
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A former New Democrat who ***changed parties*** six months ago will be the Yukon's new premier as the Yukon Party was elected to a majority government Monday night.

The party won 12 of the Yukon's 18 ridings, including party leader Dennis Fentie's riding.

Calgary Herald

The NDP took five ridings while the governing Liberals, after taking an early lead, won only one riding with party leader Pat Duncan getting re-elected.

Craig Tuton, the Yukon party campaign manager, said he expected the results.

"There was a lot of movement and we felt there was a lot of animosity toward the present (Liberal) government," he said.

Fentie left the NDP in May to join the Yukon party and was elected its leader a month later.
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A former New Democrat who ***changed parties*** six months ago will be the Yukon's new premier as the Yukon Party was elected to a majority government Monday night.The party won 12 of the Yukon's 18 ridings, including party leader Dennis Fentie's riding. The NDP took five ridings while the governing Liberals, after taking an early lead, won only one riding with party leader Pat Duncan getting re-elected."The challenges ahead are many and enormous, so let us revel in our victory and start the hard work tomorrow," Mr. Fentie told his party election headquarters by speaker phone shortly after the sweep to a majority government became apparent.Mr.

Fentie, the first rural party leader to win a Yukon government, was in his town constituency of Watson Lake, a community of 1,500 about 450 kilometres southeast of Whitehorse. Preliminary figures showed a 77 per cent turnout of the Yukon's 18,071 eligible voters.Craig Tuton, the Yukon party campaign manager, said he expected the results."There was a lot of movement and we felt there was a lot of animosity toward the present (Liberal) government," he said. Mr. Tuton said voters were disappointed in the Liberals for calling an early election instead of trying to work with the other parties and their minority position. "We'll form a strong opposition to keep this government accountable," said NDP Leader Todd Hardy. "This is what the Yukon people have given us."Speaking of Mr. Fentie, Mr. Hardy said: "We gave him his start in politics, I hope he doesn't forget us.""This is not the result we had all hoped and we had all worked for," Ms. Duncan said during an emotional speech to campaign workers.She said she has not thought about her future as now the only Liberal MLA in the legislature.Ms. Duncan won a majority two years ago but three Liberals left the caucus in April to sit as Independents, reducing the Liberals to a minority government.At dissolution, the Liberals held eight seats, the NDP had four, the Yukon party had two and there were three Independents. Mr. Fentie left the NDP in May to join the Yukon party and was elected its leader a month later.During one election campaign stop, someone in the audience noted that Mr. Fentie was convicted for trafficking narcotics in Alberta in 1976 and spent 17 months in jail. He received a complete pardon in 1996.But Mr. Hardy came to his defence, saying Fentie - who has received a full pardon - had carried himself with honour and integrity.Mr. Hardy was an NDP MLA from 1996 to 2000 but lost his seat in downtown Whitehorse in the last election.For the first time since the Yukon adopted party politics in 1978, every party ran a full slate of candidates. Coupled with the Independents, this gave the Yukon a record number of 60 candidates.There were six Independent candidates running in five ridings, including two members of the last legislature who left the Liberal caucus.The legislature expanded to 18 seats from 17 with a redrawing of the riding boundaries earlier this year.
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WHITEHORSE -- A former New Democrat who ***changed parties*** six months ago will be the Yukon's new premier as the Yukon party has been elected to a majority government.

The party won 12 of the Yukon's 18 ridings, including party leader Dennis Fentie's riding.

Whitehorse Star

The NDP took five ridings while the governing Liberals, after taking an early lead, won only one riding with party leader Pat Duncan getting re-elected.

"The challenges ahead are many and enormous, so let us revel in our victory and start the hard work tomorrow," Fentie told his party election headquarters Monday night by speaker phone shortly after the sweep to a majority government became apparent.

Fentie, the first rural party leader to win a Yukon government, was in his town constituency of Watson Lake, a community of 1,500 about 450 kilometres southeast of Whitehorse.

Preliminary figures showed a 77 per cent turnout of the Yukon's 18,071 eligible voters.

Tuton said voters were disappointed in the Liberals for calling an early election instead of trying to work with the other parties and their minority position.

"We'll form a strong opposition to keep this government accountable," said NDP leader Todd Hardy. "This is what the Yukon people have given us."

Speaking of Fentie, Hardy said: "We gave him his start in politics, I hope he doesn't forget us."

"This is not the result we had all hoped and we had all worked for," Duncan said during an emotional speech to campaign workers.

She said she has not thought about her future as now the only Liberal MLA in the legislature.
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PASSPORT CHANGES SOUGHT

Federal privacy commissioner George Radwanski is asking Foreign Affairs Minister Bill Graham to remove place of birth from the information on Canadian passports in an effort to thwart tough new U.S. border screening measures. The U.S. began a new entry-and-exit process for visitors on Sept. 11 that demands increased scrutiny of anyone born in selected Arab and predominantly Muslim countries - regardless of their citizenship. Graham has protested such ethnic profiling of Canadians and said last week he received assurances through the U.S. embassy that the practice would stop.

Yukon

YUKON PARTY WINS POWER

A former New Democrat who ***changed parties*** six months ago will be the Yukon premier now that the Yukon Party swept into power with a majority government on Monday. The party won 12 of the territory's 18 ridings, including party leader Dennis Fentie's riding. The NDP took five ridings. But the ruling Liberals retained just one. Liberal leader Pat Duncan was re-elected in her riding. Preliminary figures showed 77 per cent turnout from 18,071 eligible voters.

Alberta

CRASH A MURDER-SUICIDE

The two people who were killed when a train slammed into a sport utility vehicle last August were victims of a murder-suicide, the RCMP said yesterday. The accident happened in the Niton Junction area between Edson and Edmonton. Police said Derek Hammerton, 30, intentionally drove into the path of the train. Nicole McDavid, 17, was a passenger in Hammerton's vehicle. Witnesses said the truck pulled on to the tracks, stopped abruptly and was hit. Edson is about 200 kilometres west of Edmonton.

New Brunswick

ABORTION SERVICE ENDS

The hospital that performs about half the abortions in New Brunswick says it will stop providing the service. The South East Health Authority confirmed Monday it will no longer provide non-emergency abortions as of Dec. 31 because gynecologists at the Moncton Hospital don't want to continue doing the roughly 350 procedures a year. As of January, patients will have to travel to Saint John or Fredericton.

From The Star's wire services
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A former New Democrat who ***changed parties*** six months ago will be the Yukon's new premier as the Yukon Party was elected to a majority government Monday night.The Ottawa CitizenThe party won 12 of the territory's 18 ridings, including party leader Dennis Fentie's riding. The NDP took five ridings while the governing Liberals won only one riding as leader Pat Duncan was re-elected. At dissolution, the Liberals held eight seats, the NDP had four, the Yukon party had two and there were three Independents.
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WHITEHORSE (CP) -- A former New Democrat who ***changed parties*** six months ago will be the Yukon's new premier as the Yukon Party was elected to a majority government.

The party won 12 of the Yukon's 18 ridings, including party leader Dennis Fentie's riding.

The NDP took five ridings while the governing Liberals, after taking an early lead, won only one riding with party leader Pat Duncan getting re-elected.

Canadian Press
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WHITEHORSE -- A former New Democrat who ***changed parties*** six months ago will be the Yukon's new premier as the Yukon Party was elected to a majority government this week The party won 12 of the Yukon's 18 ridings, including party leader Dennis Fentie's riding.News Services
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Racist. Womanizer. Senator. Centenarian.

South Carolina's Strom Thurmond, the oldest sitting and longest serving U.S. senator ever, turns 100 today, a few weeks shy of his retirement from an astonishing political career spanning nearly 70 years.

On Jan. 3, he will complete his eighth term as senator, having served in the Senate for more than one-fifth of its history. As a lifelong champion of South Carolina, the state is dotted with bridges, highways, streets, schools and malls that have been named after him.

Mr. Thurmond entered politics as a state senator during the Depression. After parachuting into Normandy at the age of 41 and emerging from the Second World War as a decorated hero, he won the South Carolina governorship in 1947, ran for president the next year and has been a political fixture for most of the decades since.

His longevity, however, has been a mixed blessing. Many of those years have been marred by controversy or ridicule, and his age has been fodder for late-night talk-show hosts for a decade. (He's older than the airplane, almost as old as radio, and was 78 when IBM introduced the first personal computer in 1981.)

In the process, his racist past has largely been forgotten or ignored. His 1948 presidential bid came as leader of the pro-segregation Dixiecrat party, a breakaway group of Southern Democrats. While he ran under a platform of states' rights, he made no effort to hide his opposition to the "social intermingling" of different races.

"There's not enough troops in the Army to force the Southern people to break down segregation and admit the Negro race into our theatres, into our swimming pools, into our homes and into our churches," he said at one party convention.

Back with the Democrats in 1957, Mr. Thurmond broke the record for the longest Senate filibuster. He held the floor for 24 hours and 18 minutes (with several short breaks) while voicing staunch opposition to a civil-rights act. He read the election laws of 48 states, and moved on to include sections of the Bill of Rights and the Declaration of Independence.

He garnered laughter from senators and observers when he concluded the long diatribe by noting: "I expect to vote against this bill."

However, sensing a change in the American social climate, Mr. Thurmond became the first Southern senator to hire blacks on his staff, in the late 1950s. And in 1964, he ***changed parties*** again, to the Republicans.

If he was known in his heyday as a rabble-rouser, he later became famous as a womanizer.

After Hillary Rodham Clinton was sworn in as a senator two years ago, he gave her a signed photograph of the two embracing, featuring the caption: "To Pretty Hillary." He was also notorious for inviting attractive female staffers and journalists to sit on his lap as he went around in his wheelchair.

Yet despite his well-earned reputation, he has been a family man, marrying twice (to women 23 and 44 years his junior, respectively). He has said that his greatest achievements are his children.

Although the timing of his departure became a critical issue when the Democrats and Republicans split the Senate evenly in the 2000 election, Mr. Thurmond has become increasingly irrelevant as his health has deteriorated.

Confined to a wheelchair due to a bad hip, it became commonplace for aides to have to prompt him to vote Yes or No while in session. Close friends have commented on the slippage of his mental faculties.

Speculation surrounding his health peaked in October, 2001, when he collapsed in the Senate, prompting Democratic Majority Leader Tom Dashchle to clear the public galleries to spare his colleague further indignities.
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Jean Charest is surely the most "Canadian" premier ever to take office in the history of Quebec. His political roots were forged in the Conservative Party under Brian Mulroney and in the House of Commons, which is why Quebec Premier Bernard Landry spent the last days of the province's election campaign attacking Mr. Charest for being too close to Ottawa. To this, Mr. Charest has simply replied, "There will always be a sovereignty movement in Quebec and you have to accept that they defend that idea like I defend mine."

Jean Charest's election victory comes with the support of many francophones who, after years of reluctance, are embracing the brand of leadership he is offering them. In saying yes to Mr. Charest, Quebeckers have said yes to someone who, after spending years in the political wilderness, emerged to dominate the provincial leaders' TV debate of March 31. Despite his opponents' appeal - the fresh-faced Mario Dumont, who promised to reduce government's role in Quebeckers' lives, and the known quantity of the nationalist incumbent, Bernard Landry, they saw in Mr. Charest someone in touch with the issues most important to Quebeckers.

Mr. Charest scored big on health care, education and the economy. He refused to allow Mr. Landry to get away with being fuzzy on sovereignty. He was revealed in the debate to be experienced and tough, and at the same time, passionate and committed to his vision of a more outward and confident Quebec within Canada.

Jean Charest has suffered for many years from the label of "golden boy," someone to whom success came too easily and quickly. That's simply wrong. In fact, he has more than paid his dues.

I remember when he came into the House of Commons in 1984. Young, articulate and perfectly bilingual, he was clearly a Mulroney favourite and was quickly made assistant deputy speaker. He was very good in the role, and the House respected his authority. In June, 1986, when he was 28, he was invited into the cabinet (as the minister of state for youth) - the youngest MP ever to be sworn in. From there, he moved to increasingly important portfolios, culminating in minister of the environment.

Along the way, he paid his dues for his vision of federalism, breaking with his old friend Lucien Bouchard over the Charlottetown Accord. In 1993, battling Kim Campbell for the leadership of the federal Progressive Conservatives, he came close to upsetting what was supposed to have been an easy win for her. Later that year, after Ms. Campbell's blistering defeat before a resurgent Liberal Party, it was Mr. Charest who picked up the pieces and began rebuilding the party.

Within two years, he was fighting for Canada itself. His voice was among the most powerful and persuasive in urging Quebeckers to say no to Mr. Bouchard's phenomenal campaign in the 1995 referendum. Contesting the federal election of June, 1997, as PC leader, Mr. Charest increased the Tories' desperately thin ranks, winning more seats in Atlantic Canada, and earning the grudging respect of his political foes.

That is why, less than a year later, voices from every quarter urged Jean Charest to take up the leadership of the Liberal Party of Quebec. In April of 1998, he did so.

Now, I know from experience that moving between provincial and federal politics is a tricky switch - not least because the folk with whom you have made common cause for many years tend to see the large national questions from only one side of the jurisdictional equation. Like me, Jean Charest has seen both sides now. His job will be that of bridge-builder, explaining each side to the other. An example: The federal government sees itself as the guarantor of public health care across Canada. Provincial governments see Ottawa merely as the funding agent, the source of grief.

But if anyone expects that Mr. Charest's rise in Quebec will spell peace on the health-care front, think again. It's far more likely that Ralph Klein will have a new ally, someone who will join him in demanding that Ottawa pay its share. The difference is, with Mr. Charest, Ottawa won't be able to dismiss his demands as the clamour from another Quebec sovereigntist.

We can also expect him to understand the vital importance of the Canada-U.S. relationship; after all, he's a veteran of the federal government that brought us the free-trade deal. At the same time, we can expect that he will be a voice of reason around his own cabinet table, convincing his people in Quebec City that contrary to popular belief, there is nothing in Ottawa called "the Department of Shafting the Provinces."

In changing from federal to provincial politics, Mr. Charest also ***changed parties***. If this has created suspicion, it was a red herring: In changing from the federal to the provincial scene, he went to the only federalist party he could go to. Quebec has no real "provincial" Progressive Conservative presence. In making the switch, Mr. Charest has been consistent - and no opportunist. Under him, the Liberals won more voters than Mr. Bouchard's PQ in the 1998 election. But that didn't translate into enough seats to form a government. And still Mr. Charest stayed on, travelling to every corner of Quebec to build support.

He has accepted as his mandate the advancement of Quebec's best interests. He knows that sometimes those interests will conflict with those of Ottawa or other provinces. Ottawa has on occasion dismissed the PQ government's demands as the demands of those who would destroy a beautiful country. This cannot be said of Mr. Charest. He has earned the right to be heard and to be respected when he speaks for Quebeckers.

I expect we will hear the nationalist fire in his words when he deems it appropriate. But we will never feel the sovereigntist knife at our throats.

Jean Charest has just been politically reborn. No longer a golden boy, scarred and seasoned by defeat, he's still very much a man to watch. Many will wonder when he will next hear the call to return to the nation's capital.

*Brian Tobin is a former federal minister of industry and former premier of Newfoundland and Labrador.*
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The massive win by the Liberals in the Quebec election could mean more money and influence for the Outaouais, where the party decisively retained its five seats yesterday by winning more than 50 per cent of the votes in each riding.

The defeat of the separatist Parti Quebecois in favour of the federalist Liberals means the sovereignty issue moves to the back burner, at least for the next few years.

"It's the end of the sovereigntist threat, the end of waiting lists in hospitals, the end of being the most taxed people in North America," Roch Cholette, the re-elected Liberal MNA in Hull, told about 200 jubilant supporters yesterday.

A shelving of the sovereignty option tends to be good news for the staunchly federalist Outaouais, where every little shudder in the independence debate is felt like an earthquake.

Past experience shows that having a federalist party in power in Quebec City can mean everything from a sudden boost in the Outaouais real estate market to increased business investment. Many home-buyers and businesses prefer to put their money into a region of Canada that is going to stay in Canada.

The Ottawa Citizen

The Outaouais has already been benefiting from neighbouring Ottawa's hot housing market. More bargain hunters than ever may start to cross the Ottawa River now that it appears Outaouais real estate will remain anchored to Canada for several more years.

The Outaouais is generally defined as the area along the Ottawa River that stretches from Montebello in the east to the Pontiac region in the west and northward beyond Maniwaki into a largely uninhabited area of hydro reservoirs.

The region has long had difficulties competing with Ontario at least partially because of higher taxes on everything from incomes to gasoline and other consumer goods. The Liberals have promised to reduce income taxes, which could entice more people to move from Ontario into Gatineau and neighbouring communities and generally to help the prosperity of people already living in the area.

But perhaps the biggest impact of the election will come with the Outaouais having representation in the provincial cabinet for the first time since the days of Daniel Johnson's government a decade ago.

Benoit Pelletier, the re-elected Liberal MNA for Chapleau, is one of Liberal Leader Jean Charest's closest confidants. A constitutional lawyer, Mr. Pelletier is expected to be given a senior cabinet post. Whatever that portfolio is, Mr. Pelletier will likely have the opportunity to wield influence throughout the Outaouais. That could mean snagging more money for hospitals, roads and services that, in many cases, are currently far inferior in the Outaouais than in other regions of the province. It could also mean new policies or programs of the provincial government in any area have a greater likelihood of being fine-tuned to benefit the Outaouais.

Having a minister from the Outaouais in cabinet does not guarantee absolutely booty starts flowing to West Quebec. But having a minister who is a close friend of the premier should definitely increase the chances for some money to start flowing in the direction of the Outaouais. Certainly, expectations will be high.

The only new Liberal from the Outaouais is Charlotte L'Ecuyer, the new MNA for Pontiac and an experienced health administrator. She succeeds veteran MNA Robert Middlemiss, who retired from politics.

With health care the No. 1 issue for the Outaouais in this campaign, specifically the nurse shortage at the Outaouais Hospital, and with Mr. Charest making health care his No. 1 issue, expect to hear more from Ms. L'Ecuyer in the coming days.

The defining phrase of the campaign, as uttered by Mr. Charest, was sante ou soverainte -- health or sovereignty. The voters chose "health" and they will demand it now that the Liberals have won.

Along with Mr. Pelletier and Mr. Cholette, two other Liberals were re-elected in the Outaouais. They are Rejean Lafreniere in Gatineau riding and Norman MacMillan in Papineau.

Their PQ and ADQ opponents in all five ridings never had a chance.

"The Liberals are so strong, it's not even like David and Goliath here, it's more like David's little brother versus Goliath and his whole family," Victor Bilodeau, ADQ candidate in Pontiac riding, said before the polls even closed.

Most of the election campaign coincided with the early days of the war in Iraq. Consequently, the voters tended to have their eyes glued more to the war than to the far tamer electoral battles in their own backyard. Even yesterday, polling day, there seemed to be more enthusiasm over the Senators-Islanders game than the PQ-Liberal dust-up.

In Pontiac, voter apathy was so high, election day poll workers had to be imported from Ottawa -- in Ontario. A lack of poll workers was such a problem that polls remained open up to an hour later than scheduled in 21 ridings, including Pontiac.

No one other than a Liberal has been elected in the five Outaouais ridings since 1976, when the PQ first came to power along with two PQ MNAs from West Quebec. Both of those two PQ members sat for only one term.

This time, neither the PQ nor the Action democratique du Quebec put up much of a fight in the Outaouais. The two parties seemed to concede defeat in the region and did not bother to waste money in advertising or other campaign manoeuvres. Funds, apparently, were deemed to be better investments in other parts of the province where the PQ and ADQ stood better chances of winning seats.

The PQ did not even attempt to sell very hard such potentially popular policies for young families as a four-day work week, subsidized vacations and cheap student loans.

The Liberals fought hard in some areas of the province, but not in the Outaouais, on the issue of de-amalgamation of the super-cities engineered by the PQ in the past few years. In the Outaouais, Hull, Aylmer, Gatineau, Buckingham and Masson-Angers were all amalgamated into the new city of Gatineau.

Mr. Charest has promised to introduce framework legislation allowing for de-amalgamation. The most support for that in the Outaouais seems to be in Aylmer, where many people have lamented the loss of the city's own identity and the loss of many services for anglophones in the new city of Gatineau.

The following are snapshots of election night in each of the five Outaouais ridings.

Hull

Liberal incumbent Roch Cholette's supporters gathered at a restaurant in a Hull industrial park to celebrate. Among the crowd was Andre Desmarais, a 64-year-old businessman.

He described himself as a typical Liberal supporter: a retired entrepreneur who has watched the PQ government drive away business from the Outaouais.

"The PQ has been terrible for business," he said. "I am politically active because I am pro-business. And I would like to see this region grow again."

Part of Mr. Cholette's focus during the campaign was to revitalize his riding by recruiting younger supporters. One of those younger recruits is Michael Morin. The 23-year-old research assistant at the Department of Canadian Heritage worked as a volunteer in his first political campaign for Mr. Cholette.

"In French I would be called a turncoat," he said, "but Charest ***changed parties*** and so did Bouchard. Only fools don't change ideas."

Gatineau

A rousing cheer went up when Rejean Lafreniere waked into the sparse Wright town hall that served as his election headquarters last night.

Mr. Lafreniere had just won the Gatineau riding election in the Quebec provincial election, and the small group of 30 campaign workers had started celebrating well before his arrival.

"I'm very happy -- it's obvious that I'm happy to be part of the ruling party."

Preliminary results showed Mr. Lafreniere beat his rivals at virtually every polling station in the riding

This was despite Mr. Lafreniere's low-profile campaign. "I have to say that I'm the only candidate to be elected that didn't participate in the debates," Mr. Lafreniere said.

Mr. Lafreniere said he would be sure to make the most of being part of the ruling party.

"I'm certainly going to do things differently from the way that the PQ did it," he said. "We put in place a health system 30 years ago that it took the PQ five years to dismantle."

As for this election being his last, Mr. Lafreniere was adamant that he never said he would retire, and refused to rule out running again.

Pontiac

Liberal candidate Charlotte L'Ecuyer won an easy victory in Pontiac riding after telling voters that their health care and economy had suffered under the PQ administration.

During the campaign, Ms L'Ecuyer, 59, a former hospital administrator and social worker, told constituents that there were more limousines in front of the National Assembly and fewer doctors since the PQ government took office.

It was a low-key evening at her campaign office at Les Galeries d'Aylmer.

"People here are very smart and recognize that their high standard of living is because they are part of Canada," she said. "They are showing the rest of the province how to think."

Luc Cote, 26, the Parti-Quebecois candidate said his party's showing at the polls did not mean the electorate had tired of the PQ quest for sovereignty.

"The Quebec people decided they want another party to try to resolve constitutional problems," Mr. Cote said. "But if the Liberals try to give powers to Ottawa, you may be sure that the Parti Quebecois will oppose them."

Mr. Cote said he hoped that Ms. L'Ecuyer would have enough influence to resolve some of the riding's problems such as the need to complete Highway 148 and the need for better health care.

Papineau

Joyous supporters of incumbent MNA Norm MacMillan gathered yesterday in the Windsor Pub, a Buckingham bar owned by Mr. MacMillan's brother, Ken.

The first cheers in the smoky bar came when Bernard Derome, Radio-Canada's news anchor, announced on the big-screen television at 9:10 p.m. that Jean Charest would lead a majority Liberal government.

Louder still were the cheers five minutes later when supporters learned that the network's analysts had declared Mr. MacMillan elected.

There had never been much doubt. Liberal campaign manager, Guy Bisson, was certainly serene. "It looks like a victory," he said two hours before the polling stations closed. His call was based on his analysis of who had voted, cross-referenced with a list of known Liberal supporters.

In the Outaouais Liberal stronghold, people said that Papineau was the Outaouais riding where the PQ had the best chance, noted Mr. Bisson.

But, he added. "They've been saying that since 1989!" That's when Mr. Macmillan was first elected.

Chapleau

Red lasers, babies and about 200 smiling volunteers greeted incumbent Benoit Pelletier as he found his way to his victorious campaign party.

But his campaign team said it wasn't an easy win. "The weather was awful (during the campaign) and people were preoccupied with the war in Iraq," said Jean-Charles Charron, Mr. Pelletier's campaign director.

"We should make sure the Outaouais gets what it deserves," Mr. Pelletier said in his victory speech. "We have crossed the desert and we have emerged on the other side victorious."

The four years in opposition readied the Liberals for government, he said. The Liberals will bring unity to Quebec, he said, welcoming all into the fold.

PQ candidate Sylvie Simard said she respected the public's opinion, although she was disappointed with the results.

- - -

Chapleau

LIB by 10,185 in 1998

Polls reporting -- 188/188

Gabriel Girard-Bernier ML 142

Daniel Leblanc-Poirier BP 401

Jean Marois UFP 331

Berthe Miron ADQ 3,957

xBenoit Pelletier LIB 18,784

Sylvie Simard PQ 6,475

Gatineau

LIB by 9,478 in 1998

Polls reporting -- 178/178

Dominique Bedwell PQ 6,657

Brian Gibb ADQ 3,494

xRejean Lafreniere LIB 16,452

Julie Mercier UFP 423

Francoise Roy ML 96

Pontiac

LIB by 17,994 in 1998

Polls reporting -- 169/171

Victor Bilodeau ADQ 1,959

Luc Cote PQ 3,106

Louis Lang ML 132

Charlotte L'Ecuyer LIB 17,514

Serge Tanguay UFP 391

Hull

LIB by 8,682 in 1998

Polls reporting -- 194/194

xRoch Cholette LIB 16,233

Raphael J. Dery PQ 7,204

Maxime Gauld IND 156

Gheorghe Irimia IND 36

Jean-Francois LaRue ADQ 3,643

Benoit Legros ML 71

Stephane Salko BP 308

Denise Veilleux UFP 671

Papineau

LIB by 5,929 in 1998

Polls reporting -- 204/204

Serge Charette ADQ 3,824

Nathalie Gratton GRN 577

Gilles Hebert PQ 8,264

xNorman MacMillan LIB 17,922

Dominique Marceau UFP 282

**Graphic**

Colour Photo: Jamie Smith, The Ottawa Citizen; Benoit Pelletier, joined by wife Danielle Goulet last evening, is seen as one of the Outaouais' key players in a new Charest government.; Colour Photo: Brigitte Bouvier, The Ottawa Citizen; Charlotte L'Ecuyer receives a congratulatory kiss from Aylmer riding aide Gilles Robert.; Colour Photo: Jean Levac, The Ottawa Citizen; Roch Cholette, left, is mobbed by enthusiastic well-wishers at Liberal party headquarters in his Hull riding after vote results are announced last night.; Graphic;Diagram: Robert Cross and Dennis Leung, The Ottawa Citizen; (See hard copy for graphic).
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Jean Charest is surely the most "Canadian" premier ever to take office in the history of Quebec. His political roots were forged in the Conservative Party under Brian Mulroney and in the House of Commons, which is why Quebec Premier Bernard Landry spent the last days of the province's election campaign attacking Mr. Charest for being too close to Ottawa. To this, Mr. Charest has simply replied, "There will always be a sovereignty movement in Quebec and you have to accept that they defend that idea like I defend mine."

Jean Charest's election victory comes with the support of many francophones who, after years of reluctance, are embracing the brand of leadership he is offering them. In saying yes to Mr. Charest, Quebeckers have said yes to someone who, after spending years in the political wilderness, emerged to dominate the provincial leaders' TV debate of March 31. Despite his opponents' appeal the fresh-faced Mario Dumont, who promised to reduce government's role in Quebeckers' lives, and the known quantity of the nationalist incumbent, Bernard Landry, they saw in Mr. Charest someone in touch with the issues most important to Quebeckers.

Mr. Charest scored big on health care, education and the economy. He refused to allow Mr. Landry to get away with being fuzzy on sovereignty. He was revealed in the debate to be experienced and tough, and at the same time, passionate and committed to his vision of a more outward and confident Quebec within Canada.

Jean Charest has suffered for many years from the label of "golden boy," someone to whom success came too easily and quickly. That's simply wrong. In fact, he has more than paid his dues.

I remember when he came into the House of Commons in 1984. Young, articulate and perfectly bilingual, he was clearly a Mulroney favourite and was quickly made assistant deputy speaker. He was very good in the role, and the House respected his authority. In June, 1986, when he was 28, he was invited into the cabinet (as the minister of state for youth) the youngest MP ever to be sworn in. From there, he moved to increasingly important portfolios, culminating in minister of the environment.

Along the way, he paid his dues for his vision of federalism, breaking with his old friend Lucien Bouchard over the Charlottetown Accord. In 1993, battling Kim Campbell for the leadership of the federal Progressive Conservatives, he came close to upsetting what was supposed to have been an easy win for her. Later that year, after Ms. Campbell's blistering defeat before a resurgent Liberal Party, it was Mr. Charest who picked up the pieces and began rebuilding the party.

Within two years, he was fighting for Canada itself. His voice was among the most powerful and persuasive in urging Quebeckers to say no to Mr. Bouchard's phenomenal campaign in the 1995 referendum. Contesting the federal election of June, 1997, as PC leader, Mr. Charest increased the Tories' desperately thin ranks, winning more seats in Atlantic Canada, and earning the grudging respect of his political foes.

That is why, less than a year later, voices from every quarter urged Jean Charest to take up the leadership of the Liberal Party of Quebec. In April of 1998, he did so.

Now, I know from experience that moving between provincial and federal politics is a tricky switch not least because the folk with whom you have made common cause for many years tend to see the large national questions from only one side of the jurisdictional equation. Like me, Jean Charest has seen both sides now. His job will be that of bridge-builder, explaining each side to the other. An example: The federal government sees itself as the guarantor of public health care across Canada. Provincial governments see Ottawa merely as the funding agent, the source of grief.

But if anyone expects that Mr. Charest's rise in Quebec will spell peace on the health-care front, think again. It's far more likely that Ralph Klein will have a new ally, someone who will join him in demanding that Ottawa pay its share. The difference is, with Mr. Charest, Ottawa won't be able to dismiss his demands as the clamour from another Quebec sovereigntist.

We can also expect him to understand the vital importance of the Canada-U.S. relationship; after all, he's a veteran of the federal government that brought us the free-trade deal. At the same time, we can expect that he will be a voice of reason around his own cabinet table, convincing his people in Quebec City that contrary to popular belief, there is nothing in Ottawa called "the Department of Shafting the Provinces."

In changing from federal to provincial politics, Mr. Charest also ***changed parties***. If this has created suspicion, it was a red herring: In changing from the federal to the provincial scene, he went to the only federalist party he could go to. Quebec has no real "provincial" Progressive Conservative presence. In making the switch, Mr. Charest has been consistent and no opportunist. Under him, the Liberals won more voters than Mr. Bouchard's PQ in the 1998 election. But that didn't translate into enough seats to form a government. And still Mr. Charest stayed on, travelling to every corner of Quebec to build support.

He has accepted as his mandate the advancement of Quebec's best interests. He knows that sometimes those interests will conflict with those of Ottawa or other provinces. Ottawa has on occasion dismissed the PQ government's demands as the demands of those who would destroy a beautiful country. This cannot be said of Mr. Charest. He has earned the right to be heard and to be respected when he speaks for Quebeckers.

I expect we will hear the nationalist fire in his words when he deems it appropriate. But we will never feel the sovereigntist knife at our throats.

Jean Charest has just been politically reborn. No longer a golden boy, scarred and seasoned by defeat, he's still very much a man to watch. Many will wonder when he will next hear the call to return to the nation's capital.

Brian Tobin is a former federal minister of industry and former premier of Newfoundland and Labrador.
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The Yukon Party is united, albeit in secrecy.

The normally open Yukon Party barred reporters from attending its annual fall meeting this weekend.

However, the 30, or so, people who attended the morning session emerged united behind Premier Dennis Fentie and his government.

The meeting was billed as a chance for grassroots members to put Fentie and MLAs on the hot seat, but if any blood was let at the Saturday morning session at the Masonic Hall, neither Fentie nor the party executive would admit it.

"It was a rallying of the troops," said party president Marie Cox.

"There are no divisions in this party."

A recent article disclosed the nature of Fentie's arrest for heroin trafficking nearly 30 years ago. But it caused party members to unite rather than split apart, added Cox.

"If anything, it drew us closer together," she said.

"We know what we know about Mr. Fentie and we're satisfied with it. Mr. Fentie had a very good explanation for his behaviour over 30 years ago and he is our leader and that is the way it's going to stay."

The issue is "old news" and has no bearing on the government's ability to turn around the territory's economy while still focusing on social issues, added Fentie.

"This is not about Dennis Fentie; this about the Yukon territory and this government's ability to turn the direction that this territory has been going into a direction that will improve the lives of Yukon citizens," he said.

"We have set ourselves apart as a government; we are not status quo. We've made some decision here that past governments would not make."

Fentie cited the proposed Taxpayer Protection Act amendments as an example of his government's political will.

The decision to amend the act has been blasted by opposition politicians and, more significantly, former premier and Yukon Party leader John Ostashek.

The issue was likely front and centre during the meeting, but reporters were barred from attending the question-and-answer session.

Shortly after Fentie spoke with The News, its reporter was asked to leave the building so Craig Tuton, architect of the Yukon Party's November election victory, could address the membership in private.

"There was a very positive mood," said party treasurer Kurt Dieckmann following Tuton's speech.

"All the members of the party are very happy with our elected representatives."

The party raised more than $1,200 and collected gifts Saturday for the Share the Wish foundation, a local initiative to help needy families at Christmas, added Dieckmann.

"A lot of work has been done, notwithstanding the growing pains in the first year," said Fentie when asked to rate his government's performance.

"The mood today is upbeat; there's no question about it. There's a tremendous interest in our party and what we're doing as a government."

Fentie said his government has completed some "mundane but necessary work" and is now ready to begin building a prosperous future for the territory.

"The accomplishments to date are sufficient to where we can build from that and go into the second year of our mandate," he said.

"I've been invigorated since the day I ***changed parties*** because I went home to my roots.

"It can be said that, as an NDP member, I was more of a mercenary than anything else, focused totally on my own constituency."
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It is amazing that the new Prime Minister was able to find a place for Scott Brison just hours after he announced he was changing parties.National Post

Winston Churchill ***changed parties*** and it didn't do his career any harm either. Of course Churchill maintained that anyone under 30 who isn't a Liberal has no heart and anyone over 30 who isn't a Conservative has no brains.

Will Mr. Brison be OK as Prime Ministerial Secretary without either?

Nigel Wallbridge, Cochrane, Alta.
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Canada's very rich can breathe easier now. The Ottawa scene is unfolding according to plan. Their man has been anointed leader of the Liberal Party and is now prime minister.Thanks to the mass media they control, most Canadians are convinced that it is OK to vote Liberal again because now they are a "renewed" and "***changed" party***.

Meanwhile, the split in the other right-wing party has been healed through the recent merger of the Alliance and Progressive Conservative parties. The "new" Conservative Party of Canada will be in position, five or so years down the road, to deceive Canadians who will be tired of the Liberals into voting for illusionary change which will once again leave the very rich very much in control.

And as long as the very rich are in control, there is little hope that the tax loopholes which enable them to avoid paying their fair share through the use of tax havens will be closed. Finance ministers can claim that there not enough money to fund health care, education, infrastructure renewal, day care, and other social programs which benefit Canadians.

William Dascavich,

Vegreville
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The venom against Keith Martin is appalling. In a democracy we are allowed to make choices and politicians must be accorded the same rights as anyone else, and without retribution.

Lest we have forgotten, Winston Churchill ***changed parties*** and saved Britain.

Rickie Boothman,

Victoria

Times Colonist
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Meanwhile, Cauchon said he'll leave political life behind \_ for the time being at least \_ after Prime Minister Paul Martin excluded him from cabinet last December.

He did not rule out a political return down the road.

"I like politics enough and I'm passionate enough about politics to have the urge to come back,'' he told a news conference.

CP

"But in what context? It's much too early to say.''

Cauchon introduced a bill to decriminalize small amounts of marijuana. He also championed the Liberal government's effort to allow same-sex marriage.

Cauchon, 41, was a staunch supporter of Chretien and was the former prime minister's Quebec lieutenant.

Robert Nault, the former Indian affairs minister known for an aggressive style rejected by the new prime minister, also said Tuesday he won't run in the next election.

Nault becomes the latest Chretien loyalist to choose private life over backbench obscurity in the new Martin regime.

The Martin Liberals were looking ahead on Tuesday.

Federal Social Development Minister Liza Frulla, a Montreal MP, said Lapierre could help solidify Liberal fortunes in the next election, especially in Quebec.

"Jean Lapierre was an excellent politician and is an unparalleled communicator,'' Frulla said in Ottawa.

"He is very well connected in Quebec and that's what we need because we're planning to win a whole bunch of seats in Quebec.''

But not everyone was happy with the news of the former Bloc MP's expected candidacy.

Bernard Lemay, a salesman and local resident, said Lapierre's switch to the Bloc 14 years ago undermines his credibility.

"He ***changed parties*** back then,'' said Lemay, 61.

"How do we know he won't do the same thing again?''

Lapierre's stint with the Bloc also might not go over too well with some voters in English Canada, particularly in the West.

But Finance Minister Ralph Goodale said bringing an original member of the Bloc into the Liberals wouldn't create a backlash.

"If Jean decides to join Mr. Martin's team, he would join it on the basis that everybody else has and that is a profound commitment to the country and building all parts of the country,'' Goodale said outside the Commons.

Lapierre, who co-chaired Martin's unsuccessful leadership bid in 1990, quit his radio and TV jobs on Monday after reportedly having a conversation with Cauchon.

Lapierre had been a mainstay on Quebec radio and television, routinely using his connections to break political stories.

He worked for the CTV, TVA and TQS television networks and also hosted a show on CKAC, a popular Montreal radio station.

Also on Tuesday, current Bloc Leader Gilles Duceppe said he'll hold a news conference Thursday to reveal exactly how and why Lapierre left the party in 1992.

Cauchon, who plans to practise law, said he had no place in Martin's administration.

"Prime Minister Martin is there, he has his own team, and it's a rule in politics \_ we have to respect all that.''
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Former Liberal MP Jean Lapierre's stint with the sovereigntist Bloc Quebecois appeared to be forgotten yesterday as Liberal officials prepared for his return to the Grits.

The 47-year-old radio and television host is expected to announce tomorrow he will run for the Liberals in the Outremont riding, a Liberal stronghold.

The path was cleared for Lapierre when ex-justice minister Martin Cauchon announced yesterday he'll retire from politics before the next election.

Canadian Press

Lapierre quit the Liberals in 1990, blaming newly elected leader Jean Chretien for the failure of the Meech Lake accord, which would have recognized Quebec as a distinct society.

Lapierre was one of the original members of the Bloc Quebecois, founded by Lucien Bouchard, who had left the federal Tories.

But Liberal party officials said Lapierre's past won't hurt his bid to return to Parliament.

"I think he will be well received in the riding," said Adrienne Lafortune, president of the Liberal riding association in Outremont. "You have to put in context why he left the Liberal party."

Riding treasurer Rene Viau threw his personal support behind Lapierre.

"He would be a good representative for the Liberal party," said Viau.

Meanwhile, Cauchon said he'll leave political life behind -- for the time being at least -- after Prime Minister Paul Martin excluded him from cabinet last December.

He did not rule out a political return.

"I like politics enough and I'm passionate enough about politics to have the urge to come back," he told a news conference. "But in what context? It's much too early to say."

Cauchon introduced a bill to decriminalize small amounts of marijuana. He also championed the government's effort to allow same-sex marriage.

Cauchon, 41, was a staunch supporter of Chretien and was the former prime minister's Quebec lieutenant.

The Martin Liberals were looking ahead yesterday.

Federal Social Development Minister Liza Frulla, a Montreal MP, said Lapierre could help solidify Liberal fortunes in the next election, especially in Quebec.

"Jean Lapierre was an excellent politician and is an unparalleled communicator," Frulla said in Ottawa.

"He is very well connected in Quebec and that's what we need because we're planning to win a whole bunch of seats in Quebec."

But not everyone was happy with the news of the former Bloc MP's expected candidacy.

Bernard Lemay, a salesman and local resident, said Lapierre's switch to the Bloc 14 years ago undermines his credibility.

"He ***changed parties*** back then," said Lemay, 61. "How do we know he won't do the same thing again?"

Lapierre's stint with the Bloc also might not go over too well with some voters in English Canada, particularly in the West.

But Finance Minister Ralph Goodale said bringing an original member of the Bloc into the Liberals wouldn't create a backlash.

"If Jean decides to join Mr. Martin's team, he would join it on the basis that everybody else has and that is a profound commitment to the country and building all parts of the country," Goodale said outside the Commons.

Lapierre, who co-chaired Martin's unsuccessful leadership bid in 1990, quit his radio and TV jobs on Monday.

Cauchon, who plans to practise law, said he had no place in Martin's administration.

"Prime Minister Martin is there, he has his own team, and it's a rule in politics -- we have to respect all that."

**Graphic**

Photo: CANADIAN PRESS; Former justice minister Martin Cauchon waves as he leaves a Montreal news conference yesterday at which he announced he will not seek re-election.
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Newly minted Liberal Scott Brison is acting like a trained seal as he stands behind the embattled prime minister, his former Tory supporters say.

I didn't see any balls bouncing around there, but he was certainly standing up on cue, said Debbie Janzen, Kings-Hants Conservative Association president.

It makes me feel sick to my stomach.

Annapolis Valley Tories have spotted Brison joining the standing ovations for Martin as the PM tries to deflect blame onto Jean Chretien for creating a $250-million sponsorship program that saw $100 million snatched up by Liberal-friendly middlemen.

He sits very strategically in the House, right behind the prime minister, said David Hovell, a Tory organizer in Kings Hants. Every time the MPs stood up, well, Scott stood up there, and he was clapping and cheering for them, too.

Brison owns a Nova Scotia Duck Tolling Retriever named Scandal, a name Martin has applied to the sponsorship storm that blew up in the wake of Auditor General Sheila Fraser's scathing report this week.

The whole episode over these funds was appalling, Janzen said. But when the word scandal came up, the $250 million aside, the first thing that came to my mind was Scandal the dog following Scott.

Brison's former supporters were curious about how Brison felt defending the Liberal sponsorship scandal.

He should feel ashamed, Hovell said.

Brison, however, was anything but.

I am extremely proud of the prime minister's immediate and decisive action in response to the auditor general's report, Brison said.

Ordering a judicial inquiry and a parliamentary committee investigation is very impressive, Brison said. (Martin) has committed personally to getting to the bottom of this and to ensuring that this never happens again.

Brison still expects a spring election. And he believes he can win his riding despite his change of allegiance.

I believe that Canadians will support Prime Minister Martin in his strong commitment to getting to the bottom of this, Brison said of the sponsorship program.

Janzen worked closely with Brison for three years before he ***changed parties***. Now, she's working to push him out of office, and she's hoping the sponsorship fiasco will make that task easier.

Former provincial cabinet minister George Moody is considering going after the Valley riding.

There's lots of very good names out there, and any one of them will beat Scott in the next election, Janzen said.

[*clambie@hfxnews.ca*](mailto:clambie@hfxnews.ca)

**Graphic**

Trained seal: Scott Brison (top) applauds prime minister.
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A pox on all their houses is the 1/2rst thought that comes to mind as we move inextricably toward the upcoming federal election.

Many Canadians have become disgruntled with our politicians and our political parties. This has led to lower turnouts at elections and, this year, because of the timing of the vote, may well be the lightest on record. We have been reminded that it is a privilege to vote as well as a right, but in return, we should be able to expect that our politicians and their parties will treat us with respect.

Such is no longer the case. One only has to look at what has been happening in Ottawa in the past few years to realize that our politicians believe that they are above both the law and reproach from the electorate. As a result, more and more Canadians are turning away from their electoral responsibility.

First there was the HRDC scandal, followed by the gun registry disaster and now the sponsorship uproar. The Liberals will say that this all happened under a former government and to some extent that is true. Jean Chretien was prime minister when these things happened, but many of the Liberals seeking re-election were there during those years.

The Martin Liberals have been courting Chretien supporters as they move into election mode, but reports suggest that the Chretienites plan to sit on their hands during the campaign. Just sitting on their hands rather than having them extended seeking a bene1/2t will be a welcome change in the eyes of most Canadians.

Then, of course, we have the newly minted Conservative Party. Gone are the old Tories, Reform and Alliance, all merged into a new right-wing cohort trying to return to former glory so blatantly destroyed by Mulroney. Their policies are so foreign to many traditional conservatives that Joe Clark recently suggested that it is better to vote for the devil you know rather than the devil you don't know, meaning Martin instead of Stephen Harper.

Perhaps we should not be so hard on Harper. After all, he has indicated that he is comfortable with the way Peter MacKay has retired his old leadership debts, and we should all take him at his word. Isn't this the same MacKay who had a written agreement with David Orchard? Orchard took him at his word and we all know how long that lasted.

Former Mulroney cabinet minister Sinclair Stevens has suggested that large cash contributions could in3/4uence a politician. Stevens, who was forced to resign from cabinet because of a con3/4ict of interest scandal, said that in his experience money usually comes with strings attached.

Then there were the public musings by Harper about this region and about building a wall around Alberta which we should also forget as we head toward the ballot box. He has ***changed parties*** for the third time in a few short years and would have us believe that he has changed his views as well.

Next we have the new-look New Democratic Party with its Toronto-centric, clean-cut urbane leader, Jack Layton. Layton is a far cry from his predecessors who tended to be less sophisticated and more in tune with the working man. They also tended to be much heavier on policy and much less likely to speak in 20-second sound bites so necessary to obtain coverage in TV news reports.

All of this makes one cynical, and it means that supporting a political party or candidate is not as easy as in the old days when one usually followed their parents and maintained traditional links with parties. Others, not quite as scrupulous, would sell their vote for a drink or chocolates.

What then do we do?

There is only one possible solution. We could encourage the other federal party to expand its in3/4uence beyond the borders of Quebec. Le Bloc Quebecois, a new party in all other provinces, could become the party of choice. We could all vote for them, not to separate from our country, but to separate from our politicians.

That would certainly send a message and would be much better than not voting at all.

Peter O'Brien has been helping Nova Scotia business and government understand each other for more than 25 years. He lives in Clayton Park west.
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Conservatives in B.C. believe they will hold all of the province's former Alliance ridings, and could even increase their tally, as voters join a western push to ensure party leader Stephen Harper becomes prime minister.

John Reynolds, the party's national campaign co-chair, said that although nothing in politics is a given, "we're very comfortable with the job we've done [in B.C. ] in the past number of years."

"Rural areas, we're going to be safe there," said Reynolds, West Vancouver-Sunshine Coast MP in the last Parliament. "We've had them strongly in the past, I think we'll be fine. And obviously the target is to win them all, but if we come up with two more, I'll be happy."

Vancouver Sun

Reynolds said he thinks that with all signs indicating a close election, B.C. voters will want to tip the balance in favour of the Conservatives.

"The national mood shows a minority government, yet it's a toss-up to who it's going to be. I think British Columbians will get behind Stephen Harper, just like Albertans do and Saskatchewans will and Manitobans will."

Provincial Conservative campaign co-chair Bob Ransford was more cautious about whether the new party will hold all the former Alliance seats, but, like Reynolds, he didn't express concern about potential battles in rural ridings.

Ransford said that although it's true many early Reform party members came from NDP and union roots, he doubts they will go back to the NDP because many of them were from rural areas.

NDP leader Jack Layton, a Montreal-born academic who lives in Toronto where he has been a city councillor, is unlikely to appeal to them, he said.

"The message that Layton is talking about is a message that resonates in urban British Columbia. I haven't heard him so much addressing the issues of small resource communities where people are out of work."

He also said Conservative candidates will remind voters of the 10 years of NDP rule in B.C.

Ransford said that where the Conservatives will have to fight hard is in ridings such as Surrey North, where former Alliance MP Chuck Cadman is running as an independent after losing the nomination battle, and new ridings in south Surrey, where the husband-and-wife team of Gurmant and Nina Grewal is running.

"We're going to have to be extra-vigilant in those ridings. We've got our work cut out," he said. "I think any of the ones where we had hard-fought nomination battles, you always end up with some bad feelings at the end of that."

On the other hand, Ransford also said there are some Liberal ridings that Conservatives could take. One riding where there is expected to be a tough fight is Vancouver Quadra, where former provincial Social Credit cabinet minister Stephen Rogers is running for the Conservatives against Liberal Stephen Owen, who has just finished his first term in Parliament.

There also are several ridings where there is a potential for competition because of their history.

Burnaby-Douglas, where NDP MP Svend Robinson resigned recently, is anyone's guess. Two ridings that are nominally Liberal, Esquimalt-Juan de Fuca and Richmond, are considered Liberal only because their one-time Canadian Alliance MPs ***changed parties***.

Ransford said the B.C. campaign will stick to the national messages of the central campaign group, with specific references to B.C. examples.

"Whatever message we have in B.C. is going to be consistent with the national theme that's being developed and that basically is: 'We deserve more accountable, more honest government, and government that respects the people that elected it."

In B.C., that theme will mean pointing to the way Liberal MPs have not acted as advocates for B.C. in Ottawa, but as messengers from Ottawa telling B.C. what has been decided.

Political analyst David Mitchell said the Conservative party could be in for a surprise and that it's a mistake to count on even what are perceived to be relatively safe ridings.

"If the Conservative party thinks that in British Columbia they can relax in the Interior and in the North because it's in the bag, that's a time when, quite frankly, they're vulnerable."

Mitchell pointed out that B.C. has not elected someone running under a Conservative party banner for a generation.

"If they think that all of a sudden the Alliance or previously Reform vote just naturally translates into Conservative, it demonstrates an unfortunate confidence."

B.C. also has a tradition of voting in a contrary way.

"Whatever national trends are out there, B.C. almost always goes the other way," Mitchell said.
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VANCOUVER (CP) \_ The federal Liberal campaign in B.C. debuted a TV ad Monday featuring prominent former New Democrats \_ now Liberal candidates \_ saying they ***changed parties*** because of Paul Martin's "moderate approach.''

The 30-second spot, which begins airing Tuesday in British Columbia, features former NDP premier Ujjal Dosanjh, forest union boss Dave Haggard and Shirley Chan, an eastside Vancouver health activist.

Strolling through the woods, the three tell viewers they've always fought for working families, health care and B.C.'s place within Canada.

"We've always backed the NDP,'' Dosanjh says. "Today, there's a better choice.''

CP

The ad is designed to woo moderates, especially NDP supporters, in a province that could decide who forms the government after June 28.

Polls suggest the Liberals face some tight three-way contests in B.C.

The ad will tell voters with a social conscience who might be thinking about voting NDP that their "most effective vote is a Liberal vote,'' said Mark Marissen, Liberal campaign chair in B.C.

"Our team is ethnically diverse, ideologically diverse,'' he said. "We have strong women candidates. We can't say this about the other parties in British Columbia at all.''

The Liberals, who had six B.C. seats going into the campaign, have staked their fortunes on a so-called dream-team of candidates. Some, like Dosanjh, were appointed. Others, including Haggard and Chan, saw their opposition evaporate once Martin's election machine anointed them.

The stars in the ads said they turned their backs on the NDP after Martin promised they would help influence policy towards British Columbia. None said they were promised anything, such as a cabinet post, for their defection.

"That's the challenge for us, to take that voice of British Columbians into Ottawa in the government, regardless of where we sit on the backbench, the front bench or somewhere in between,'' said Haggard, who stepped down two weeks ago as president of the Industrial, Wood and Allied Workers of Canada.

Haggard said he's angry that NDP Leader Jack Layton apparently favours environmentalism over unionized resource industries such as forestry. But he sidestepped suggestions existing Liberal MPs in B.C. were ineffectual.

"What (then-prime minister) Jean Chretien did was under his leadership,'' he said. "Paul Martin has reached out to British Columbia.''

Dosanjh said he joined the Liberals to ensure there's a progressive government and that moderate New Democrats have a home.

Chan, a 12-year member of the provincial NDP, worked for former Vancouver mayor Mike Harcourt and campaigned for him when he led the NDP to power in 1991.

"I believe the Liberals are the right way to go because I want to ensure the social programs I have worked for my whole life are going to be rebuilt, and built up with a government which has managed to balanced the books for the last seven years,'' she said.

Chan, who later became Health Canada's B.C./Yukon regional manager, acknowledged she never criticized Martin when he slashed $7 billion in health and social transfer payments to the provinces in the mid-1990s to balance the federal budget.

The cuts were widely condemned by the B.C. New Democrat government, which was forced to cut its health budget and impose restrictions on welfare eligibility.

"I felt there was a need to address our deficit problem,'' she said.

Dosanjh admitted he pushed to have the money restored because that's what provincial politicians are expected to do. But he recognized Martin had to deal with Canada's fiscal crunch.

"If Paul Martin hadn't done what he did, we wouldn't be in a position to now reinvest in the social programs we cherish so much,'' he said.

Layton, campaigning in Edmonton, said Dosanjh has some explaining to do.

"What's he doing as part of this team that has so devastated the province's finances and is in bed with George Bush on missile defence?'' he asked.

Chan's New Democrat opponent, Vancouver East incumbent MP Libby Davies, said the ad shows the Liberals are worried about being outflanked by the NDP.

"We've got serious momentum here in B.C. and the Liberals are running scared,'' she said in news release.
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VANCOUVER (CP) -- The federal Liberal campaign in B.C. debuted a TV ad Monday featuring prominent former New Democrats -- now Liberal candidates -- saying they ***changed parties*** because of Paul Martin's "moderate approach."

The 30-second spot, which begins airing Tuesday in British Columbia, features former NDP premier Ujjal Dosanjh, forest union boss Dave Haggard and Shirley Chan, an eastside Vancouver health activist.

Strolling through the woods, the three tell viewers they've always fought for working families, health care and B.C.'s place within Canada.

"We've always backed the NDP," Dosanjh says. "Today, there's a better choice."

The ad is designed to woo moderates, especially NDP supporters, in a province that could decide who forms the government after June 28.

Polls suggest the Liberals face some tight three-way contests in B.C.

The ad will tell voters with a social conscience who might be thinking about voting NDP that their "most effective vote is a Liberal vote," said Mark Marissen, Liberal campaign chair in B.C.

"Our team is ethnically diverse, ideologically diverse," he said. "We have strong women candidates. We can't say this about the other parties in British Columbia at all."

The Liberals, who had six B.C. seats going into the campaign, have staked their fortunes on a so-called dream-team of candidates. Some, like Dosanjh, were appointed. Others, including Haggard and Chan, saw their opposition evaporate once Martin's election machine anointed them.

The stars in the ads said they turned their backs on the NDP after Martin promised they would help influence policy towards British Columbia. None said they were promised anything, such as a cabinet post, for their defection.

"That's the challenge for us, to take that voice of British Columbians into Ottawa in the government, regardless of where we sit on the backbench, the front bench or somewhere in between," said Haggard, who stepped down two weeks ago as president of the IWA.
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VANCOUVER -- The federal Liberal campaign in B.C. debuted a TV ad Monday featuring prominent former New Democrats -- now Liberal candidates -- saying they ***changed parties*** because of Paul Martin's "moderate approach."

The 30-second spot, which begins airing Tuesday in British Columbia, features former NDP premier Ujjal Dosanjh, forest union boss Dave Haggard and Shirley Chan, an eastside Vancouver health activist.

Strolling through the woods, the three tell viewers they've always fought for working families, health care and B.C.'s place within Canada.

"We've always backed the NDP," Dosanjh says. "Today, there's a better choice."

The ad is designed to woo moderates, especially NDP supporters, in a province that could decide who forms the government after June 28.

Polls suggest the Liberals face some tight three-way contests in B.C.

The ad will tell voters with a social conscience who might be thinking about voting NDP that their "most effective vote is a Liberal vote," said Mark Marissen, Liberal campaign chairman in B.C.

"Our team is ethnically diverse, ideologically diverse," he said. "We have strong women candidates. We can't say this about the other parties in British Columbia at all."

The Liberals, who had six B.C. seats going into the campaign, have staked their fortunes on a so-called dream-team of candidates. Some, like Dosanjh, were appointed. Others, including Haggard and Chan, saw their opposition evaporate once Martin's election machine anointed them.

The stars in the ads said they turned their backs on the NDP after Martin promised they would help influence policy towards B.C.

None said they were promised anything, such as a cabinet post, for their defection.

"That's the challenge for us, to take that voice of British Columbians into Ottawa in the government, regardless of where we sit on the backbench, the front bench or somewhere in between," said Haggard, who stepped down two weeks ago as president of the Industrial, Wood and Allied Workers of Canada.

Haggard said he's angry that NDP Leader Jack Layton apparently favours environmentalism over unionized resource industries such as forestry. But he sidestepped suggestions existing Liberal MPs in B.C. were ineffectual.

"What (then-prime minister) Jean Chretien did was under his leadership," he said. "Paul Martin has reached out to British Columbia."

Dosanjh said he joined the Liberals to ensure there's a progressive government and that moderate New Democrats have a home.

Chan, a 12-year member of the provincial NDP, worked for former Vancouver mayor Mike Harcourt and campaigned for him when he led the NDP to power in 1991.

"I believe the Liberals are the right way to go because I want to ensure the social programs I have worked for my whole life are going to be rebuilt, and built up with a government which has managed to balanced the books for the last seven years."

**Graphic**

Photo: Tom Hanson, CP photo; Prime minister Paul Martin stands next to a danger sign at a news conference following a tour of the Saskatchewan Synchotron Institute while campaigning in Saskatoon Monday. ;
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VANCOUVER -- The federal Liberal campaign in B.C. debuted a TV ad Monday featuring prominent former New Democrats -- now Liberal candidates -- saying they ***changed parties*** because of Paul Martin's "moderate approach."

The 30-second spot, which begins airing Tuesday in British Columbia, features former NDP premier Ujjal Dosanjh, forest union boss Dave Haggard and Shirley Chan, an eastside Vancouver health activist.

Strolling through the woods, the three tell viewers they've always fought for working families, health care and B.C.'s place within Canada.

The Canadian Press

"We've always backed the NDP," Dosanjh says. "Today, there's a better choice."

The ad is designed to woo moderates, especially NDP supporters, in a province that could decide who forms the government after June 28.

Polls suggest the Liberals face some tight three-way contests in B.C.

The ad will tell voters with a social conscience who might be thinking about voting NDP that their "most effective vote is a Liberal vote," said Mark Marissen, Liberal campaign chair in B.C.

"Our team is ethnically diverse, ideologically diverse," he said. "We have strong women candidates. We can't say this about the other parties in British Columbia at all."

The Liberals, who had six B.C. seats going into the campaign, have staked their fortunes on a so-called dream-team of candidates. Some, like Dosanjh, were appointed. Others, including Haggard and Chan, saw their opposition evaporate once Martin's election machine anointed them.

The stars in the ads said they turned their backs on the NDP after Martin promised they would help influence policy towards British Columbia. None said they were promised anything, such as a cabinet post, for their defection.

"That's the challenge for us, to take that voice of British Columbians into Ottawa in the government, regardless of where we sit on the backbench, the front bench or somewhere in between," said Haggard, who stepped down two weeks ago as president of the Industrial, Wood and Allied Workers of Canada.

Haggard said he's angry that NDP Leader Jack Layton apparently favours environmentalism over unionized resource industries such as forestry. But he sidestepped suggestions existing Liberal MPs in B.C. were ineffectual.

"What (then-prime minister) Jean Chretien did was under his leadership," he said. "Paul Martin has reached out to British Columbia."
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Photo: Ujjal Dosanjh
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ROME - The media-shy wife of Silvio Berlusconi, the Italian Prime Minister, sees herself as Penelope to her husband's Ulysses, staying at home with the family as the hero battles storms and monsters on an epic adventure.

That is the self-portrait painted by Veronica Lario in a new biography, published yesterday and based on interviews with journalist Maria Latella, who describes herself as a close friend.

The book provides a frank glimpse into the world of the glamorous former actress who is hardly ever seen in public with her husband, Italy's richest man. They met after he spotted her on stage in Milan in 1980.

Reuters

Ms. Laria's reticence is legendary. When she joined her husband at dinner with a visiting George W. Bush, the U.S. President, and his wife, Laura, earlier this month, her appearance was, for the Italian media, almost as big a story as the visit itself.

The fact she is so invisible has sparked much speculation about the state of the marriage -- she is the Prime Minister's second wife. Mr. Berlusconi himself joked at a news conference with a visiting Danish politician that he was thinking of introducing his guest to his wife "because he's much better looking than Cacciari."

He was referring to Massimo Cacciari, a bearded leftist professor and a former mayor of Venice, but his wife categorically denies she is having any sort of affair with the man. She insists her marriage is solid.

"I believe I have been a perfect wife for Silvio, for the man that he is," she says. "He has been able to concentrate on himself and his work, having a wife who has not made his absence from the family a problem."

The book tells anecdotes from her childhood, her life on stage and the early days of their romance. Mr. Berlusconi once presented her with the gift of a blanket after she had mentioned that her apartment in Rome was rather chilly. "I laughed but I was touched," she says.

Ms. Lario is fierce in defending her husband, the object of a string of corruption investigations and criticism from many in Italy who say he wields too much power through his media empire.

"I'm not sure in which circle my husband would have ended up if Dante had known him, perhaps in some corner of Purgatory," she says.

Not in Hell then? "No, certainly not."

She compares him to the Greek hero Ulysses -- whom Dante placed in Hell -- in another passage. "There is something of the epic in his life, in the sense that like the life of the Homeric hero, it's a tale of grandiose and extraordinary undertakings."

Her views are not always consistent with those of her husband, a centre-right entrepreneur.

"I have ***changed parties*** often. I have voted for radicals and Socialists," she admits.

The biography offers snapshots of life in the Berlusconi household: The Italian Prime Minister, often pictured by Italian cartoonists in the garb of Napoleon, has a collection of statuettes of the great man; and the media mogul's children were not allowed to watch television when they were young.

Now with her three children -- two daughters and a son -- growing up, Ms. Lario says her life is entering a new phase. She talks of taking a "sabbatical year" to travel the world alone.
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ROME - The media-shy wife of Silvio Berlusconi, the Italian Prime Minister, sees herself as Penelope to her husband's Ulysses, staying at home with the family as the hero battles storms and monsters on an epic adventure.

That is the self-portrait painted by Veronica Lario in a new biography, published yesterday and based on extensive interviews with journalist Maria Latella, who describes herself as a close friend.

The book provides a frank glimpse into the world of the glamorous former actress who is hardly ever seen in public with her husband, Italy's richest man. They met after he spotted her on stage in Milan in 1980.

Reuters

Ms. Laria's reticence is legendary. When she joined her husband at dinner with a visiting George W. Bush, the U.S. President, and his wife, Laura, earlier this month, her appearance was, for the Italian media, almost as big a story as the visit itself.

The fact she is so invisible has sparked much speculation about the state of the marriage -- she is the Prime Minister's second wife. Mr. Berlusconi himself joked at a news conference with a visiting Danish politician that he was thinking of introducing his guest to his wife "because he's much better looking than Cacciari."

He was referring to Massimo Cacciari, a bearded leftist professor and a former mayor of Venice, but his wife categorically denies she is having any sort of affair with the man.

She insists her marriage is solid. "I believe I have been a perfect wife for Silvio, for the man that he is," she says. "He has been able to concentrate on himself and his work, having a wife who has not made his absence from the family a problem."

The book tells anecdotes from her childhood, her life on stage and the early days of their romance. Mr. Berlusconi once presented her with the gift of a blanket after she had mentioned that her apartment in Rome was rather chilly.

"I laughed but I was touched," she says.

Ms. Lario is fierce in defending her husband, the object of a string of corruption investigations and criticism from many in Italy who say he wields too much power through his media empire.

"I'm not sure in which circle my husband would have ended up if Dante had known him, perhaps in some corner of Purgatory," she says.

Not in Hell then? "No, certainly not."

She compares him to the Greek hero Ulysses -- whom Dante placed in Hell -- in another passage. "There is something of the epic in his life, in the sense that like the life of the Homeric hero, it's a tale of grandiose and extraordinary undertakings."

Her views are not always consistent with those of her husband, a centre-right entrepreneur.

"I have ***changed parties*** often. I have voted for radicals and Socialists," she admits.

The biography offers snapshots of life in the Berlusconi household: The Italian Prime Minister, often pictured by Italian cartoonists in the garb of Napoleon, has a collection of statuettes of the great man; and the media mogul's children were not allowed to watch television when they were young.

Now with her three children -- two daughters and a son -- growing up, Ms. Lario says her life is entering a new phase. She talks of taking a "sabbatical year" to travel the world alone.

"I firmly intend to deny myself much less than I have in the past. I want to try to exist a little more, to be a little more," she says.

But she adds, perhaps for her husband's peace of mind: "Don't worry, I'm not about to pose for a calendar."
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Scott Brison's more popular as a Liberal than as a Tory.

The former Progressive Conservative leadership candidate, who defected to the Liberals late last year after his party merged with the Canadian Alliance, was beaming last night as he gave a victory speech in front of cheering supporters.

"I thank the people of Kings-Hants," Brison said. "I thank you for having stood by me, and I guarantee you I will stand up for you."

In 2000, as a Progressive Conservative Brison won 40 per cent; yesterday as a Liberal he claimed 46 per cent.

Brison's election was over, but he was still raring for a fight with the Conservatives.

"I think it's safe to say the people of Kings-Hants believe in family values, but they don't believe that family values should be used as code words for prejudice and bigotry," he said.

Brison, who is openly gay, acknowledged his partner during his speech.

"I am so proud of my family, and Bernard here tonight, who have been just so supportive," he said.

Brison, 37, has been known to croon off-key Johnny Cash songs when handed a microphone.

"I had a backup plan if politics didn't work out; I could have gone to Nashville," he said. "But the fact is, you've decided to hire me again."

Throughout the campaign, Tories had been predicting Brison's defection would spell his defeat. But that posturing evaporated last night.

"This is better than what we expected," said defeated Conservative candidate Bob Mullan.

When Brison ***changed parties*** in December, the Tories had $1,400, and much of their riding executive had followed the sitting MP to the Liberals.

"The deck was stacked against us," Mullan said. "We really knew we couldn't win, but we've achieved a lot more than we thought we could in our wildest imaginings."

The family physician said he enjoyed the campaign, despite the loss. "Next time around, look out, this machine's going to be ready to go," Mullan said. "You haven't seen the last of me. I'll put it that way."

A packed Windsor's Spitfire Arms Ale House erupted with applause when it became obvious Brison had won Kings-Hants.

"Everybody's quite pleased," said publican Troy Kirkby. "Who knew? I thought it would be closer, myself. But I'm ecstatic that Scott got back in."

Kings-Hants

x Scott Brison LIB 17,554

Bob Mullan CON 11,294

Skip Hambling NDP 6,638

Kevin Stacey GRN 1,364

Jim Hnatiuk CHP 486

Richard Hennigar IND 300

[*clambie@hfxnews.ca*](mailto:clambie@hfxnews.ca)

**Graphic**

Valley Favourite: Scott Brison celebrated keeping his seat. He switched from the Conservatives to the Liberals last year.
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It has nearly been lost in the hail of Bush versus Kerry coverage, but there is also a pitched battle for the U.S. Congress hanging in the balance tomorrow.

And there's no shortage of colourful races to watch, particularly in the Senate, where Republicans hold a razor-thin margin.

In Kentucky, an aging former baseball player-turned-senator is facing charges that he's lost his mind after some bizarre campaign antics. In Alaska, the daughter of a Republican icon is defending her seat, and denying charges of nepotism, after inheriting her way into the Senate. In Colorado, a billionaire beer baron is in a showdown with a rancher who has Hispanic roots. And in South Dakota, Tom Daschle, the Senate Democratic Leader and staunch defender of the U.S. ban on Canadian cattle, is fighting for his political life.

Americans will choose 34 of their 100 senators as well as 435 members of the House of Representatives tomorrow. In a country where it takes loads of campaign cash to get to Washington and incumbency rules, only a few of those races are truly competitive.

Yet the outcome of just a handful of races could prove as important to the future direction of the United States as the presidential contest. If Democratic challenger John Kerry becomes president, he could face both a Senate and House in hostile hands, limiting his ability to make good on promises.

Likewise, unless Republicans gain seats in the Senate, President George W. Bush would likely face a continuation of the stalemate that has prevailed for the past four years.

Few political analysts expect the House to change hands. About three dozen seats are in play and the Democrats would need to pick up 13 seats to seize control from the Republicans.

The House has ***changed parties*** just once in the past 50 years and incumbents win 98 per cent of the time.

The Senate is another story. There, the Republicans hold a 51-48 margin, with one independent (Democratic-leaning Jim Jeffords of Vermont). Picking up just nine seats would give Republicans unfettered control, allowing them to overcome the filibusters that have stalemated key bills.

"This is going to be a very tough election for Democrats," said Jennifer Duffy, managing editor of the Washington-based Cook Political Report. "Democrats are playing on a hostile map."

The Democrats are defending 19 Senate seats, and more than half are in states that voted for Mr. Bush in the 2000 election.

Ms. Duffy rated the Republican's chance of holding the Senate at 70 per cent, with a good chance of building on that lead.

The Democrats, on the other hand, will be lucky to save their leader, Mr. Daschle, who is facing a strong challenge from Republican John Thune.

The Bush administration and the Republican National Committee have made Mr. Daschle a top target because of his national reputation and his role in blocking favourite party bills, including sweeping energy legislation. The two candidates have raised more than $20-million (U.S.) combined to fund their race for the seat.

"The hope of Republicans is that if Democrats lost their party leader, they might reconsider how they do business in the Senate," Ms. Duffy said.

His defeat could prove positive for Canada. He has used his leadership status repeatedly to fight efforts to reopen the border to Canadian cattle and beef.

Another interesting race is in Kentucky - normally safe Republican turf. But Jim Bunning, a first-term senator and former Cy Young-winning ace for the Detroit Tigers in the 1960s, has seen his 20-point lead melt after a series of bizarre pronouncements.

He accused supporters of Democrat Dan Mongiardo of beating his wife "black and blue" at a picnic, apparently without evidence, and then likened his swarthy-skinned opponent to one of Saddam Hussein's sons. Already in trouble, the reclusive senator agreed to a televised debate, but only via satellite from his office in Washington, without anyone else in the room.

The Democrat, a doctor, has argued that the 74-year-old Mr. Bunning is showing evidence of dementia.

Another unusually wild contest is in Alaska, a Republican stronghold that is witnessing one of its most important elections in a generation. Without ever running, Republican Lisa Murkowski inherited her Senate seat from her father, Frank Murkowski, a legendary politician who loved to deliver Washington pork to his home state.

Ms. Murkowski is in a tough race against former Alaska governor Tony Knowles, who was Mr. Bush's roommate at Yale University. Mr. Knowles, a conservative Democrat, has made the charge of nepotism stick, and he's now leading in most polls.

In Colorado, Peter Coors has taken a break from the family brewing business to try his hand at politics. His Democratic opponent, state Attorney-General Ken Salazar, has taken aim at the socially conservative Republican base by tying Mr. Coors to wild beer ads. He's also played up his rancher and Mexican roots to appeal to the 10 per cent of Hispanic voters in the state.
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He remembers life before world wars.

He recalls with glee the arrival of the first car in his community, how its owner treated voters with rides to the polling station in a horseless carriage and how some area residents became annoyed, fearing the noise would scare the horses.

Ernest MacPherson admits he has witnessed "too many" changes in his nearly 105 years of living. However, he feels some of the changes have been for the better.

MacPherson got his first car a few years after his 1928 marriage to Nellie Boulter.

But he has never used a computer and claims he has no interest in starting now.

Both Ernest and Nellie grew up in the community of Dunblane.

They took over his brother's farm. The only thing between it and the farm where he grew up and worked as a boy was a fence line.

He has plowed with teams of horses and he feels a little hard work never hurt anybody.

He was also the last farmer in his community to farm with horses.

The MacPhersons raised three daughters: Florence (Leon) Hatchard of Moncton; Marie (Osborne) Phillips of West Cape and Grace (Wendell) Yeo of Southwest Lot 16.

After Nellie's death in 1980, MacPherson continued to live in the family home for several years before moving in with his daughter, Marie, and her husband.

Six years ago he took up residence at the Lady Slipper Villa in O'Leary where he enjoys church services, entertainment and welcoming visitors.

He has also reigned as king of the villa more than once.

In addition to three daughters, the Ernest and Nellie MacPherson union produced 11 grandchildren, 28 great grandchildren and five great-great grandchildren.

When asked if he can keep track of them all, he responds: "They keep track of me."

MacPherson will mark his 105th birthday today. Already, cards and best wishes have started to flow into his ground floor room at the villa.

Proudly displayed on the wall of his room is a distinguished citizen plaque he received from the province of P.E.I. at the start of the 21st century.

He also passes around photos taken many years ago and he has stories to tell about every one of them.

In one black and white photo, he poses with his brother and two other men who worked in the woods.

He recalls that he and his brother, after being hired in Moncton and driven to Plaster Rock, walked 50 miles into the woods, then walked out three months later, each with $200 in their pockets, income he describes as a lot of money for those days.

They gave it all to their father.

"We really didn't need to," he shrugged, but he explained that his father could use it to help raise seven children and look after the farm.

His parents were John Alex and Jessie (Currie) MacPherson. His father, he said, was a good storyteller.

He pointed to a picture of his mother and proudly admitted, "she was a pretty woman."

With a gleam in his eye, MacPherson challenged a reporter to point him out from a photograph of lumberjacks.

"You couldn't be more wrong," he responded to the reporter's guess.

In addition to farming (he had 100 acres and farmed 50 to 60 of them and milked up to eight cows), MacPherson hired out to spray potatoes. He also had a two-ton truck for hauling potatoes and "anything at all."

It was a cream truck and it had a nice box. On Saturday nights he'd use it to take community folk to O'Leary. He only hauled cream with it once and found that to be "an awful job."

After hearing an acknowledgement that cream cans were heavy, MacPherson responded, "they were light coming back."

Living and working in a rural community, MacPherson said residents had to make their own fun. He said he and his wife went to church a lot.

They also attended socials and little parties where they played crokinole and cards - mostly rook.

There was also a lot of skating during the winters, but MacPherson said there was little time for anything but work during the growing season.

Just a few weeks ago the villa's senior resident was coaxed into playing a game of rook.

He proudly reported that he and a grandson played together and "we beat the other fellows."

He did take an interest in politics and doesn't miss an opportunity to cast a ballot. He said he voted Conservative every time but once.

He explains why he ***changed party*** allegiance that one time. There was a fellow in the community who had neither home nor a job, he relates. He asked the Liberal politician to find the man a job and, in less than a week the fellow was employed.

MacPherson has enjoyed relatively good health, although he has had some skin cancer recently. His hearing is failing but he still has keen eyesight.

He reads The Journal-Pioneer regularly, often without the benefit of his glasses.

A few years back he insisted "as long as I can walk, I'm going to, " and so, he walks wherever he wants to go.

He has two walking canes but prefers not to use them.

"If I had given up walking two or three years ago or three or four years ago, I wouldn't be walking now."

The centenarian said he smoked half a cigar once and it nearly sickened him so he never smoked again. He also never drank.

He was always an early riser and still is. After 2 o'clock in the morning he sleeps only in short spurts and usually rises between 5:30 and 6 a.m. He said he is usually one of the first ones at the Villa's breakfast table.

He also admits to "little naps" during the day.

Although he claims that he doesn't have a good appetite, he says he eats a lot of oranges and apples.

"I don't know if that's a help or not. It probably hasn't hurt. The doctor said I was as strong as a horse." MacPherson added.
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A month ago, Fernando (Freddie) Ferrer was cruising along in the direction of a historic political breakthrough in this city.

With the backing of New York's Democratic establishment, the former Bronx borough president was the clear favourite to win the party's nomination to challenge Republican Mayor Michael Bloomberg, a former billionaire businessman, in the fall election.

A victory against the competent but uninspiring incumbent appeared achievable, though no slam dunk. With it, Mr. Ferrer would become the first Latino mayor of America's most populous city, successor to larger-than-life public figures such as Rudolph Giuliani, Fiorella LaGuardia and the 19th-century Tammany Hall legend William M. (Boss) Tweed.

Then, Mr. Ferrer struck a reef in the treacherous waters of the city's turbulent racial politics.

With a few ill-chosen words that appeared to absolve four policemen in the shooting of an unarmed black man six years ago, Mr. Ferrer opened a rift between his campaign and the African-American community, including some politicians who supported him in his unsuccessful 2001 campaign for the Democratic nomination and were expected to endorse him this time.

His stumble has reinvigorated the field of challengers, each representative of a distinct constituency in the Democratic Party. And it has raised the likelihood of a divisive primary season - like the one in 2001 that left the party exhausted and damaged in the general election against Mr. Bloomberg.

Lining up against Mr. Ferrer is slate of candidates who could have answered a Broadway casting call to fill stereotypical roles for Democratic politicians in New York.

\* Manhattan borough president Virginia Fields is a stylish and articulate though untested black woman who focuses on the problems of poor neighbourhoods and promises new opportunities for minorities and women;

\* City Council Speaker Gifford Miller is an earnest, liberal, Ivy Leaguer from Manhattan's affluent Upper East Side who offers a middle-of-the-road blend of prudent activism;

\* Congressman Anthony Weiner is an aggressive Jewish upstart from Queens who defends the interests of embattled middle-class New Yorkers of the "outer boroughs."

The four took the stage last week in a candidates meeting that produced a few sparks, notably Mr. Weiner's attack on Mr. Ferrer's plan to tax trades on the New York Stock Exchange, but mainly boilerplate Democratic nostrums about the need for better schools, more jobs and an end to Mr. Bloomberg's plan to spend $600-million (U.S) on a new football stadium on the west side of Manhattan.

Two nights later at a public forum, Mr. Ferrer, a soft-spoken, owlish man, ratcheted up his delivery, telling a radio audience that he is a passionate man - passionate about affordable housing, about the city's struggling public schools and about unemployment, particularly among young black and Latino men. But he came across as a politician who has been told by handlers that he needs to be more passionate to sway voters.

He accused the current mayor of "squandering" money on the stadium - planned as home to the New York Jets and the Olympics, should New York win a long-shot bid to host the 2012 Games - while neglecting the real priorities of New Yorkers.

While Mr. Bloomberg tends to give pep talks about the state of New York, Mr. Ferrer has focused his campaign on serious problems facing the city: jobless rates above 40 per cent among young black and Latino men, soaring property values squeezing the middle class and poor alike, and the ongoing crisis in the public-school system, which has suffered from chronic underfunding and violence; high dropout rates and poor student achievement.

But it's one thing to enunciate the challenges, and quite another to persuade people that you are the one to tackle them.

His anemic performance at candidates' meetings - together with his gaffe over the police shooting - has senior New York Democrats worried that they will lose city hall for the fourth consecutive election, an astonishing performance given the party's deep roots and overwhelming numerical superiority in the city.

"None of the Democrats are breaking through with their message," New York State Assembly Speaker Sheldon Silver, a Democrat from Manhattan's Lower East Side, told The New York Times. "They are risking losing to a man whom they should clearly be able to beat."

Mr. Bloomberg is a moderate Republican - a former Democrat who ***changed parties*** to run for mayor four years ago - who was praised by Time magazine as one of America's best mayors. But while many affluent New Yorkers admire him, he has generated little enthusiasm among the broader population, particularly in the ethnic communities.

Until a few weeks ago, Mr. Ferrer was the prohibitive front-runner to face Mr. Bloomberg in November. Polls had him leading the field by more than 20 percentage points and besting the mayor in a head-to-head race. He had endorsements from Eliot Spitzer, the crusading state Attorney-General who has announced his candidacy for governor in 2006, and from Carl McCall, a leading black Democrat in the city and former state comptroller.

And he had the kind of inspiring life story that American politicians love to highlight to establish their populist credentials.

He was raised by his mother and his grandmother, immigrants from Puerto Rico who worked in the kitchens of the Waldorf-Astoria hotel. As a youngster, he shined shoes, and was later a scholarship student at New York University, an elite private university in Manhattan.

As the de facto mayor of the Bronx, he presided over a building boom that saw the borough reverse its slide into an urban nightmare and reinvigorate decaying neighbourhoods. While the renaissance was city-wide, Mr. Ferrer received credit not only for that turnaround, but also for bringing jobs and much-needed services to the borough.

In the 2001 mayoral race, he led a minority-based coalition with support from the likes of incendiary black powerbroker Rev. Al Sharpton. That coalition coalesced around opposition to former mayor Giuliani, whose unqualified support for police rankled those who felt that the NYPD often victimized minorities.

Mr. Ferrer lost the Democratic primary that year to Mark Green, a veteran New York City politician, in a campaigned marred by racial tension. Mr. Green's campaign distributed a New York Post cartoon in white neighbourhoods depicting Mr. Ferrer kissing Mr. Sharpton's greatly enlarged backside; the Ferrer camp accused Mr. Green of racism.

With the Democrats divided, Mr. Bloomberg won a squeaker over Mr. Green after spending $74-million of his own money on his campaign.

This year, Mr. Ferrer counted on refashioning the 2001 coalition and building a solid base among Democrats of all stripes. Then he stumbled over Amadou Diallo.

In 1999, Mr. Diallo, an unarmed African immigrant, died in a blizzard of gunfire from police who mistook him for a rape suspect. The four officers - who were later acquitted of criminal charges - fired 41 bullets, striking him 19 times.

The shooting prompted an explosion of fury among minority activists and their supporters. Mr. Ferrer himself was arrested during a protest against the shooting, thus bolstering his credentials in the black community, which felt particularly victimized by Mr. Giuliani's encouragement of aggressive police tactics.

Last month, Mr. Ferrer appeared to flip-flop on the Diallo case, telling a meeting of police sergeants that he felt the shooting was "not a crime" and that there was a tendency to "over-indict" the NYPD.

The outrage in the African-American community was immediate and visceral. Brooklyn city councilman Charles Barron told a black newspaper: "Freddie Ferrer just shot the 42nd bullet."

Mr. Sharpton publicly rebuked Mr. Ferrer at a rambunctious town hall meeting after the audience flailed the hapless politician, who repeatedly apologized for his "poor choice of words."

Mr. Ferrer's critics and political opponents have refused to let the matter die. In a recent debate hosted by WWRL radio and broadcast live to a largely African-American audience, he was asked again whether he believed the shooting was a crime. He replied that, regardless of the jury verdict acquitting the officers, the shooting was "wrong by any standard."

His opponents were less equivocal. Ms. Fields said flatly that it was a crime, while Mr. Miller elevated the rhetorical stakes, labelling it "a crime against humanity."

A poll of New York City Democrats by Quinnipiac University, in nearby Connecticut, conducted after the incident, showed Mr. Ferrer's support slipping to 36 from 40 per cent, while Ms. Fields's had risen to 21 from 14 per cent.

Still, Mr. Ferrer remained the only Democrat who led Mr. Bloomberg in a head-to-head poll, and did so by a comfortable 46-40 margin.

Former mayor Ed Koch, a Democrat who is co-chairing Mr. Bloomberg's re-election campaign, predicts that Mr. Ferrer will not recover from the Diallo debacle. "I think he is going down like a stone, in free fall," Mr. Koch said in an interview.

*Shawn McCarthy is New York bureau chief of The Globe and Mail.*

**It's a wonderful town**

And just what kind of city does New York's mayor preside over?

**Population:** 8.1 million

**Area:** 800 square kilometres

**Five boroughs:** Manhattan, Brooklyn, Queens, Bronx and Staten Island

**Number of city councillors:** 51

**Number of city employees:** 300,000

**Proposed spending (2006 budget):** $49.2-billion (U.S.)

**Expected revenue (2006 budget):** $49.6-billion (U.S.)

**Expected budget shortfall over next four years:** $8.2-billion (U.S.)

**Number of public schools:** 1,565

**Number of public-school students:** 1.1 million

**Number of homeless people on streets and in shelters:** 38,000

**Foreign-born population:** 40 per cent

**Top source countries for immigrants:** Dominican Republic, China, Jamaica, Guyana, Mexico.

**Household income for top 20 per cent, excluding capital gains:** $159,631

**Household income for middle 20 per cent:** $37,827

**Household income for bottom 20 per cent:** $5,746

*Source: City of New York and Fiscal Policy Institute*
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When John Diefenbaker visited London as prime minister of Canada in the late 1950s, he called on a longtime idol, Sir Winston Churchill. Recalling his first visit to the British Parliament during the First World War when he saw a speech by Churchill -- then in political purgatory over his role in the ill-fated attempt to take the Dardanelles -- Diefenbaker said, "the first time I saw you, you were in disgrace."

"Which time was that?" Churchill replied.

Churchill is remembered and honoured today for his role as the "saviour" of Britain and perhaps of western civilization, when he led Britain in standing alone against Adolf Hitler's plans to impose Nazi tyranny all over Europe and beyond. But in a political career that lasted 65 years, Churchill survived an unmatched series of political ups and downs.

At the same time as he was busy making history, Churchill was a prolific author and, even in his lifetime, the books by and about him constituted an industry in and of itself.

Forty years after his death, the Churchill book industry is still going strong, thanks to continuing interest in his life and times, unexplored avenues of his complicated life, the declassification of previously secret documents and revisionist histories that stir fresh controversy.

The most recent product of that industry, Churchill: The Unexpected Hero, by Churchill scholar and University of Edinburgh historian Paul Addison, is a study of Churchill's reputation as he went through all those ups and downs in his life.

Addison takes readers for a short but breathtaking ride on the Churchillian roller coaster. Churchill was called every nasty name imaginable by politicians of every political persuasion as he changed policies to suit the job he was doing, and he famously ***changed parties*** twice. Many of the epithets hurled his way are recorded by Addison.

For example, Addison quotes Diefenbaker's Liberal predecessor, William Lyon Mackenzie King, who before the Second World War called Churchill an "evil genius" and "one of the most dangerous men I have ever known." In 1947, King wrote that Churchill "was the greatest man of our times." King was far from alone in holding such diverse opinions on the same man.

While Churchill is today fondly remembered, especially by those on the political right, nearly a century ago he was reviled by Conservatives for deserting their party and betraying his class with his calls for military expenditure cuts, his Edwardian social reforms and his support for trimming the powers of the House of Lords.

And the leftists who detest Churchill for his role in dealing with the Tonypandy riots of 1910 and the General Strike of 1926 and for his "warmonger" reputation, have to take into account his early social legislation and his pursuit of superpower understanding and purchase of trade union peace during his second premiership. In short, Churchill pleased almost everyone and infuriated everyone, often at the same time.

The central question in this book concerns Churchill's continued popularity, even today, 60 years after the Second World War was won. As Addison points out, Churchill's friend and rival David Lloyd George emerged from his First World War premiership as popular as Churchill did from the second, yet Lloyd George's reputation did not long outlast the glow of victory.

Lloyd George was re-elected immediately after the war, Addison argues, and his popularity plummeted with the problems that beset his peacetime government. Churchill's 1945 electoral defeat to a Labour Party that promised to "win the peace" was a blessing to him, as his wife Clementine said. Not only did he miss having to deal with the daunting postwar problems Britain faced, but he had the time to write the voluminous war memoirs that further burnished his reputation. And when Churchill did return to 10 Downing St. in the early 1950s in declining health, he made it to retirement "with dignity and without major embarrassment."

A highlight of Addison's book is his discussion of Churchill's reputation in the years after he left active politics and since his death. While Addison can be counted among Churchill's fans, he rarely pulls his punches when discussing Churchill's many blunders or the weaknesses in his legend; his glossing over of Churchill's over-the-top defence of Edward VIII in the 1936 abdication crisis is the exception to this rule.

And for readers who have passed on Churchill biographies because most, such as Roy Jenkins' 1,000-page Churchill, require a long commitment, Addison's book is much shorter and remains an entertaining and thought-provoking read.

Chris Gainor is well known to local Churchill admirers for his excellent impersonations of the late Sir Winston.

Churchill: The Unexpected Hero by Paul Addison; Oxford University Press; 320 pages; $29.95
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OTTAWA (CP) \_ Political defections in Canada go right back to 1869 in the very first Parliament, when Nova Scotia MP Stewart Campbell moved to the Liberal-Conservative party from the anti-confederate movement.

But for Campbell, and most MPs who followed his example over the years, jumping ship eventually became a political kiss of death.

MPs have ***changed parties*** for a variety of reasons. Some acted out of principle, others out of pique. Some were moved by opportunism and the glittering lure of a cabinet seat.

CP

Paul Hellyer, a Liberal minister in the 1960s, lost the party leadership to Pierre Trudeau and ran as a Tory. He lost. He formed his own party. And lost again.

Jack Horner, a veteran, high-profile, rock-ribbed Alberta Conservative took a Liberal cabinet post in 1977 and was trounced in the 1979 election.

Hazen Argue, a prominent 1960s New Democrat lost a leadership bid in 1961. He promptly joined the Liberals, won re-election in 1962 and then lost his seat in 1963. He eventually ended up in the Senate.

Belinda Stronach, in moving from the Conservatives to the Liberals, is the latest politician to take this calculated risk, but she's doing it at a time when the political price of defection seems to have eased.

And at a time when more MPs seem willing to take the chance.

"There do seem to be more (defections) in the last few years but you could also say we have more MPs,'' says Nelson Wiseman, a political science professor from the University of Toronto.

"It might also reflect the fact that the elections now are more than ever controlled from the top down in national campaigns where the local factors mean less.''

The present Liberal government now has three Conservative defectors in its ranks \_ two of them in cabinet, including Stronach.

Public Works Minister Scott Brison was a front-bench Conservative when he jumped to the Liberals in December 2003, just as Prime Minister Paul Martin took office. Brison has gone from being a question period gadfly to a fly swatter as he leads the government's sponsorship defence.

Former Reform, Alliance and Tory MP Keith Martin ran and won as a Liberal last June, and now is a parliamentary secretary.

Martin's government also includes Transport Minister Jean Lapierre, who may be the reigning champion of ship-jumpers.

He began as a Liberal MP in 1979. He became an Independent for six months in 1990, then sat with the Bloc for two years. He left federal politics for a decade and returned as a Liberal last June.

That kind of flip-flop isn't unique. In Britain, Sir Winston Churchill twice ***changed parties***, going from Tory to Liberal and back. After his second change, he noted: "Anyone can rat, but it takes a certain amount of ingenuity to re-rat.''

Alberta MP David Kilgour is also well-travelled politically. After 11 years as a Tory, he joined the Liberals in 1991 and was re-elected four times, only to become an Independent last month.

Between 2000 and 2003 there was a rash of defections to the Liberals from the Conservatives, the NDP and the Bloc. There was also John Bryden, who jumped the other way, to the Conservatives from the Liberals for a three-month stint last year.

There are no simple explanations for this, says Wiseman.

"There are just too many factors,'' he said. "Maybe what's telling is that it speaks to the great volatility of politics in this country.''

Allen Tupper, political scientist from the University of British Columbia, said "it's very difficult to say what's happening.''

The biggest round of defections in modern history came in 1990, when Lucien Bouchard abandoned his great friend Brian Mulroney and led a clutch of Quebec Tories to found the Bloc Quebecois.

That was followed in 1993 by the collapse of the old Conservatives and the elevation of the Bloc to Official Opposition, developments that still echo politically.

"A lot of this, I think, is a function of the realignment of the parties that occurred in 1993,'' said Tupper.

He said the reconstituted Conservative party remains a frail vessel and "very susceptible to the sort of things that have happened.''

There is also a lot of overlap between Liberal and Conservative policies.

"That's where I think the ease of transit is,'' he said.

Whether defectors hang onto the seats often depends more on personalities than politics. Brison, for instance, was a well-liked MP in a strongly Conservative riding and the voters stuck with the man over party.

Stronach may hope that applies to her as well.

Antonia Maioni, a political scientist at Montreal's McGill University, says Stronach has strength in her riding.

"As far as I can tell, she is someone who is very attuned to local needs.''
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Belinda Stronach had barely made her debut as a Liberal yesterday when like-minded callers were pre-emptively phoning Toronto radio stations to bemoan the sexist nature of anyone who might in the ensuing days dare to label the woman a political whore.

Oh, how very cute, and how very familiar: It is never enough for the Liberal Party of Canada, its henchmen or supporters, to let the people decide what they will make of a given situation. The good Liberal always attempts to dictate the very language of what will, and what won't, constitute the parameters of fair comment and reasonable discussion thereafter.

But let us, just this once, dispense with those niceties.

Ms. Stronach ***changed parties*** on the very eve of the most important vote of Paul Martin's government, and slipped straight into the warm waters of cabinet - in the position, no less, as the minister in charge of democratic renewal and of implementing the recommendations of the Gomery inquiry.

As an aside, this is surely akin to putting the hen in charge of the fox house.

Ms. Stronach has zero experience in government; little in opposition; none in dealing with the mandarins of the civil service and the way that they can be leaned on and otherwise persuaded to fall into line with ignoble government aims; and isn't bilingual. Why, yes indeed, who better to ride herd over those well-practised, and in the main French-speaking, scoundrels from the Quebec wing of the party, Ottawa and environs?

But true to Liberal form, Ms. Stronach apparently already believes she has somehow begun to clean things up, just by her presence. Listen to what she said yesterday: "Let me say I'm very proud to undertake this role, to bring greater ethics, because without ethics, that's the foundation, that's our moral fibre." Huh? How has she done anything there but demonstrate her own feeble grasp of that other official language, English?

What changed from January of last year, when Ms. Stronach ran for the leadership of the new Conservative Party? What changed since Christmas, when she dispatched flowers to her former colleagues' doorsteps? What changed, for heaven's sakes, from a couple of weeks ago, when Ms. Stronach aired her concerns with voting down the Liberal budget, yet voted with the rest of Mr. Harper's caucus to try to bring down the government?

The Conservative Party didn't change. Mr. Harper didn't change. Even Ms. Stronach's views haven't changed.

In the short time the Canadian public has known her, and in the little she's allowed herself to be known, she's always been a liberal-minded Conservative, or what used to be called a Red Tory. Her problem with the Conservatives was always that they weren't enough like the Liberals on the issues she deems dear.

So if she didn't change, and the Conservatives didn't change, and Mr. Harper didn't change, what changed?

Pretty clearly one of two things - Ms. Stronach's perception either of her own future within a Harper government or of the party's future itself.

If it was the latter - that the Conservatives under Mr. Harper may not win the next election, whenever it comes - she may well be proved correct and she will certainly have done more than her share to see to it. If it was the former, then Mr. Harper's assessment of Ms. Stronach's blond ambition as the singular force that drives her is on the money.

But either way, whatever the truth of her motive, it ought not to diminish the utter crassness of her choice. She decided that it was better to ride into the next election with a known quantity (albeit a morally vacuous and arguably corrupt one) than take her chances with an unproven quantity, especially one that to her eye appears unlikely to be able to win. If this *isn't* politically slatternly behaviour, what on earth is?

As for Mr. Martin's remarks yesterday - that the timing of Ms. Stronach's move has precious little to do with tomorrow's big vote - suffice to say that they were greeted by hoots of laughter from the national press corps, a body whose members are not noted for openly dissing the man in power.

But where, even for Liberals, he crossed a line was in casting his new Human Resources Minister as gutsy.

Gutsy would have been for Ms. Stronach to cross the floor to the homely back benches, without first seeking for herself a nifty cabinet post as an inducement. Or to sit as an independent of conscience, as others have done. Or to quit outright. The very worst scenario has Ms. Stronach not being elected and returning to her daddy's company, Magna International, and her $9-million-a-year salary; the best has her staying on as part of the government-that-will-not-die or being returned with a renewed mandate. Of such magnificent alternatives there is no place for courage.

I heard Mr. Harper's news conference yesterday, too. I thought he conducted himself remarkably well in the circumstances, acknowledging how betrayed and crushed some of his colleagues are, while saying, for his sanguine part, he had seen the old switcheroo coming. It was only when he was asked how he had learned of Ms. Stronach's plans that he mentioned Peter MacKay, Ms. Stronach's lover. Mr. MacKay, he said, broke the news to him shortly before Ms. Stronach called to tell him, which was shortly before she appeared at the podium with Mr. Martin.

Mr. Harper went on to offer that Mr. MacKay was fairly devastated by all of this.

By midafternoon, on the same radio shows where callers earlier had phoned in to protect Ms. Stronach's political virginity, people were denouncing Mr. Harper for having got personal and nasty.

Oh, for God's sake. What Belinda Stronach did to *him* was personal and nasty. That is the nature of a sellout, especially when accompanied by some well-aimed shots at the fellow you're ditching: Her decision was "forced" on her by Mr. Harper's decision to try to bring down the government, she said; he isn't "truly sensitive" to the needs of this "big and complicated" country called Canada.

At the risk of being deemed insensitive, I will not be lectured to by a poor little rich girl who has proved only, as someone smarter than me said yesterday, that no matter how much money you've got, you can still be bought.

She was selling; Mr. Martin was buying: Two wealthy, misunderstood, brave people, just trying to save the country. To borrow from a Chris Rock riff, those Crazy White Kids.

*cblatchford@globeandmail.ca*
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Prime minister Paul Martin lured a leading Conservative into his cabinet on Tuesday, giving him a crucial ally for a budget vote on Thursday on which the government will survive or fall.

Belinda Stronach, a former chief executive of an auto parts company, said she could no longer serve in the Conservative Party because it had aligned itself with the separatist Bloc Quebecois to defeat the Martin government.

"The political crisis affecting Canada is too risky and dangerous for blind partnership," she said at a news conference in Ottawa beside Martin.

"I have a concern that lining up with the Bloc is not good for Canada to defeat this budget and trigger an election."

If the opposition effort succeeds, she added, it could "leave the field open" for separatists to gain momentum and split the country eventually.

Stronach, who ran unsuccessfully against Stephan Harper for the Conservative Party leadership last year, was offered the job of minister of Human Resources and Skills Development.

Coming less than a year after the Liberals won a narrow electoral victory, the government crisis has been fed by daily testimony of Liberal kickbacks and money laundering in a public investigation of a federal program sponsoring sporting and cultural events in Quebec.

With the defection, the Conservative Party and Bloc Quebecois should have 152 votes against the government, while the Liberals and social democratic New Democratic Party can count on 152 votes, including one independent.

The Liberals won New Democratic support by rewriting their budget to include about $4 billion in new social spending.

The fortunes of the government will now rest with two independent Commons backbenchers. Should they split, a tie would be broken by the Speaker, who is a Liberal.

The independents, Chuck Cadman and David Kilgour, who are both westerners, are non-committal about how they will vote.

Kilgour, who has ***changed parties*** four times, has made an effort to trade his vote. He is asking for more help for the beef industry hurt by the closing of the American border after an outbreak of mad cow disease, and a restoration of federal aid for independent charitable organizations that work in developing countries.

But most of all, Kilgour is demanding that Canada send as many as 500 peacekeepers to Darfur in Sudan to set an example to the world.

Kilgour said he had a 90-minute conversation with Martin last week, and the prime minister took note of his arguments.

Martin has appeared to move in Kilgour's direction, promising about $150 million in aid and sending up to 100 Canadian troops. But Kilgour said that commitment still fell short.

Cadman, a former Conservative, has not overtly tried to bargain for his vote. He said he was weighing local polls to see how his constituents in British Columbia wanted him to vote.
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Leave aside Belinda Stronach's motivations, ethics, love life and shoes. Consider her economic policies. The Web record is thin but it does contain both an extended 2004 interview with the CBC's Carole MacNeil and her March 7 Commons speech excoriating the budget she ***changed parties*** to support.

In the interview, she says she believes "in a smaller government and a more decentralized government. And Liberals believe in slightly larger government, and there's a good saying -- that the government cannot give you anything it has not taken from you first." That is a good saying, though was "slightly" a hint she may have been thinking of jumping even as she ran for the Conservative leadership?

Her attack on the budget, just eight weeks ago, says lots of good things, too: "[T]he Prime Minister has ... spent the entire planning surplus ... [T]he windfall surplus will not be used to pay down the crippling national debt." (That's good, "crippling national debt.") "What will he do when the fiscal climate of the country changes and he has spent the entire planning surplus?" Mind, this was written before the Jack Layton and Dalton McGuinty budget addenda, in which Mr. Martin blew away even more of the planning surplus.

"Continuing blindly along in neglect" -- good phrase that, even if demeaning to the visually challenged -- "the budget promises some extra money for border personnel. This is helpful, but the Liberals will spend more money on the Gomery commission investigating irresponsible government than they will put into enhanced border security each year of the budget." Is there any extra money in the addenda for border security? Nope. "The Minister of Finance had promised us accountability and transparency. We received neither in this budget. This is a classic Liberal election budget based on spending." Again, this was before Mr. Martin bumped spending even more.

It's good, strong stuff. Did Ms. Stronach believe it when she said it or was she merely handed a statement to read? If she believed it, what changed her mind? If she was just reading, how will we know in future whether she believes what she's saying or is just reading?

Ms. Stronach's budget critique also says this: "The government remains fixated on lowering the marginal tax rate on profits as its approach to the corporate tax regime. However, the key to competitiveness for advanced-technology manufacturers is ongoing investment in continuous innovation. This is where much of the future success of Canada must lie. The government should be acting here to also make the effective tax rate on investment more competitive, but the budget is silent on this critical part of the puzzle."

Actually, if the government really were "fixated" on lowering marginal tax rates on corporate profits, that would be great. It did reduce rates in Budget One before raising them back up in Budget Two and then 15 hours later bringing them back down in Budget Three. But the "effective rate" is the combined effect of the statutory rate and the various special write-offs available on investments. Ms. Stronach clearly wants more special write-offs, especially for advanced manufacturers who do continuous investment.

The trouble with fiddling with write-offs is that only certain kinds of investments get help. If you invest here, you get a tax break. If you invest over there, you don't. This desire to fiddle with the economy seems particularly acute among CEOs who come into politics. CEOs live to make decisions. Money goes here or money goes there, we back this or we back that because we think that's best for the firm.

Except that running an economy isn't at all like running a firm. You certainly do want to plan the evolution of a business firm, you certainly don't want to plan the evolution of an economy. If no one is in charge of a business firm, it dies. If no one is in charge of an economy, it does just fine--in fact, much better than if people are planning it.

Naturally, hands-on CEOs have to keep hands off. That's a real problem because CEOs are born meddlers. We've got a problem? Let's find a policy lever. Paul Martin is a former CEO, too, and he's an inveterate meddler. Early childhood education, R&D, machinery and equipment, science and technology: Put our money there and there and there and things will really roll.

This assumes Canadians themselves don't actually want growth. Having a C.D. Howe sitting atop the economy has to induce growth. That's utterly wrong, of course. To make the economy roll, you need to get out of the way and let it happen. If a government really were fixated on reducing marginal tax rates, Canadians' desire to better their standard of living would automatically generate economic growth. We may not get that kind of government from the new, centrist Conservative party. We certainly won't get it from ex-CEOs Stronach and Martin.
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Re: MacKay's heart has to heal, May 19

Ah, romance.

It seems that Peter MacKay knew not what his current romantic partner was about to do. Belinda Stronach jumped ship to join the people that MacKay and his boss Stephen Harper are now referring to as thieves and scoundrels. It seems that poor Peter feels spurned by her actions, as though she did an about-face on some unspoken commitment.

***Changed parties***, did she? Perhaps MacKay now understands how David Orchard feels. It doesn't seem that long ago that MacKay did his own about-face with Orchard, breaking a verbal agreement to leave the Progressive Conservative Party intact.

Jerry Coulson

Gibsons

**Graphic**

Photo: Jerry Coulson
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Mentioning Churchill and our two infamous, newly Liberal turncoats in the same context is an outrageous oxymoron.

Churchill ***changed parties*** because he had a vision of events to come and disagreed with the national policies of the day. Not only was he right but he later positioned himself to implement the policies which saved his country and freed Europe.

Mr. Brison and Ms. Stronach, on the other hand, are simply unprincipled opportunists who have now found their true home in a party which has no principles other than staying in power. The Conservative party is better off without them.

Terry Mitchell, White Rock, B.C.
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MIKE DUFFY: Welcome back. The federal Liberals are planning a

Quebec blitz in the wake of Gilles Duceppe's decision to stay on the federal

scene, rather than jump into Quebec provincial politics. Duceppe was widely

seen as someone who might not only beat Liberal Premier Jean Charest, but

could conceivably lead the separatists to a victory in a third referendum. To

look ahead to this new battle for the hearts and minds of Quebecers, we're

joined tonight by Foreign Affairs Minister Pierre Pettigrew, and by Bloc

Quebecois MP Richard Marceau. So Mr. Marceau, why would Mr. Duceppe turn

down the chance to actually go to Quebec and perhaps become the Premier

and maybe even the first president of an independent Quebec?

RICHARD MARCEAU [Bloc MP]: Well, as you know, the Bloc leader Gilles

Duceppe has been saying all along that for the sovereignty movement, what

we've been doing in Ottawa, what we are doing in Ottawa is as important as

what's being done in Quebec City. He's been saying it since he was elected as

a Bloc MP 15 years ago, and going to Quebec City would, I guess, prove

otherwise. So if he put his money where his mouth is, he decided to stay in

Ottawa. The Bloc's work in Ottawa is very important and, believe me, whether

he's in Ottawa or Quebec City, he's going to be a big part of the "yes"

campaign in the next referendum.

DUFFY: Mr. Pettigrew, yesterday on CTV's "Question Period", your colleague

Jean Lapierre gave us a taste of the kind of tough fighting that's going to come

in this battle for the hearts and minds of Quebecers. Let's have a quick listen.

JEAN LAPIERRE [Transort Minister]: If he doesn't go it will show that the guy

doesn't have it to one day run anything. And so, perpetual opposition, and we'll

be able to say that he was a coward, frankly.

DUFFY: So Mr. Pettigrew, is it appropriate to call Gilles Duceppe a coward?

Is that the new line?

PIERRE PETTIGREW [Minister of Foreign Affairs]: Well I would certainly argue

that Mr. Duceppe, like many, many separatists, have realized that they will not

win the next referendum. I don't think Mr. Duceppe would miss the opportunity

of a lifetime if he sincerely believed that separation was looming on the horizon.

He would have wanted to be where it really counts. When you keep the same

job that you've been doing for eight years, and it leads absolutely nowhere

else, it is a perpetual opposition, it really shows that you prefer simply to be the

Monday morning quarterback, and I don't think it reflects very well also on the

other members of the Bloc because he said I couldn't leave the Bloc because

there are no other guys that can lead it.

MARCEAU: Mike, if I may say that, like Pierre is very funny sometimes when

he says that. When somebody stays at the same job for eight years, it shows

something. Well if it had been for Prime Minister Martin and his team

backstabbing Prime Minister Jean Chretien, I'm sure Chretien would still have

been there. The only reason Jean Chretien is not there, and Pierre knows that,

Pierre Pettigrew knows that, he was back stabbed by Prime Minister Martin's

friends in the Liberal party and that's the only reason why they ***changed party***.

And as for being a long time in a position, Pierre Pettigrew was elected in '96,

so that's nine years ago. He's been in cabinet nine years ago. So…

DUFFY: Is he coward? Is he a coward?

MARCEAU: I didn't use that word. I don't think Pierre Pettigrew is a coward,

actually we like the guy. He's on the wrong side of the political divide, but

that's something else. But being at the same job for eight or nine years…

DUFFY: Is Mr. Duceppe a coward and will that come back to haunt him among

the voters of Quebec?

PETTIGREW: He preferred comfort. He preferred comfort. Canada is a very

comfortable place, and honestly I would never compare the job of perpetual

permanent opposition, where you never have access to power. You can put

questions and all that, but in politics you go there because you really want to

give the answers, not only put the questions. He had the opportunity to make

a difference, and he chose not to make a difference. And I think it says a lot

about the guy.

DUFFY: Mr. Marceau, the government's plan is to reannounce all the things

they've already announced but weren't noticed by Quebecers because of all of

the controversy over the Gomery inquiry. It sounds like a good strategy to me.

You do it all over again, no additional cost to the taxpayers, and hopefully this

time you get some PR. How will you and the Bloc counteract this strategy?

MARCEAU: Well if the only thing they have to announce is old stuff, it shows

what kind of government it is. Directionless, no idea, no vision, just, as we

would say in French, representing [inaudible] to Quebecers. And Quebecers

want new ideas, want something different. And if I may, Mike, I would

disagree with Pierre Pettigrew. I think Pierre still lives in a world where the

Liberals were a majority. Now with the minority government, believe me, and

I know that from the justice committee, we've been making a different. We're

putting, we're changing the bills, we're changing the laws for the better, and

we're making a difference. And if it weren't the case, I don't think Pierre

Pettigrew would be that unhappy that Gilles Duceppe didn't leave.

PETTIGREW: No, but honestly, honestly, he chose to lead the branch plan

instead of going to the real heading of the real party. The one that counts is the

PQ. Gilles Duceppe himself said in the last campaign, throughout the campaign,

when you vote for the Bloc you don't vote for a referendum. That decision will

be made at another time, by another party. Now he had the chance to go and

lead the other party, and he chose to stay at the branch plant. Now of course

there was no member of the PQ, and there's no member of the Quebec national

assembly, no former PQ minister who supported him. Even though he was way

ahead in the polls, there's not a single one of them who wanted him as their

leader, and I think it shows really something quite significant.

MARCEAU: Mike, I'm willing to bet that Pierre Pettigrew and Jean Lapierre

spent the entire weekend on their knees praying for Gilles Duceppe to leave.

And unfortunately for them, it's not happening and what's going to happen

with that is that at the next federal election, a vast majority of seats from

Quebec in the House of Commons will again, for the fifth consecutive time, be

held by the Bloc Quebecois. And that's what those guys don't want.

DUFFY: Let me ask you when that election is going to be held? You're going

to have four or five votes tomorrow night. Any chance the government will fall?

MARCEAU: Well as far as I can tell, the 54 Bloc members will be there, will

be voting against the government, so it's up to them to make sure that they

pass. If they don't do the work properly, they're going to fall. But we are, the

54 Bloc members will be there to vote against the government.

DUFFY: Mr. Pettigrew, what's your bet?

PETTIGREW: No, my view is that the government will win the vote tomorrow.

Canadians do not want an election. Quebecers did not want an election. I think

the Bloc has a lot of credibility with Quebecois when they tried to force an

election in May, when they try to force the election of the Harper Conservative

government, they hung themselves very much because they tried to get elected

Prime Minister of Canada, Harper, who would have supported the BMD, who

is against Kyoto, all the things supporting of the financing the municipalities,

all kinds of things that are important to Quebecois, they tried to get Harper in

rather than us.

MARCEAU: We tried to kick a corrupt government out and we're going to try

again as soon as we can. They have to be out.

DUFFY: That's the last word. I want to thank you both for joining us tonight.

MARCEAU: Thank you.
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OTTAWA (CP) \_ Belinda Stronach has weathered her first political grilling as a freshly minted Liberal cabinet minister, sticking to her briefing notes and handing off technical questions to a flank guard of senior officials.

Stronach, who crossed the floor to the Liberals last month on the eve of a key confidence vote and was promptly awarded the human resources portfolio in Paul Martin's cabinet, appeared before the Commons human resources Tuesday.

She stuck to her notes, delivering guarded replies as former Tory colleagues and Bloc MPs quizzed her on Employment Insurance, and defending policies she had attacked just weeks before.

CP

Conservative Peter Van Loan went after her on the question of fairness for Ontario, saying the province gets less than its fair share of retraining money.

Is that fair? asked Van Loan.

"I'm going to defer to the deputy minister,'' Stronach replied.

The official pointed out that the money is doled out largely on the basis of unemployment and Ontario is lucky enough to have a strong economy with a lower jobless rate.

Van Loan kept at it. Hadn't Stronach, as a Tory, demanded a fair shake for Ontario in the fight over fiscal imbalance?

Ontario is proud to help Canadians in less fortunate provinces, Stronach said: "It's part of our value system as Canadians.''

Van Loan went after her over the fact that in recent years, the government has collected $46 billion more in EI payments than it needed to run the system.

The so-called surplus is really a bookkeeping noting, because the government mixes the EI money in with the other public accounts.

Van Loan reminded Stronach that a few weeks ago, she was among those who said the government was stealing money in the form of EI payments.

Shouldn't workers and employers get their money back?

Stronach replied that the auditor general approved blending the EI money into the regular public accounts.

Christiane Gagnon of the Bloc complained that Stronach was handing the committee "a lot of words'' and didn't heed its recommendations.

The minister said the government had basically adopted eight of the committee's 28 most recent recommendations.

Gagnon was little impressed.

After 90 minutes, Stronach left, barely mussed by her experience.

She was asked how it was like on the other side of the table.

"I am delighted to be here,'' she said. "I'm excited to hold this portfolio because it's about investing in people.''

She said she sees no contradiction between her present positions and those she held on the Opposition benches.

"If you look at what I've spoken out on . . . I've always spoken about the need to invest in people.''

She said she ***changed parties*** because she was uncomfortable with the Tories and with the idea of defeating the Liberal government.

"Mine is a question of fate and circumstance,'' she said. "I was having great difficulty lining up with the Bloc to bring down the government at this time.

"I didn't think that was in the national interest . . . I thought unity was at risk.''
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SACRAMENTO, Calif. - Arnold Schwarzenegger, the California Governor, has called a special election for November, putting his job on the line as he tries to go to the people over the heads of squabbling lawmakers.

Twenty months after he came to office stressing the urgency to free the state from the grips of entrenched powerbrokers, the Republican Governor framed the special election as part of the commitment he made to voters during the recall election that brought him to power less than two years ago.

"It is from the people that a democracy gets its strength," Mr. Schwarzenegger said in his first televised address on Monday evening from his office as hundreds protested outside.

"And millions of people have signed the petitions to reform the budget, education and [legislative] redistricting."

The election -- the fourth in two years in California -- will be the most critical test of Mr. Schwarzenegger's administration, in which he faces well-funded opponents and some reluctance even from powerful figures in his own party.

It sets the stage for a political war for control of Sacramento pitting the Governor's big-business allies against Democrats and labour unions, his two principal detractors.

Among the issues, voters will be asked to decide: the appointment of a panel of retired judges to redraw state legislative boundary lines, a process known as redistricting; limits to the growth of state spending and a provision allowing the governor to make unilateral mid-year budget cuts; forcing teachers to wait five years, rather than two, to achieve tenure; and requiring minors to receive their parents' or guardians' consent before having an abortion.

The redistricting measure would redraw the state's legislative and congressional districts, a process now carried out once a decade after the U.S. Census.

Under Mr. Schwarzenegger's proposal, the process would be taken out of the legislature's hands and given to the new panel.

The Governor says this would inject competition into a political environment where none of the seats up for election last year in the state legislature or U.S. Congressional delegation ***changed party*** hands. The panel would not need to wait for a new census to redraw lines, he adds.

The plan is expected to boost the Republicans' power in the U.S.'s most populous state, which has traditionally voted Democrat in presidential elections. Democrats also control 33 of the state's 53 seats in the U.S. House of Representatives, and both chambers of the state legislature.

"Once you take redistricting from the assembly, you're going to open up California politics like it's never been opened up since the Progressive era," said Kevin Starr, a University of Southern California professor and author of a seven-volume state history.

"You'll get more Republicans, more conservatives and you'll get more independents."

The fastest-growing California counties, such as Riverside, east of Los Angeles, are areas where Mr. Schwarzenegger and the Republicans enjoy their greatest support. In last November's presidential election, George W. Bush received 44% of the California vote, up from 41.7% in 2000.

Democrats are portraying the election as an unnecessary vanity project for a Governor who has abandoned bipartisanship.

"After months of name-calling, finger-pointing and scapegoating, we have come to this point," assembly Speaker Fabian Nzqez said in a television interview after Mr. Schwarzenegger's speech.

"Tonight, the Governor pulled the trigger on a special election no one needs and few Californians even want."

The opposing parties have taken to the airwaves to put their case to voters.

A coalition of labour unions, representing such groups as nurses, teachers and prison guards who oppose the Governor, has aired ads and dogged him with protests virtually everywhere he has appeared.

The campaign seems to have been effective. Mr. Schwarzenegger's popularity plunged 20% in one statewide poll; in another one, California voters said they did not approve of holding a special election by 62% to 37%.
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Larry Guno's career path to the floor of the legislative assembly was a lot longer and more arduous than the route most people take.

The remarkable thing about his one term as the MLA for the remote corner of northwestern B.C. was that he made it there at all.

It's a pretty significant achievement, considering where he came from. He was born in the Nisga'a village of Old Aiyansh at the outset of the Second World War, then overcame childhood tuberculosis and a long stint in residential schools. He pursued an education, obtained a law degree and in 1986 became a Member of the Legislative Assembly for Atlin, an important career pinnacle no matter what they say. He was only the second native person ever elected to the legislature.

He died on July 17 in his home in Terrace at the age of 65, from the severe effects of chronic stomach ulcers. It was apparently a quiet death, which is in keeping with his demeanour. Although he delivered many thoughtful, incisive speeches in the legislature as an Opposition critic, he was a quiet, self-effacing kind of man.

They gave him a nice send-off at the big community centre in New Aiyansh, in the Nass Valley. It was the perfect venue. He was on the Nisga'a negotiating team for years and that's where the Nisga'a Treaty was finally signed in 1998. He spent the last several years of his life -- typically working behind the scenes -- helping to make the dream of a Nisga'a nation come true.

Maybe it was his grandmother who started him in that direction. Friends say she urged him as a kid to sit down and write a letter to the Queen about the Nisga'a land claim, which was decades old even then.

A few hundred people attended his memorial service. Letters of condolence from Premier Gordon Campbell and past premiers Glen Clark and Mike Harcourt were read. And several people got up to eulogize him, including Chief Joe Gosnell, one of the leaders in the long struggle to secure that treaty.

Gosnell recalled Guno Thursday as a key adviser on the self-government provisions of the treaty and a man whose advice was valued, since he straddled both cultures.

Former Victoria NDP MLA Gordon Hanson went to the service and spoke of how Guno exemplified the Nisga'a concept of the common bowl, an outlook on life based on fairness, equity and sharing what's available.

At a funeral and a traditional settlement feast, many more paid tribute.

In the 1940s, Aiyansh (later to relocate and become New Aiyansh) was a small village with no electricity and no cars. The written memorial eulogy illustrates how tough life was. The family home burned down when he was an infant, and he fell in the river as a toddler, saved by the fact his father was able to snatch him out of the current. (The eulogy provides another remarkable illustration of the hardships Guno overcame: He was predeceased by four sisters and two brothers, all of them younger than himself.)

He went to "Indian Day School" early on, but as was the common practice, the federal government forced him to a residential school -- in Edmonton -- at age eight. He was moved to one in Alert Bay later, caught tuberculosis there and spent time in a sanitariums in Nanaimo and elsewhere. Surgery was performed to excise a damaged portion of his lung. (It didn't stop him from playing regularly years later in a pickup basketball game that started in the legislature crowd during his term.)

Over the past few years he wrote a play based on his school experience. Bunk Number Seven is scheduled to be staged in Toronto next year.

Good fortune put him in contact with several people who advocated education, just as his father Gus did. The senior Guno lived off the land and missed out on an education, but urged it upon his son. He also ushered him out of the home at age 18, forcing self-reliance.

Guno worked in a variety of jobs, but persevered with education and got a University of British Columbia law degree in 1979, later opening a practice in Vancouver.

Atlin was an anomalous riding. It covered a huge area and it took days to drive around, but it only had 5,000 souls in it, a fraction of the average population in other constituencies. Guno won with 1,440 of 2,300 votes.

The first native MLA, Frank Calder, represented it for years, for the NDP and the Social Credit Party. Guno's immediate predecessor, Al Passarell, also ***changed parties*** during his career.

In Guno's first speech in the legislature he paid tribute to both men, then added: "Given the penchant of my last two predecessors for crossing the floor, I feel compelled to say the only time I'm going to cross the floor is when we cross to form the next government."

He didn't quite make it: The riding disappeared in a redistribution, and he'd decided to retire in any event.

His life wasn't all triumph: He acknowledged he had some difficulties over the years with occasional drinking bouts. But he mostly overcame that problem as well, as he did all the other difficulties that were put before him.

[*leyne@island.net*](mailto:leyne@island.net)
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MIKE DUFFY: Earlier this week our colleague Steve Murphy at CTV

in Atlantic Canada, CTV Halifax, had an interview with Belinda Stronach, the

Minister of Manpower and Skills Development. And it was rather interesting

because Ms. Stronach, a lot of the national media have been trying to talk to

her and she's been too busy to talk with us. But we thought those of you who

followed politics would like to see how Belinda is making out. So let's have a

look at the highlights of her chat with Steve Murphy of CTV Halifax.

STEVE MURPHY [Reporter]: In your estimation, how likely is it that in fact

we're going to have a federal election campaign underway by Christmas?

BELINDA STRONACH [Minister of Manpower and Skills Development]: That's

difficult to say. But certainly the people that I've talked to don't want to have

a Christmas election. Christmas is a time for families. The people that I've

talked to really say, look, why don't you continue working hard and working

on programs that really matter to Canadians, that make a difference in our

quality of life and what's another 90 days. The Prime Minister has said that he

will call an election 30 days after Gomery releases his second report and I think

Canadians have the right to hear what's in that report and how Justice Gomery

will, the recommendations that he will make to strengthen the systems and

checks and balances that we have in government.

MURPHY: Well Minister, you know after twelve years in power governments

get arrogant. You yourself said not that many months ago, and I'm quoting

here, "We've only had one party in this country for the last 11 years. When

you get that you have a one-party state and you get all of the stagnation that

goes with the one-party state". Those are your own words. How can you now

say a party in power for twelve years is capable of overcoming the sort of

stagnation and arrogance that led to Gomery's findings?

STRONACH: I got involved in politics for a number of reasons. One was to see

that we have a stronger democratic process in place, that we do have checks

and balances in place. And that's something I still believe in because I think it

helps to have good proper debate to make sure that we have good programs

in place that will serve Canadians well. But having said, look, if you believe in

a Canada that is, and a government that will manage the economy soundly, and

we have one of the best economies in the G-8, but also that reflects Canadian

values, I believe there is only one party at this point in time that will enable to

Canada to achieve that. And that's why I'm part of the Liberal party.

MURPHY: But Minister, if this party and this government were stagnant 22

months ago, how can it not be anything but stagnant now?

STRONACH: Well we did bring together the two former Conservative parties

to form the Conservative party. There are checks and balances, greater checks

and balances in place. And I still believe that that's important for democracy to

function well. But having said that, each party has to put forward their

platforms and their policies which they believe will enhance the lives of

Canadians. And I believe that this party better represents the values that

Canadians stand for and can bring about a better quality of life for Canadians.

MURPHY: Minister, last time you were here you were a Conservative MP on

your way to speak at the Conservative annual dinner. Tonight you're there at

the trade centre getting ready to speak to the Liberal annual dinner. I wonder

personally, you know, how strange is that for you?

STRONACH: Well first of all, I've always said, look, I may have ***changed***

***parties*** but I never changed the principles that I stand for, and I do stand for a

strong economy, a vibrant economy and also good social infrastructure.

MURPHY: But from the sort of partisan point of view, it must seem strange

to prepare remarks for the people you were criticizing last time?

STRONACH: Again, I may have ***changed parties*** but I didn't change principles

that I stand for. And you know what, there's good folks in both parties. But at

the end of the day, it's about collectively what you stand for and the values

and the principles that you embrace, and the priorities you put forward as a

party and how you feel or articulate those policies that they will enhance the

lives of Canadians.

MURPHY: So did you really become a Liberal or did you just stop being a

Conservative?

STRONACH: Well, you know, I travelled a lot across this country and there are

folks I bump into that said, hey, we always thought you were a Liberal.

MURPHY: Your father was a Liberal. Before I let you go, I know it's six

months after the fact, but you're also known in this part of the country as the

person who broke up with Peter MacKay, and it happened around the same

time as you crossed the floor. How were those two events in fact connected?

STRONACH: Well, I think, Steve, if, and I know you pay close attention to

what's said, and those are personal issues and I choose not to get into personal

comments on personal relationships.

MURPHY: Fair enough.

STRONACH: The reason I joined the government was based on principle, and

I know that some have accused me and said, look, she's opportunistic. Well if

I'm going to be accused of being opportunistic to do the right things for

Canada, perhaps, yes, but I could have been minister for only a day and we

could have gone into an election at that point in time. I got into politics for

reasons of public service, to stand up for my community and hopefully enhance

the lives of Canadians.

MURPHY: The two things that happened were reported simultaneously even

if they weren't linked. How do you feel about the way that was all reported?

STRONACH: Good try, but I'm not going to personal stuff.

MURPHY: No, well I'm not asking you to go into personal stuff. I'm merely

asking you how you felt about the way your political decision was intermingled

with your private decision?

STRONACH: To me this was one of the most difficult decisions that I've ever

had to make. But for me, you've got to follow your heart, you've got to follow

your principles, and that's what I did. So at the end of the day, I have to look

in the mirror say do I feel comfortable with the actions and the decisions that

I made. And, again, I got into this for reasons of public service to enhance the

lives of the people in my community of Newmarket and Aurora and hopefully

participate in building a strategy that will allow Canada to compete in this

highly competitive global economy so that we can attract good jobs to Canada,

we can keep good jobs in Canada and that we can enhance the quality of life

for Canadians.

MURPHY: Minister, we're very grateful to have a few minutes of your time.

We thank you very much.

STRONACH: Thank you.

DUFFY: So there you have it, Steve Murphy of CTV Halifax speaking with

Belinda Stronach, the Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development.

And I must say that I thought she handled herself pretty well there. It's

amazing what a little bit of on the job training does. She's parrying those

questions very well.
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This election result will eventually produce major changes in Canadian politics, even if all cannot be predicted now.

One of the major party leaders, Paul Martin or Stephen Harper, will be gone when his party loses. Each will have twice failed: in Mr. Martin's case, to win a majority; in Mr. Harper's, to take power.

Not too long after the election, therefore, at least one of them will be replaced. Of course, each might try in a minority government situation to carry on as leader. Circumstances might permit lingering leaderships, but too many disappointments will cause one or both to leave, or be forced to leave.

Neither has caught fire with the public. Mr. Martin is not disliked but his standing has fallen sharply since his days with the finance portfolio. Mr. Harper never got on the wave length of a lot of Canadians.

Minority government is almost a sure thing, because no party is popular in enough places to stitch together a majority, and the Bloc Québécois has removed 50-60 seats from a national governing party.

Minority government circuses, such as the one Canadians just witnessed, could continue with a series of similar parliamentary shows, but that's unlikely. This minority Parliament has been quite disgusting at a theatrical level. It has featured what minority governments usually exhibit: orgies of spending, short-term survival tactics, wheeling and dealing, and extensive bad manners. The way politicians and the political process are now perceived, combined with the winter weather, will make the voter turnout the lowest on record.

Another shapeless, shameless Parliament such as the one just ended will produce change. Here are some options.

A structured coalition government will emerge - a Liberal/NDP coalition, for example - that will bring somewhat greater stability than the issue-a-day manoeuvring of this Parliament.

Or, another shapeless, shameless Parliament will cause Canadians to admit that the day of national parties is largely over. As a result, more voices will demand that the electoral system be changed to make coalitions among parties the norm, as in all countries with proportional representation.

Or, a new political leader might catch the country's fancy and carry that party to a majority. This is the dreamy Michael Ignatieff scenario: the white knight from abroad who saves the Liberal Party (and the country) from itself. This was the Bernard Lord scenario for the Conservatives, until the New Brunswick Premier kept stubbing his political toes back home.

In addition to changed leaders (and therefore ***changed parties***, since leaders alter the parties they lead) and perhaps a changed electoral system, one can possibly imagine a changed country.

With each passing election, the Bloc Québécois puts down deeper roots in Quebec, weakening federalism in the process. The combination of the Bloc's work (subsidized by Canadian taxpayers, of course), combined with the strength of the Parti Québécois and the milquetoast federalism of the provincial Liberal government, plus the feeble leadership of Mr. Martin and the federal Liberals, means a mismatch of political forces in Quebec that cannot auger well for federalism.

There will be changes after the election, too, in the economic and social choices presented to Canadians for a simple arithmetic reason. Never in the history of Canada has one government committed so much future money for so many programs over such a long period of time as Paul Martin's Liberal government.

The scope of his government's spending commitments has been breathtaking - commitments that stretch for years and years, and sprawl over almost every major area of government policy. The result will be: few choices, certainly fewer that there might have been had this unprecedented spending binge not occurred.

The anticipated surpluses have been largely committed in unilateral federal programs (often in areas of provincial jurisdiction), for federal-provincial programs, or in one-off provincial deals that predictably were matched with other one-off deals to keep disgruntled provinces happy or quiet.

There being so little money available, relative to the size of the anticipated surpluses, there will be shrivelled room for debates about big issues.

Canadian politics will therefore likely descend further into the frenzied pursuit of real or imagined ethical transgressions and scandals, imputations against the reputations of leading politicians, and construction of yet more new legislative or regulated barriers against government malfeasance, so that the kind of public discourse that has dominated this Parliament, and will almost certainly define

this campaign, will continue to

discourage and disgust the Canadian electors.*jsimpson@globeandmail.ca*
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This election result will eventually produce major changes in Canadian politics, even if all cannot be predicted now.

One of the major party leaders, Paul Martin or Stephen Harper, will be gone when his party loses. Each will have twice failed: in Mr. Martin's case, to win a majority; in Mr. Harper's, to take power.

Not too long after the election, therefore, at least one of them will be replaced. Of course, each might try in a minority government situation to carry on as leader. Circumstances might permit lingering leaderships, but too many disappointments will cause one or both to leave, or be forced to leave.

Neither has caught fire with the public. Mr. Martin is not disliked but his standing has fallen sharply since his days with the finance portfolio. Mr. Harper never got on the wave length of a lot of Canadians.

Minority government is almost a sure thing, because no party is popular in enough places to stitch together a majority, and the Bloc Québécois has removed 50-60 seats from a national governing party.

Minority government circuses, such as the one Canadians just witnessed, could continue with a series of similar parliamentary shows, but that's unlikely. This minority Parliament has been quite disgusting at a theatrical level. It has featured what minority governments usually exhibit: orgies of spending, short-term survival tactics, wheeling and dealing, and extensive bad manners. The way politicians and the political process are now perceived, combined with the winter weather, will make the voter turnout the lowest on record.

Another shapeless, shameless Parliament such as the one just ended will produce change. Here are some options.

A structured coalition government will emerge -- a Liberal/NDP coalition, for example -- that will bring somewhat greater stability than the issue-a-day manoeuvring of this Parliament.

Or, another shapeless, shameless Parliament will cause Canadians to admit that the day of national parties is largely over. As a result, more voices will demand that the electoral system be changed to make coalitions among parties the norm, as in all countries with proportional representation.

Or, a new political leader might catch the country's fancy and carry that party to a majority. This is the dreamy Michael Ignatieff scenario: the white knight from abroad who saves the Liberal Party (and the country) from itself. This was the Bernard Lord scenario for the Conservatives, until the New Brunswick Premier kept stubbing his political toes back home.

In addition to changed leaders (and therefore ***changed parties***, since leaders alter the parties they lead) and perhaps a changed electoral system, one can possibly imagine a changed country.

With each passing election, the Bloc Québécois puts down deeper roots in Quebec, weakening federalism in the process. The combination of the Bloc's work (subsidized by Canadian taxpayers, of course), combined with the strength of the Parti Québécois and the milquetoast federalism of the provincial Liberal government, plus the feeble leadership of Mr. Martin and the federal Liberals, means a mismatch of political forces in Quebec that cannot auger well for federalism.

There will be changes after the election, too, in the economic and social choices presented to Canadians for a simple arithmetic reason. Never in the history of Canada has one government committed so much future money for so many programs over such a long period of time as Paul Martin's Liberal government.

The scope of his government's spending commitments has been breathtaking -- commitments that stretch for years and years, and sprawl over almost every major area of government policy. The result will be: few choices, certainly fewer that there might have been had this unprecedented spending binge not occurred.

The anticipated surpluses have been largely committed in unilateral federal programs (often in areas of provincial jurisdiction), for federal-provincial programs, or in one-off provincial deals that predictably were matched with other one-off deals to keep disgruntled provinces happy or quiet.

There being so little money available, relative to the size of the anticipated surpluses, there will be shrivelled room for debates about big issues.

Canadian politics will therefore likely descend further into the frenzied pursuit of real or imagined ethical transgressions and scandals, imputations against the reputations of leading politicians, and construction of yet more new legislative or regulated barriers against government malfeasance, so that the kind of public discourse that has dominated this Parliament, and will almost certainly define

this campaign, will continue to

discourage and disgust the Canadian electors. "mailto:jsimpson@globeandmail.ca" jsimpson@globeandmail.ca
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This election result will eventually produce major changes in Canadian politics, even if all cannot be predicted now.

One of the major party leaders, Paul Martin or Stephen Harper, will be gone when his party loses. Each will have twice failed: in Mr. Martin's case, to win a majority; in Mr. Harper's, to take power.

Not too long after the election, therefore, at least one of them will be replaced. Of course, each might try in a minority government situation to carry on as leader. Circumstances might permit lingering leaderships, but too many disappointments will cause one or both to leave, or be forced to leave.

Neither has caught fire with the public. Mr. Martin is not disliked but his standing has fallen sharply since his days with the finance portfolio. Mr. Harper never got on the wave length of a lot of Canadians.

Minority government is almost a sure thing, because no party is popular in enough places to stitch together a majority, and the Bloc Québécois has removed 50-60 seats from a national governing party.

Minority government circuses, such as the one Canadians just witnessed, could continue with a series of similar parliamentary shows, but that's unlikely. This minority Parliament has been quite disgusting at a theatrical level. It has featured what minority governments usually exhibit: orgies of spending, short-term survival tactics, wheeling and dealing, and extensive bad manners. The way politicians and the political process are now perceived, combined with the winter weather, will make the voter turnout the lowest on record.

Another shapeless, shameless Parliament such as the one just ended will produce change. Here are some options.

A structured coalition government will emerge -- a Liberal/NDP coalition, for example -- that will bring somewhat greater stability than the issue-a-day manoeuvring of this Parliament.

Or, another shapeless, shameless Parliament will cause Canadians to admit that the day of national parties is largely over. As a result, more voices will demand that the electoral system be changed to make coalitions among parties the norm, as in all countries with proportional representation.

Or, a new political leader might catch the country's fancy and carry that party to a majority. This is the dreamy Michael Ignatieff scenario: the white knight from abroad who saves the Liberal Party (and the country) from itself. This was the Bernard Lord scenario for the Conservatives, until the New Brunswick Premier kept stubbing his political toes back home.

In addition to changed leaders (and therefore ***changed parties***, since leaders alter the parties they lead) and perhaps a changed electoral system, one can possibly imagine a changed country.

With each passing election, the Bloc Québécois puts down deeper roots in Quebec, weakening federalism in the process. The combination of the Bloc's work (subsidized by Canadian taxpayers, of course), combined with the strength of the Parti Québécois and the milquetoast federalism of the provincial Liberal government, plus the feeble leadership of Mr. Martin and the federal Liberals, means a mismatch of political forces in Quebec that cannot auger well for federalism.

There will be changes after the election, too, in the economic and social choices presented to Canadians for a simple arithmetic reason. Never in the history of Canada has one government committed so much future money for so many programs over such a long period of time as Paul Martin's Liberal government.

The scope of his government's spending commitments has been breathtaking -- commitments that stretch for years and years, and sprawl over almost every major area of government policy. The result will be: few choices, certainly fewer that there might have been had this unprecedented spending binge not occurred.

The anticipated surpluses have been largely committed in unilateral federal programs (often in areas of provincial jurisdiction), for federal-provincial programs, or in one-off provincial deals that predictably were matched with other one-off deals to keep disgruntled provinces happy or quiet.

There being so little money available, relative to the size of the anticipated surpluses, there will be shrivelled room for debates about big issues.

Canadian politics will therefore likely descend further into the frenzied pursuit of real or imagined ethical transgressions and scandals, imputations against the reputations of leading politicians, and construction of yet more new legislative or regulated barriers against government malfeasance, so that the kind of public discourse that has dominated this Parliament, and will almost certainly define

this campaign, will continue to

discourage and disgust the Canadian electors. "mailto:jsimpson@globeandmail.ca" jsimpson@globeandmail.ca
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AURORA, Ont. - When Grace Miller shook Belinda Stronach's hand one year ago, the 89-year-old former school teacher told the Conservative party candidate from Newmarket-Aurora that, one day, "you're going to be prime minister."

"Today," says Miller, "I'd like to slap her face. I just think she's terrible for walking from one camp to the other. Mind you, personally, she's a lovely girl. She's quite a lady."

What a difference a year and a change of political allegiance makes. In June 2004, Belinda Stronach was a billionaire auto parts heiress turned rookie Conservative MP, who was being touted as a stylish new political leader for a new generation. In May, she crossed the floor of the House of Commons to join the Liberals in one of the most dramatic political defections in Canadian history.

Now Stronach, 39, is a Liberal cabinet minister, a household name across the country, a star candidate for a battered minority government fighting for survival, and, in the minds of some, perhaps a contender to one day become the first elected female prime minister. There's just one obstacle. Stronach has to get re-elected in a riding where it becomes quickly apparent that she has rubbed many people the wrong way by switching parties. Stronach is about to learn another fundamental lesson: all politics are local. And in her case, that is going to make for nothing short of a bitter street fight in the community where she grew up as the daughter of its richest man: billionaire Frank Stronach, the founder of Magna International Inc.

People are angry and her main opponent, 50-year-old consultant Lois Brown, who has deep roots in the community, is determined to make Stronach wear her change of colours to Liberal red like a scarlet Letter.

"This corrupt, incompetent, criminally privileged Liberal party is the one Belinda Stronach crossed the floor to join, with full knowledge of the existing scandal!" Brown says right up front on her website.

Stronach's reply, to paraphrase liberally, would be: Bring it on girl.

"All I'm saying," says Stronach between sips of tea in an empty room of her campaign headquarters, "is Lois, you better say what you stand for. What values you have. And people will judge. Right?"

Stronach says she believes the voters in this community, where she grew up, went to school, had her two children, got divorced, and which she continues to call home, will understand why she deserves to be sent back to Parliament Hill as an elected Liberal.

Stronach insists that the polling she did in her riding in May, prior to the switch, showed her constituents didn't want an election then and wanted a federal budget passed. "As a result of that, $9 million has come to this community in infrastructure money alone ... that's a tangible example."

And she says she is more at home in what she calls a more tolerant, fiscally responsible party that reflects her vision of the country and the community in which she grew up.

"People have got to understand this was a very difficult decision for me. I had a lot of political capital invested. I did not take the move over lightly," says Stronach, who takes credit as one of the "architects" of the merger of the Progressive Conservatives and Canadian Alliance to form the Conservative Party of Canada.

"I worked hard in the Conservative party to bring about a more moderate face, a more modern party. And to me, it became apparent at a certain point in time, look either I didn't have the input I wanted or the leader didn't want to move in that direction," she says. "The party no longer reflected the values that I stand for."

Those values are symbolized by support of same-sex marriage. Stronach didn't share the position of Stephen Harper and was ready to vote against her old party even before she jumped to the government.

But on the main street of her riding, a rural-urban microcosm that also doubles a northern satellite community of Toronto, not every one is as comfortable with her stand on gay marriage.

Irma Karon runs her own framing business just off Yonge Street in downtown Aurora, and says she feels Stronach isn't paying enough attention to "family issues" and that there has been too much focus on the same-sex debate.

Even when Stronach was a Conservative, Karon, who is in her 60s, was skeptical of the billionaire chief executive officer turned politician.

"She's powerful because of her wealth for sure. She's capable to be the CEO of something. But she was running to be the prime minister. There's a few steps you have to make first," says Karon.

But many former Conservatives believe in Stronach, too. Ten of the 20 key people at the centre of her campaign are former Conservatives who followed her to the Liberals, notably top adviser Mark Entwistle, who was a former press secretary to Brian Mulroney.

"In terms of Belinda, she represents both personal attitudes and public policy that I believe in. I've always considered myself a fiscal conservative but I've never embraced the social conservative attitudes that a lot of people in the new Conservative party have. I consider myself a Tory," says Rob Sinclair, 42, a top Stronach strategist who joined the Conservatives in his teens and has been a Liberal since May.

As far as Stronach is concerned, she'd rather shift the focus from same-sex marriage, her jump to the Liberals and, of course, her personal life.

In this election, Stronach is billing herself as a powerful voice for her community at the seat of a power, federal cabinet. She's a defender of Prime Minister Paul Martin's decision to call an inquiry into the sponsorship scandal and she's quick to tout the fiscal record of the Liberals that she says makes Canada the envy of all rich countries. She's enthusiastic about some of the work she has been doing with Treasury Board President Reg Alcock that isn't as sexy or high profile as other matters, such as strengthening internal audits of departments and ministerial responsibility to make government more accountable.

To her credit, Stronach sounds quicker on her feet and better in command of herself on serious issues than she did in her early days in government when she was awkwardly fending off opposition questions about her new portfolio, Human Resources, with scripted responses.

**Graphic**

Photo: Tom Hanson, Canadian Press; Prime Minister Paul Martin smiles alongside Belinda Stronach, who left the Conservatives to join the Liberals in May. Stronach says she believes voters will understand why she ***changed parties***.
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AURORA, Ont. -- When Grace Miller shook Belinda Stronach's hand one year ago, the 89-year-old former school teacher told the Conservative party candidate from Newmarket-Aurora that, one day, "you're going to be prime minister."

"Today," says Miller, "I'd like to slap her face. I just think she's terrible for walking from one camp to the other. Mind you, personally, she's a lovely girl. She's quite a lady."

What a difference a year and a change of political allegiance makes. In June 2004, Belinda Stronach was a billionaire auto parts heiress turned rookie Conservative MP, who was being touted as a stylish new political leader for a new generation. This past May, she crossed the floor of the House of Commons to join the Liberals in one of the most dramatic political defections in Canadian history.

Now Stronach, 39, is a Liberal cabinet minister, a household name across the country, a star candidate for a battered minority government fighting for survival, and, in the minds of some, perhaps a contender to one day become the first elected female prime minister. There's just one obstacle, Stronach has to get re-elected in riding where it becomes quickly apparent that she has rubbed many people the wrong way by switching parties. Stronach is about to learn another fundamental lesson: all politics are local. And in her case, that is going to make for nothing short of a bitter street fight in the community where she grew up as the daughter of its richest man: billionaire Frank Stronach, the founder of Magna International Inc.

People are angry and her main opponent, a 50-year-old consultant named Lois Brown, who has deep roots in the community, is determined to make Stronach wear her change of colours to Liberal red like a scarlet letter.

"This corrupt, incompetent, criminally privileged Liberal party is the one Belinda Stronach crossed the floor to join, with full knowledge of the existing scandal!" Brown says right up front on her website.

Stronach's reply, if we were to paraphrase liberally, would be: bring it on girl.

"All I'm saying," says Stronach between sips of tea in an empty room of her campaign headquarters, "is Lois, you better say what you stand for. What values you have. And people will judge, Right?"

Stronach says she believes the voters in this community, where she grew up, went to school, had her two children, got divorced and continues to call home, will understand why she ***changed parties*** and why she deserves to be sent back to Parliament Hill as an elected Liberal.

Stronach insists that the polling she did in her riding in May, prior to the switch, showed her constituents didn't want an election then and wanted a federal budget passed. "As a result of that, $9 million has come to this community in infrastructure money alone . . . that's a tangible example."

And she says she is more at home in what she calls a more tolerant, fiscally responsible party that reflects her vision of the country and the community in which she grew up.

"People have got to understand this was a very difficult decision for me. I had a lot of political capital invested. I did not take the move over lightly," says Stronach, who takes credit as one of the "architects" of the merger of the Progressive Conservatives and Canadian Alliance to form the Conservative Party of Canada.

"I worked hard in the Conservative party to bring about a more moderate face, a more modern party. And to me it became apparent at a certain point in time, look either I didn't have the input I wanted or the leader didn't want to move in that direction," she explains. "The party no longer reflected the values that I stand for."

Those values are symbolized by support of same-sex marriage. Stronach didn't share the position of Stephen Harper and was ready to vote against her old party even before she jumped to the government.

But on the main street of her riding, a rural-urban microcosm that also doubles a northern satellite community of Toronto, not every one is as comfortable with her stand on same-sex marriage.

Irma Karon runs her own framing business just off Yonge Street in downtown Aurora, and says she feels Stronach isn't paying enough attention to "family issues" and that there has been too much focus on the same-sex debate.

Even when Stronach was a Conservative, Karon, who is in her 60s, was skeptical of the billionaire chief executive officer turned politician.

"She's powerful because of her wealth for sure. She's capable to be the CEO of something. But she was running to be the prime minister. There's a few steps you have to make first," says Karon.

But many former Conservatives believe in Stronach. Ten of the 20 key people at the centre of her campaign are former Conservatives who followed her to the Liberals, notably top adviser Mark Entwistle, who was a former press secretary to Brian Mulroney.

"In terms of Belinda, she represents both personal attitudes and public policy that I believe in. I've always considered myself a fiscal conservative but I've never embraced the social conservative attitudes that a lot of people in the new Conservative party have. I consider myself a Tory," says Rob Sinclair, 42, a top Stronach strategist who joined the Conservatives in his teens and has been a Liberal since May.

As far as Stronach is concerned, she'd rather shift the focus from same-sex, her jump to the Liberals and, of course, her personal life.

In this election, Stronach is billing herself as a powerful voice for her community at the seat of a power, federal cabinet. She's a defender of Prime Minister Paul Martin's decision to call an inquiry into the sponsorship scandal and she's quick to tout the fiscal record of the Liberals that she says makes Canada the envy of all rich countries. She's enthusiastic about some of the work she has been doing with Treasury Board President Reg Alcock that isn't as sexy or high profile as other matters, such as strengthening internal audits of departments and ministerial responsibility to make government more accountable.

To her credit, Stronach sounds quicker on her feet and better in command of herself on serious issues than she did in her early days in government when she was awkwardly fending off opposition questions about her new portfolio, Human Resources, with scripted responses.
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Colour Photo: CanWest News File; Belinda Stronach is in for a tough battle
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When Grace Miller shook Belinda Stronach's hand one year ago, the 89-year-old former schoolteacher told the Conservative Party candidate from

Newmarket-Aurora that, one day, "you're going to be prime minister."

"Today," says Miller, "I'd like to slap her face. I just think she's terrible for walking from one camp to the other. Mind you, personally, she's a lovely girl. She's quite a lady."

What a difference a year and a change of political allegiance makes. In June 2004, Belinda Stronach was a billionaire auto parts heiress turned rookie Conservative MP, who was being touted as a stylish new political leader for a new generation.

This past May, she crossed the floor of the House of Commons to join the Liberals in one of the most dramatic political defections in Canadian history.

Now Stronach, 39, is a Liberal cabinet minister, a household name across the country, a star candidate for a battered minority government fighting for survival, and, in the minds of some, perhaps a contender to one day become the first elected female prime minister.

There's just one obstacle: Stronach has to get re-elected in a riding where it becomes quickly apparent that she has rubbed many people the wrong way by switching parties.

Stronach is about to learn another fundamental lesson: all politics are local. And in her case, that is going to make for nothing short of a bitter street fight in the community where she grew up as the daughter of its richest man: billionaire Frank Stronach, the founder of Magna International Inc.

People are angry and her main opponent, a 50-year-old consultant named Lois Brown, who has deep roots in the community, is determined to make Stronach wear her change of colours to Liberal red like a scarlet letter.

"This corrupt, incompetent, criminally privileged Liberal Party is the one Belinda Stronach crossed the floor to join, with full knowledge of the existing scandal!" Brown says right up front on her website.

Stronach's reply, if we were to paraphrase liberally, would be: "Bring it on, girl."

"All I'm saying," Stronach says between sips of tea in an empty room of her campaign headquarters, "is 'Lois, you better say what you stand for. What values you have.' And people will judge, right?"

Stronach says she believes the voters in this community, in which she grew up, went to school, had her two children, got divorced, and which she continues to call home, will understand why she ***changed parties*** and why she deserves to be sent back to Parliament Hill.

Stronach insists the polling she did in her riding in May, prior to the switch, showed her constituents didn't want an election then and wanted a federal budget passed. And she says she is more at home in what she calls a more tolerant, fiscally responsible party that reflects her vision of the country and the community in which she grew up.

"People have got to understand this was a very difficult decision for me. I had a lot of political capital invested. I did not take the move over lightly," says Stronach, who takes credit as one of the "architects" of the merger of the Progressive Conservatives and Canadian Alliance to form the Conservative Party of Canada.

"I worked hard in the Conservative Party to bring about a more moderate face, a more modern party. And to me it became apparent at a certain point in time: look, either I didn't have the input I wanted or the leader didn't want to move in that direction," she explains. "The party no longer reflected the values that I stand for."

Those values are symbolized by support of same-sex marriage. Stronach didn't share the position of Stephen Harper and was ready to vote against her old party even before she jumped to the government.

But on the main street of her riding - a rural-urban microcosm that also doubles as a northern satellite community of Toronto - not every one is as comfortable with her stand on gay marriage.

Irma Karon runs her own framing business just off Yonge St. in downtown Aurora, and says Stronach isn't paying enough attention to "family issues" and there has been too much focus on the same-sex debate.

Even when Stronach was a Conservative, Karon, who is in her 60s, was skeptical of the billionaire chief executive officer turned politician.

"She's powerful because of her wealth for sure. She's capable to be the CEO of something. But she was running to be the prime minister. There's a few steps you have to make first," Karon says.

As far as Stronach is concerned, she'd rather shift the focus from same-sex, her jump to the Liberals and, of course, her personal life.

In this election, Stronach is billing herself as a powerful voice for her community at the seat of power, the federal cabinet.

She's a defender of Prime Minister Paul Martin's decision to call an inquiry into the sponsorship scandal and she's quick to tout the fiscal record of the Liberals that she says makes Canada the envy of all rich countries.

She's enthusiastic about some of the work she has been doing with Treasury Board President Reg Alcock, such as strengthening internal audits of departments and ministerial responsibility to make government more accountable.

To her credit, Stronach sounds quicker on her feet and better in command of herself on serious issues than she did in her early days in government, when she awkwardly fended off opposition questions about her new portfolio, Human Resources, with scripted responses.

Yet Stronach knows she can't escape the focus on her personal life, whether it's whom she's dating or which designer's shoes she favours.

She now shares custody of her two children, Frank and Nikki, with their father, Donald, to whom she was married for five years. Her second marriage, to Olympic speed skater Johann Olav Koss of Norway, ended in 2002 after three years.

Her spectacular public breakup with Conservative MP Peter MacKay injected Canadian politics with a dose of celebrity soap opera that the country hasn't seen since the turbulent end to Pierre and Margaret Trudeau's marriage in the 1970s.

She insists she has thick skin, and that she can rise above what's written about her. She says if she let it get to her, she quite frankly wouldn't be able to get out of bed in the morning.

She says she doesn't want young women to get the wrong idea about politics: that if they enter public life, don't worry about all the focus on your shoes and who your male partner is.

"I can look in the mirror and say, what's important to me? Did I stick true to my principles? Can I sleep at night? Did I follow my heart? I don't want to look back. I want to say, I have no regrets."

Ottawa Citizen

**Graphic**

Photo: TOM HANSON, CP; Belinda Stronach shook up federal politics on May 17, 2005, when Prime Minister Paul Martin announced her defection from the Conservative Party to the Liberals. Newly appointed human resources minister, she cast a key vote to keep the government in power.; Graphic/Diagram: (See hard copy for graphic)
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NEW YORK (AP) \_ New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg was sworn in for another four years Sunday and launched his second term portraying the city at a critical crossroads, with the promise of ''finishing our unfinished work.''

Bloomberg took the oath at an afternoon City Hall ceremony. His first address of 2006 touched on the progress he believes he has made and tried to set an aggressive tone for the next four years.

''Now we have a choice to make,'' Bloomberg said.

''We could be content with what we have accomplished \_ and preserve our gains \_ or we can take our beloved city even further.''

The former CEO and then-political novice took his first oath of office on New Year's Day in 2002, as rescue workers still searched for victims' remains amid the World Trade Center rubble. The economy was in tatters and he warned of tough times ahead.

This year, in his second inaugural address, the Republican mayor recalled that day and the tragic point in the city's history, saying those wounds ''may never fully heal.''

''But something else has endured, something even more compelling, something even more powerful \_ our unity,'' he said.

''Staying united, we will renew the promise of our city and commit ourselves to finishing our unfinished work,'' he said.

He hit on what his re-election campaign pushed as the high notes of his first term, including lower crime, better student achievement and a healthier economy.

Bloomberg, who in the early 1980s founded his own financial information company, reversed the post-Sept. 11 fiscal slump with a mix of borrowing, tax increases, funding shifts and cuts.

Although the city's $52-billion budget is balanced for this fiscal year, multibillion-dollar gaps loom. Critics said Bloomberg should have used this year's money to pad the lean years ahead, rather than using it up to balance one fiscal year.

''This is not the time to relax our vigilance,'' Bloomberg warned Sunday, adding his administration must ''live within its means.''

Despite the economic pains, Bloomberg has been drawing up a second-term wish list of new proposals for affordable housing, economic development and better schools that he says can be accomplished without a tax increase.

Echoing his 2002 address, the mayor \_ a lifelong Democrat who ***changed parties*** just before his 2001 race \_ promised again to govern ''without partisanship or prejudice.''

**Load-Date:** January 2, 2006

**End of Document**

[***No difference between Liberals, Tories***](http://advance.lexis.com/api/document?collection=news&id=urn:contentItem:4J2V-3B60-TX77-B243-00000-00&context=)

Prince George Citizen (British Columbia)

January 14, 2006 Saturday, Final Edition

Copyright 2006 Prince George Citizen All Rights Reserved

**Section:** OPINION; Pg. 4

**Length:** 224 words

**Byline:** Robert Waite, The Citizen

**Body**

There is so much talk of change during this campaign. The Liberals claim they are a ***changed party***. The Conservatives say it's time for a change. People I talk to say we need a change.

With all this talk of change, I find it strange that the end result will be just more of the same for working people in Canada. Since Confederation, Canada has been ruled by the Liberals 23 times and the Conservatives 12 times. In this de-facto two party system, where does one find change?

Swapping out one corporate-friendly Parliament for another even more friendly to corporate demands is not change. It is business as usual for the wealthy and powerful in this country.

The Liberals were on the way to giving another $4-billion gift to corporate Canada before backing down due to pressure from the NDP. The only reason they gave up on the plan was to secure the backing of the left in order to retain power.

The Conservatives want to entrench property rights to make it easier for corporations to challenge local land-use controls, environmental laws and water rights. They also want to reduce the GST, which was put in place to protect Canadian social programs from the ravages of the Free Trade Agreement and NAFTA.

If Canadian citizens are really looking for change, I suggest taking a long hard look at why you vote the way you do.

-- Robert Waite

Prince George
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In some respects it was a typical day at Lakeview Avenue Public School in Stoney Creek. Kids came in from morning recess like always.

Except this time, there was a man in the hallway when they came in -- on a mission to topple the Liberal government after 13 years as a loyal supporter.

Election day in Hamilton.

The man walked into the gym, where on this morning, it was distinguished not only by the mascot lion's head mural and hoops on the walls, but by several polling stations.

"I'm anxious to vote," said Lakhwinder Multani. "Get them out of power, the corrupt government. I'm voting strategically. NDP. Anybody but the Liberals."

Minutes later, another man came in from the cold. He was unexcited by his civic duty, nor too impressed with any of the choices before him.

"Everyone's a liar," said Ken Graham. "Voting for anybody but the Liberals. Who? I have no idea. Just want the Liberals out."

The workers were in the gym manning the tables with the cardboard voting booths. One woman had a novel tucked discreetly under the table on her lap, for the inevitable down periods during the day.

A friendly worker cheerily asked a reporter and photographer to leave the room. Against Elections Canada rules.

Election day: some excitement surrounding the democratic exercise, but mostly a preponderance of normalcy, and, in some quarters -- it's election day?

"Is today voting day? I totally knew that," said Tracy Prowse, with a big smile.

The 23-year old wasn't positive on that one, though. And in any case, she wasn't voting. Never does. She was working at Kel & Bri's Hair, Esthetics & Tanning on Paramount Drive.

Tracy was more focused on rubbing exfoliating cream on a customer's hands and using a free foot to rock the customer's toddler stroller.

The Ramones' I Want to Be Sedated bounced off the walls from the sound system.

"If I did vote, I'd vote Green. But I never vote," she said with a smile and not a hint of cynicism or negativity. "Don't have the time to go check it out."

The customer, Nicole Thiele, is voting. Liberal. The Conservatives want to erode the universality of the Canadian health care system. And Stephen Harper rubs her the wrong way.

"My husband always says, 'if you don't vote, you can't complain.'"

Ellen Mattice is underwhelmed by voting day. Unexcited. Really. She voted in the morning and then met friends at Sackville Seniors Centre on Upper Wentworth to play some cribbage.

"We're not excited," said Ellen.

"I'm excited," offered Peggy Armstrong.

"I don't get excited about anything but cards," said Ellen.

Ellen voted Liberal. Peggy voted NDP.

"NDP!" said Ellen. "You cancelled me out. They won't get in, Peg."

"My father voted for the CCF out west," said Peggy.

Over at another table, Geoff Harvey is excited, yes.

"Excited that it's over, thank God," he said. "It's been a dirty campaign. One guy says something, and then the other just denies it and promises more money."

He voted for a different party than he normally would, ***changed parties***, but won't say to who.

He's more enthused by the fact that he got a great deal on used books being sold today at the Centre. Twenty-five cents each. Got hardcovers of James Michener's Texas and Ken Follett's A Dangerous Fortune.

At his table, finishing her turkey pie for lunch, Chris Miller says she voted NDP. She usually votes Liberal, though.

She came to the Centre to play bingo that morning, just like she does every Monday. Except, this time, she shows up and bingo's cancelled.

Room 2, the bingo room, is occupied - by a polling station.

"So who do you blame for that?!" cracked Geoff Harvey with a smile.

It was glorious by noon in the city, crisp air, not a cloud in the sky. Perfect day to go for a walk.

Inside the Second Cup in Westdale Village, two women chatted. Breanne Camera sipped on an iced cap - it was that kind of afternoon - and Chelsey Marshall had an Italian soda.

They were talking election.

It is a big one this time around, will impact their future as much or more than anyone's, they agreed.

The NDP appeals to Breanne. She worries about a social conservative agenda from Harper's Conservatives.

Chelsey thinks the Conservative policies, overall, deserve a chance.

Both think the Liberals have overstayed their welcome, that a change is necessary.

Two women, talking issues on election day.

They finished their drinks - and walked back to school for their afternoon class at Westdale High.

Breanne and Chelsey are 16 years old, ineligible to vote, and they don't think that's right.

This campaign was, like any other, noisy, negative, seemingly ubiquitous. A momentous occasion, historic, for those emotionally engaged in it in some way.

And in Hamilton, voting day was like any other day - busy, bustling, the election pretty much managing to squeeze in a place on the daily agenda for most who live here.

But down at the waterfront at mid-afternoon, Harbour West, the only sounds were the occasional duck quacking, a loose wire on a vacant flag pole clinking repeatedly, water lapping against the rocks, and the odd snicking sound of thin plates of broken ice in the still part of the harbour bumping against each other.

From the west, out of Cootes Paradise, a stiff wind capped the water, rustled the sea grass bathed in sunshine. Epochal political change in the air, the seasons shifting?

No, it's still the middle of winter. It was just the wind.

[*jwells@thespec.com*](mailto:jwells@thespec.com)
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The Liberals did not do as badly as predicted in Monday's election for one reason: Canadians fear massive change.

Our region is a good example. Only two ridings ***changed parties*** in th Atlantic provinces. Why? Because "stick with the devil you know" is our childhood lullaby.

Making inroads in the Maritimes will be tough for Harper's Tories. The western Tory is at best a distant cousin to East Coast conservatives. Our Tories still believe in being "progressive."

The election results tell us Canada is a nation of regions. The United States is divided into red and blue states. Canada is more complicated. Our country is a quilt of red, light blue and dark blue - with some orange tossed in.

You can predict how Albertans will vote, and which party Quebec will support. You know that in cities, Harper's a tough sell. In the Maritimes, take the results from last time and toss in a bit of change.

Many Canadians were bored with Paul Martin's Liberals and weary of hearing explanations for scandals. Still, they weren't ready to buy what Harper was selling.

The fear factor was real. A new prime minister? Sure, but voters wanted some measure of control.

Harper only won a minority. Considering where the Conservatives were not long ago, that's an amazing achievement.

The reason they didn't get a majority is that Canadians are not yet ready to give the Conservatives the keys to the house, cottage and snowmobile. Voters are not sure what life under a Harper majority would look like.

Will Harper be good for business? Bad for college students? Great for arts and culture?

Being the cautious people we are, we may take Harper out for a test drive. Most of us want to be able to take him back to the dealership if things don't work out.

To reduce risk, we have to be sure Harper doesn't have complete run of the House. Mom and Dad may have left on vacation. But a tough grandma is down in the basement, ready to come up if we need her.

What do we really know about Stephen Harper? We know this prime minister designate's wife, Laureen Teskey, can keep her own name. (When Maureen McTeer tried that, she was often called "Mrs. Joe Clark.")

Teskey looks like the kind of person you wouldn't mind having over for coffee. Insiders call her opinionated and louder than her husband - which sounds like a typical marriage.

Harper won by playing it safe. If you want power in this country, you have to be subtle about it. He could not afford to appear extreme. Canadians do not take well to power grabs.

Harper was quietly confident to the end. Many experts were amazed to see how "political" he became. Harper learned that what you don't say is more important than what you do say.

Having a new Prime Minister may be a nice change. If it's not, we have options.

In typical Canadian fashion, even those who didn't vote for Harper will sit back and give him a chance to show what he can do.

Anything else would be - well, un-Canadian.

[*sandraporteous199@hotmail.com*](mailto:sandraporteous199@hotmail.com)
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To the best of my knowledge, the baseball savant Yogi Berra never met a Canadian Liberal. Not that it matters. The great Yogi, the master of the errant aphorism, possessed wisdom that transcends borders.

"If you come to a fork in the road," Yogi advised, "take it."

Exactly! The Liberal party, Canada's natural governing party (as Liberals see themselves), is at a crossroads. It is being pulled in two directions. One faction holds that the Liberals, having lost the election and their leader, should play it safe -- they should choose someone familiar and reassuring, a leader who will steer a steady course until that happy day when Stephen Harper makes A Big Mistake and a grateful country once again embraces the Liberal party.

The other faction believes that this week's defeat delivered a profound message: if the Liberal party is to rise again, it must find new faces, new policies and new attitudes. Reform or perish is their mantra.

The play-it-safe group's preferred candidate is Frank McKenna, the former premier of New Brunswick who resigned this week as Canadian ambassador to the United States. McKenna is a classic off-the-shelf leadership candidate -- ready, respectable and widely recognized by Canadians.

McKenna, however, has no federal experience, and the Liberals have never chosen a former provincial premier as their leader. The transition from provincial politics to the federal arena is extremely difficult, witness the struggles of George Drew and Robert Stanfield of the Conservatives and Tommy Douglas and Alexa McDonough of the New Democrats.

The Liberals are the party of central Canada. They have never chosen a leader who did not come out of Ontario or Quebec (yes, I know John Turner held a Vancouver seat in his final incarnation). Liberals go where the votes, seats and money are. What's more, McKenna has no charisma. His speeches are workmanlike. Although his supporters claim he is bilingual, my friends in Quebec say his French is noticeably weaker than Harper's. His tepid support for the Meech Lake constitutional accord when he was premier can only hurt him in Quebec.

At this early stage, McKenna is the preferred candidate of the Paul Martin wing of the still-divided party. Failing McKenna, they look to John Manley, the former finance minister who sat out the last two elections, or to Bob Rae, the former Ontario premier, who morphed from New Democrat to Liberal some years ago.

Although Manley says he will not be a candidate, his backers hope to persuade him by showing him that he would have a better chance than he did the last time around when he tried to run, only to find that Martin had vacuumed up all his support. Manley is from Ontario, which is a plus. Like McKenna, he is solid and respectable, but he is probably even more boring than the New Brunswicker. In Rae's case, the Ontario connection is not necessarily an asset; his term as premier is remembered, darkly, by a great many Ontarians.

Brian Tobin, the former federal fisheries minister and Newfoundland premier, will be remembered as the "Captain Canada" who defeated the Spaniards in the Great Turbot War of 1995. Like McKenna, he suffers from small-province syndrome and some Liberals consider him too quick tempered and erratic for national leadership. But he would be interesting.

The reform-or-perish faction doesn't have a candidate yet. Many of Jean Chrétien's old supporters belong to this group. They regard themselves as real liberals, not faux conservatives. They argue that the party needs to return to first principles. Why, they ask, would Canadians vote for a McKenna or a Manley? If they want a conservative, they will choose a real one -- Stephen Harper.

These Liberals think the party needs to go outside the box to find a leader who is new, progressive, intellectually stimulating and politically exciting. Their template is Pierre Trudeau who came out of nowhere to take the party and country by storm in 1968.

Michael Ignatieff, the Harvard professor who was elected in Etobicoke-Lakeshore, may be fresh, brainy and well-pedigreed. But he has no political experience -- none -- and many Liberals find him irksomely arrogant.

Belinda Stronach is getting ready to run for the leadership. She will bring glamour -- and controversy -- to the race. By all accounts, she has been a capable and hard-working cabinet minister since she ***changed parties*** last spring. But Stronach is a very new Liberal, and veteran Grits resent her meteoric rise.

The battle for the soul and future of the Liberal party will be fascinating. A path, a road, must be chosen. And as Yogi Berra also famously observed, "If you don't know where you are going, you will wind up somewhere else."

Cambridge resident Geoffrey Stevens, an author and former Ottawa columnist and managing editor of the Globe and Mail, teaches political science at Wilfrid Laurier University and the University of Guelph. He welcomes comments at [*geoffstevens@sympatico.ca*](mailto:geoffstevens@sympatico.ca).
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It was my compatriot Edmund Burke who, 200 years ago, taught the political world that an MP once elected is not the member for Bristol but a member of Parliament. This cardinal principle, that MPs are not delegates but representatives, is ignored in your judgment of David Emerson's situation (Mr. Emerson Should Face His Riding's Voters Again - editorial, Feb. 9).

Essentially, it matters not by whom he was supported nor by which party; what matters is what he was elected for. Will he represent his constituents less well because he has ***changed parties***? The furor about Mr. Emerson's campaign funds is also misplaced. Had he died the day after he was elected, would his estate be obliged to repay his former Liberal riding association? He would, arguably, have let his backers down.

There is another fundamental consideration. The primary task of the House of Commons is to sustain a government. The party system makes that task difficult. In a situation of minority government, action such as that taken by Mr. Emerson is not only legitimate, it is imperative.
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MIKE DUFFY: Welcome back to "Mike Duffy Live" on this Monday

edition. As I mentioned earlier in the broadcast, the Minister of International

Trade, David Emerson, has reaffirmed today that he is not going to quit. This

despite tremendous public pressure on him in order to do so to resign and

create a by-election. The embattled Minister of International Trade appeared

this morning on the Bill Good program on CKNW in Vancouver. Bill Good joins

us now. Bill, before we get to you and your analysis of how your audience

there has been reacting to all of this, let's have a listen to the tape of David

Emerson when he was asked the question about quitting, and then I gather he

had a surprise caller. Anyway, we'll have a little listen to some tape and then

come back with Bill Good in just a second.

[START OF TAPE]

BILL GOOD: You're not here this morning to resign?

DAVID EMERSON [International Trade Minister]: I am not here this morning to

resign because, while I have to admit that I gave thought to that and talked

about it with my family, we are all even more resolved today to not be driven

from office by what has been going on with a lot of the partisans and party

operatives that have been spinning the media. I will leave when I can't be

helpful to the people of my riding and the people of BC. I will leave when Prime

Minister Harper says I've had enough, David, you better leave. I will do all of

those things, but I will not be driven out just by a lot of people who are

creating a media firestorm. I will deal directly with people that have issues and

concerns and I will help them, and that, I believe, is my job.

GOOD: We have a call from Madrid, the Right Honourable Kim Campbell, and

this was not a call that I had anticipated.

KIM CAMPBELL [Former Canadian Prime Minister]: There's nothing selfish

about David Emerson's choice. He hasn't run to a safe seat, a safe haven. He

knows that the government he's in is probably going to be back to the people

again in a year or 18 months, and that it's going to be tougher. So he hasn't

chosen the opportunistic easy way out, and he's done it on principle. And if I

were to be asked, you know, what party does David Emerson belong to, I'd say

the party of British Columbia.

[END OF TAPE]

DUFFY: Well that's a pretty powerful endorsement from Kim Campbell. Bill,

he seemed very calm, cool, and collected there. He's obviously thought this

through. Some might argue he should have given it this kind of thought before

he actually made the switch. Was that the tenor of the whole show, that he's

just now dug in?

BILL GOOD [CKNW Radio Show Host]: Well, yes, I think so, Mike. I was

struck by his calmness and by his tenacity, for a couple of reasons. I had

thought that by now he might have had enough and thrown in the towel,

although it's not his manner. But he doesn't need it, and I thought personally

it might be taking too much of a toll on his family. What struck me was the

comment he made about his family. His wife apparently is very solidly behind

him in this, as are his kids. He's got a young family, and they're taking a lot of

heat. This morning I got the sense that he was, it would really take Mr. Harper

deciding he no longer wanted Mr. Emerson for Mr. Emerson to fold his tent

now.

DUFFY: Has there been any reaction, I mean obviously he's from Vancouver,

and the whole thing was about getting a minister for Vancouver. Of course

James Moore is, what, 20 minutes out of town in one of the suburbs. Has the

government's rationalization of Mr. Emerson taken hold at all in Vancouver?

GOOD: I would say definitely outside the riding. I don't think it plays nearly as

strongly in the riding. It plays with the Board of Trade, the Chamber of

Commerce, people who are in the tourism industry, remember he brought the

Tourism Commission to Vancouver, to British Columbia from Ottawa. He's held

in very high regard by those people, and they tend to be non-partisan. I think

they look at the value in having a strong powerful cabinet minister here. I'm not

sure the constituents value that. The calls I'm getting are very mixed. They're

white hot, anger, and they're strongly supportive. And they tend to come I

think generally speaking from the business community and from people outside

the riding.

DUFFY: So it's one of these split deals, and Kim Campbell seemed to be

telegraphing in her comment that she thinks David Emerson is going to have a

hard time in this government's last two years, he may do great work, but in…

GOOD: What that said to me, what Kim Campbell said to me was that it's

taken a week for there to become some kind of supportive organization.

Remember, this is a new government, a new minister in a new portfolio, no

political staff, he's just ***changed parties***, he doesn't have a bunch of people to

kind of protect him, to build some furore, to get some media going in his

favour. He's been all alone out there, and I think Ms. Campbell's call was

indicative that some people behind the scenes have started to try and garner

some support for him.

DUFFY: Finally, is it his tenacious nature, this is a man who used to play

football, he's an old jock, he's a very competitive person. Is that what we're

seeing kick in here, and that maybe if they hadn't been quite as vicious against

him and so obviously organized, I mean the NDP has been putting on quite a

drive there. Faced with that, then he digs in, and that's that?

GOOD: Well I think he was a bit politically naive. I mean he's not a naive guy,

he's a very experienced business pro, but I think he was a little naive about the

kind of reaction this would get, and I was a bit amused to watch Libby Davies,

New Democrats being holier than thou. Here in British Columbia, we remember

very well the provincial NDP government getting Gordon Wilson, spiriting him

across the floor and making him an instant Finance Minister. So it's not that

they're pristine on those issues. The fact is Mr. Harper is playing by rules that

he denounced. I understand the anger about that, but they're still the rules, and

until they're changed I think we aren't going to see the end of this. This may

provide the motivation, though, for people to take a really good hard look at

what we do about crossing the floor in the future. But it's not a simple issue.

DUFFY: It sure isn't. Bill Good, great to see you. We'll be watching you for the

CTV News tonight at 6:00 in Vancouver. Thank you very much for joining us

now.

GOOD: Thanks very much, Mike. Any time.

DUFFY: That's Bill Good at CTV Vancouver. He does the radio in the morning

and the news in the evening.
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The Editor:

Prime Minister Stephen Harper's statements about open government and accountability are more promise than reality.

MP David Emerson crossing the floor to become a Conservative minister is simply old-fashioned, back-door politics.

What happened to Harper's promise of having everything out in the open? What about the accountability of Emerson to the people who elected him? At least when MP Keith Martin ***changed parties***, he had the crediblity to allow the voters to be able to support or oppose his move.

If the prime minister truly wants to provide openness and accountability, then he should have Emerson resign and run for the Conservative party in a byelection, allowing the voters to have their rightful say in the issue.

Tom Meek

Nanaimo
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JANE TABER: One of the topics plaguing the Conservative

administration is the implementation of their proposed child care package. They

promised in the election to give parents $1200 a month for each child under six

years old, but the provinces are starting to speak out against changing the

Liberal deal that was signed last year. To talk about this, we are joined in

Toronto by the minister who planned the Liberal deal and negotiated those

deals, Ken Dryden, and the new NDP MP from and Toronto, Olivia Chow. Now,

I have to say we did ask the Conservative minister Diane Finley who's in charge

of this file to appear on the show, but she declined. So welcome Olivia Chow

and welcome Ken Dryden.

KEN DRYDEN [Liberal MP]: Thank you Jane.

OLIVIA CHOW [NDP MP]: Thanks.

TABER: To you first, Mr. Dryden. Bill Graham, the interim leader of your party

said today in the Globe and Mail that he's going to play tough, that they're not

going to prop up this Tory government. And child care could be a deal breaker.

Would you be prepared to defeat the government if Mr. Harper tears up these

deals that you negotiated?

DRYDEN: Well all of that's strategy once the House begins, but I think the key

point now is between now and April the 3rd is for the public voice to be heard

and for the media voice to be heard. It wasn't heard a lot during the campaign

in terms of early learning and child care. Now is that opportunity for people to

in the quiet of the morning after to see in fact what is there and what isn't

there in terms of the Conservative plan.

TABER: Okay, Miss Chow, are you optimistic? Mr. Dryden seems to think that

maybe it's not a done deal, that the Liberal plan might still prevail?

CHOW: Well the unfortunate thing is that the agreements are done

administratively so there's nothing that the House of Commons can really do

unless we make sure that there is a child care act. So that we embed the whole

notion and enshrine the whole child care, national child care program into the

House of Commons in legislation. Then the government, whichever government

whether it's a new government, old government or even two years from now,

this won't happen over and over again. We also need to make sure that the

money is in the budget. So I want to invite Mr. Dryden to join with the NDP,

and let's get the Bloc also onside to say, okay, let's enshrine this national child

care act into the parliament. Then it would protect child care, a national child

care program for generations to come. Rather than, you know, it comes and

goes and you can't plan child care like that. You cannot sacrifice kids' promises

just like that.

TABER: Mr. Dryden, what about those NDP national child care act.

DRYDEN: Actually I couldn't hear anything that Olivia said. I can only hear

your questions.

TABER: She was talking about the NDP's proposal for a national child care act

and getting the Liberals onside with the NDP, and perhaps the Bloc as well to

force the Tories into adopting this act.

DRYDEN: I mean, the key understanding of this is that as of two years ago,

we made a plan, and we, and it was part of a campaign promise to deliver

national early learning and child care right across the country. That was our

approach, that was our plan. This is not an NDP plan. This was a Liberal plan.

And this is something where we got ten provinces to sign ten agreements. It

is a big departure from the past. It is a big, ambitious, and important approach

to take. I think the key in terms of the Conservatives at this particular stage is

not to understand what they said in the campaign as $1,200 before taxes to

a child under the age of six, not in terms of the bricks and mortar money. But

what their promise was, was to do child care better. That's what their promise

was. That's what the public understands it to be. That's what the media

understands it to be. And that's the standard that we, and I would hope that

the NDP and others in the House would hold them to.

CHOW: Okay, but Mr. Dryden, how do you hold them to it if these

agreements are done administratively? All they have to do is just go and cancel

and talk about cancelling it. We now have, whether it's New Brunswick or

British Columbia because they've just signed on in principle. They don't even

have the funding agreement…

DRYDEN: The problem, Olivia, is…

CHOW: So how do we force the issue in the House of Commons? We have

to have a decent debate, a national debate.

TABER: Let Mr. Dryden in there, sorry.

DRYDEN: The problem, Olivia, as you know, is that legislation can be reversed

as well. And the key in all of this, you know, is to hold them to the promise of

doing child care better. That's what they said to the public, that's what the

public understood during that election campaign. And you don't believe that

their approach will make it better. I certainly don't believe that their approach

will make it better. But they are the government now. They have the obligation

of government, and they have the obligation of now delivering on the promises

and to, and for everybody to absolutely be clear of what that promise was,

when they deliver their $1,200, that's not delivering on the promise. The

promise is to create very, very strong powerful early learning and child care.

CHOW: I agree with you that we could have a win-win situation. We could

have a national child care program enshrined in legislation. We could also have

family allowance. If the Tories want to have family allowance, let them do it.

We can do both, and in order to do it, yes, you're right, we can cancel

legislation, but it has to be done in the House of Commons. That means that

we can have a national debate. Right now these agreements, if they just cancel

it, what can we do? I mean we will then work, of course, with all the child care

folks that deliver wonderful care for our kids. We can get the parents really

saying we need something like that. We can look at the Quebec model saying

if it can happen in Quebec we can also have it across Canada. We can inspire

parents to demand it. But we need action in the House of Commons too.

DRYDEN: And the problem that all of us have right now is the House of

Commons doesn't reconvene until April the 3rd. Now is not the time to discuss

strategy. Now is the time to hear that public voice, and to hear the media

voice, both of which were awfully silent during the campaign. Now they have

the opportunity. Come April 3rd, that's when is time for you, for us, for

everyone else to determine a strategy.

TABER: Okay Mr. Dryden and Miss Chow, it sounds like you're already having

that national debate on "Mike Duffy Live", and it's a fascinating debate. I have

to ask Mr. Dryden, though, because of his former career, the Olympics.

Gretzky's team seems to be doing pretty well. What do you think? A gold

medal for Canada, Mr. Dryden?

DRYDEN: Jane, that's why they play the games. We'll find out. We'll watch.

That's what makes them exciting. Canada is obviously always a top contender,

and we'll see.

TABER: And what about Gretzky on the corruption and the gambling issue, are

you concerned about that at all?

DRYDEN: No I'm not. And what I found stunning in the coverage so far is that

I haven't yet heard something that Wayne Gretzky has done wrong. And then

I hear all of the media talk about how in fact he is the distraction. He's not

creating the distraction that I've heard of, because I haven't heard of him doing

anything wrong. If there's any distraction that's being created, it is the focus

of the media. And if there was something that he had done wrong, then it's

absolutely appropriate focus and therefore distraction. But I would just kind of

let them be. They're doing fine. They've got an important task ahead, and

that's an important task for 33 million Canadian people, and for them not to be

the distraction.

TABER: Okay. Miss Chow, what's your bet for the Canadian hockey team,

mens and women's?

CHOW: Well women always win first. That's what happened last time. A gold

for the women and then the men.

TABER: Okay. And one last question to Mr. Dryden. The Liberal leadership, are

you going for it or not?

DRYDEN: Well I would ask Olivia whether she's going for the leadership?

CHOW: Even though I'm wearing red, but it doesn't mean I've ***changed***

***parties***. We don't do that.

TABER: You're trying to avoid the question. You're getting pretty political

there, Mr. Dryden. Are you going for it or not?

DRYDEN: I've just begun to think about, and we will see.

TABER: Okay, thank you very much. Olivia Chow, the new NDP member from

Toronto, and of course the former minister in charge of child care, the child

care plan, Ken Dryden. They both joined us from Toronto. Thank you very

much.

DRYDEN: Thank you, Jane.

CHOW: Thank you.
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Former prime minister Paul Martin yesterday spoke out for the first time about David Emerson's defection to the Conservatives, saying the about-face "astonished" him since the ex-Liberal had publicly condemned Stephen Harper only days before switching.

Mr. Martin issued a 365-word statement from Europe, where he is travelling, that amounted to a public excoriation of the man Liberals once called a "dream" candidate.

"As the person who recruited Mr. Emerson to public life, and given the lack of any articulated principle behind his decision, I certainly share the disappointment of so many Canadians in both Mr. Harper and Mr. Emerson," he said.

The former prime minister said Mr. Emerson's switch was "without precedent," in part because the Vancouver MP crossed the floor so quickly after being elected a Liberal last month.

"Mr. Emerson had campaigned only days earlier against the Conservatives - using language that can only be described as categorical in its condemnation of Mr. Harper and his positions," said Mr. Martin, who retains the title of Liberal Party Leader until a successor is picked.

"Now as a member of Mr. Harper's government, [Mr. Emerson] will not only be required to defend the policies of his department - but all the policies of a government which he has attacked in an unequivocal way as being contrary to his own principles."

The Liberal Party Leader said Mr. Harper and Mr. Emerson have yet to adequately explain themselves, especially since the Conservative Prime Minister has criticized floor-crossing in the past.

"I am also troubled by the unwillingness of Mr. Harper and Mr. Emerson to confront the legitimate questions that Canadians have about this matter," Mr. Martin said.

Mr. Emerson, who served as industry minister in the defeated Liberal government, has largely ducked media questioning since joining the Conservatives on Feb. 6 to serve as Mr. Harper's International Trade Minister.

Mr. Martin said he has still not received an explanation for Mr. Emerson's defection.

"He announced that he would be making contact with me to explain the principle that led him to his decision to cross the floor. To date I have not received his explanation, nor have I heard from Mr. Emerson at all."

Mr. Martin accused the Prime Minister and Mr. Emerson of showing a lack of respect for voters.

"To date, neither has been willing to subject themselves to an appropriate level of scrutiny on this matter - a decision that I believe robs Canadians and the people of Vancouver Kingsway of a deserved explanation," he said. "In particular, it is to those voters that a greater measure of respect is owed."

Mr. Harper, who attended a Flag Day ceremony on Parliament Hill yesterday, ducked out a back door to avoid questions from the media. Before his exit, a television reporter asked him about Mr. Martin's comments on Mr. Emerson.

"You know my answer," Mr. Harper said. "Mr. Emerson will make a great contribution."

A spokesman for the Prime Minister's Office rejected Mr. Martin's criticism. "I don't think members of the former Liberal government are in any position to be preaching about respect for voters," said William Stairs, Mr. Harper's communications director, who added he had not read Mr. Martin's statement and could not respond directly.

Bloc Québécois Leader Gilles Duceppe also took shots at the new Trade Minister after telling reporters that he hoped Michael Wilson, the incoming Canadian ambassador to the United States, would work quickly to resolve the softwood lumber dispute.

When asked if that wasn't Mr. Emerson's job, Mr. Duceppe joked about reports that Mr. Emerson opposed a possible framework for a softwood truce last fall: "Emerson? Which Emerson? It's tough to say. It seems there was a deal or not a deal, we don't know. Maybe a deal under the Liberals is not a deal under the Tories or vice versa."

The Bloc Leader pointed out that the defection marked the first time an MP has ***changed parties*** before even taking the oath of office. "He is in the *Guinness Book* [*of World Records*] for sure."
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Former prime minister Paul Martin yesterday spoke out for the first time about David Emerson's defection to the Conservatives, saying the about-face "astonished" him since the ex-Liberal had publicly condemned Stephen Harper only days before switching.

Mr. Martin issued a 365-word statement from Europe, where he is travelling, that amounted to a public excoriation of the man Liberals once called a "dream" candidate.

"As the person who recruited Mr. Emerson to public life, and given the lack of any articulated principle behind his decision, I certainly share the disappointment of so many Canadians in both Mr. Harper and Mr. Emerson," he said.

The former prime minister said Mr. Emerson's switch was "without precedent," in part because the Vancouver MP crossed the floor so quickly after being elected a Liberal last month.

"Mr. Emerson had campaigned only days earlier against the Conservatives -- using language that can only be described as categorical in its condemnation of Mr. Harper and his positions," said Mr. Martin, who retains the title of Liberal Party Leader until a successor is picked.

"Now as a member of Mr. Harper's government, [Mr. Emerson] will not only be required to defend the policies of his department -- but all the policies of a government which he has attacked in an unequivocal way as being contrary to his own principles."

The Liberal Party Leader said Mr. Harper and Mr. Emerson have yet to adequately explain themselves, especially since the Conservative Prime Minister has criticized floor-crossing in the past.

"I am also troubled by the unwillingness of Mr. Harper and Mr. Emerson to confront the legitimate questions that Canadians have about this matter," Mr. Martin said.

Mr. Emerson, who served as industry minister in the defeated Liberal government, has largely ducked media questioning since joining the Conservatives on Feb. 6 to serve as Mr. Harper's International Trade Minister.

Mr. Martin said he has still not received an explanation for Mr. Emerson's defection.

"He announced that he would be making contact with me to explain the principle that led him to his decision to cross the floor. To date I have not received his explanation, nor have I heard from Mr. Emerson at all."

Mr. Martin accused the Prime Minister and Mr. Emerson of showing a lack of respect for voters.

"To date, neither has been willing to subject themselves to an appropriate level of scrutiny on this matter -- a decision that I believe robs Canadians and the people of Vancouver Kingsway of a deserved explanation," he said. "In particular, it is to those voters that a greater measure of respect is owed."

Mr. Harper, who attended a Flag Day ceremony on Parliament Hill yesterday, ducked out a back door to avoid questions from the media. Before his exit, a television reporter asked him about Mr. Martin's comments on Mr. Emerson.

"You know my answer," Mr. Harper said. "Mr. Emerson will make a great contribution."

A spokesman for the Prime Minister's Office rejected Mr. Martin's criticism. "I don't think members of the former Liberal government are in any position to be preaching about respect for voters," said William Stairs, Mr. Harper's communications director, who added he had not read Mr. Martin's statement and could not respond directly.

Bloc Québécois Leader Gilles Duceppe also took shots at the new Trade Minister after telling reporters that he hoped Michael Wilson, the incoming Canadian ambassador to the United States, would work quickly to resolve the softwood lumber dispute.

When asked if that wasn't Mr. Emerson's job, Mr. Duceppe joked about reports that Mr. Emerson opposed a possible framework for a softwood truce last fall: "Emerson? Which Emerson? It's tough to say. It seems there was a deal or not a deal, we don't know. Maybe a deal under the Liberals is not a deal under the Tories or vice versa."

The Bloc Leader pointed out that the defection marked the first time an MP has ***changed parties*** before even taking the oath of office. "He is in the Guinness Book [ of World Records] for sure."

With a report from Gloria Galloway
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Paul Martin says he can't understand how former Liberal cabinet minister David Emerson can justify jumping to the Conservatives - nor how Prime Minister Stephen Harper could suddenly drop his opposition to MPs switching parties.

"When I learned that he had been recruited to sit as a Conservative cabinet minister only days after his election as a Liberal, I was astonished," Martin said in his first public remarks on Emerson's decision to join the Conservatives as trade minister on Feb. 6.

The former prime minister, who is travelling in Europe, said in a statement that he shares "the disappointment of so many Canadians in both Mr. Harper and Mr. Emerson" as a result of the episode.

Emerson, who was recruited into federal politics by Martin, has been under pressure from the opposition parties, some Tory MPs, members of his former Vancouver Kingsway riding association and some editorial writers to step down and run as a Conservative in a by-election.

But he has refused, saying he ***changed parties*** because he believes that, by remaining a cabinet minister, he can accomplish more for his riding and for British Columbia. Emerson has also hinted that he blames Martin for bringing him into politics and then deciding to give up the Liberal leadership after the Jan. 23 election loss.

Martin said Emerson's move puts the former Liberal in an impossible position. Only days earlier, as a Liberal candidate, Emerson had condemned Harper, Martin noted.

Martin also questioned how Harper could have asked Emerson to cross the floor to another party after the way the Conservatives slammed MP Belinda Stronach for jumping from the Tories to the Liberals last year. "Mr. Harper engineered this switch after having criticized floor crossing heavily in the past," Martin observed.

Martin also said he was "troubled" by what he said was the unwillingness of Harper and Emerson to discuss the defection with the media since the uproar broke out last week.

"To date, neither has been willing to subject themselves to an appropriate level of scrutiny on this matter - a decision that I believe robs Canadians and the people of Vancouver Kingsway of a deserved explanation. In particular, it is to those voters that a greater measure of respect is owed."

Martin also said that despite Emerson's statement on Feb. 6 that he intended to talk over his decision to join the Tories with Martin, no talk has taken place.
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JANE TABER: Well, David Emerson's defection is one of the reasons

why Stephen Harper's government got off to a rocky start. But this was a quiet

week for the Prime Minister, And it seems that Mr. Harper is simply intent on

getting down to business. To talk about the new government, we are joined by

some senior party statesmen. In Vancouver, the NDP's Joy MacPhail, and

joining us from Toronto, Conservative Senator Hugh Segal and the Liberals

Brian Tobin. Good afternoon everyone.

BRIAN TOBIN [Former Liberal Cabinet Minister]: Good afternoon.

JOY MACPHAIL [Former BC NDP Cabinet Minister]: Hi.

HUGH SEGAL [Conservative Senator]: Hi.

TABER: And to you first, Joy MacPhail in Vancouver, talk about what the

Emerson, what the impact of the Emerson defection has been.

MACPHAIL: Well I'm actually incredibly surprised at how intense the feeling

is in Vancouver about David Emerson being a turncoat. I hadn't attended any

of the rallies or protests until this past Thursday evening. And I went to the one

at the, a local school in David Emerson's riding and just sat in the back. And

people poured in, filled an elementary school auditorium to the rafters and out

into the hallway, and it was multipartisan. It was not nonpartisan. It was

multipartisan. Tories were up speaking. Liberals were up speaking. New

Democrats were up speaking. Jack Layton sat there and furiously wrote down

what people were advising him to tell David Emerson. It really is heartfelt.

People feel scorned. They feel like they've been defrauded. And I don't think

this issue is going to go away.

TABER: Okay Brian Tobin, get in there. I understand you were in BC this week

and you heard about it as well.

TOBIN: Well I did, and I must say I was actually there Wednesday, Thursday,

and left Friday, and I was just telling Hugh before the show started that I was

surprised that, in fact, a lot of the deep emotion was coming not so much from

New Democrats or Liberals but from Conservatives. And I think that's the one

piece in all of this that may have been unexpected, that a great many

hard-working Conservatives who worked very hard over the last number of

years through the Reform and the Progressive Conservative marriage to a new

party, putting it all together, are feeling very betrayed as well. And I think

that's going to be one of the difficult things for Stephen Harper. Not just facing

the opposition, but frankly as parliament comes back and as the troops get

together, facing his own team. It's going to be tough on this one. This one is

not going away any time soon. Certainly didn't go away last week. Week two

now of this issue.

TABER: Yeah, Senator Segal, we know the arguments why Stephen Harper

appointed Michael Fortier to the Senate and then to the cabinet as well as the

argument for David Emerson. He wanted the big cities represented. But has this

not damaged his moral authority?

SEGAL: I think the issue will come down to performance. I think if the Prime

Minister brings in legislation on accountability, if he brings in legislation on an

elected Senate, it's inappropriate, I think it's a little unfair to criticize a Prime

Minister for operating under the rules which he found when he came into

office. And we have a long tradition, particularly in BC, of Liberals becoming

Socreds and Socreds becoming Conservatives, and Reformers joining the

Conservative party, there's a lot of mobility movement and mobility and that's

true in all parts of our own national history in fact where people have ***changed***

***parties*** for a series of reasons. I think the critical issue will be Mr. Emerson's

performance as a Minister of Foreign Trade on critical files. And if that

performance is seen to be constructive, then I think people will assess his

desire to continue to be of service to the crown and the country on its merits.

There's always going to be anger when he these sort of things take place. I

remember the anger of the riding association in Belinda Stronach's constituency

when she changed, but in the end she carried that seat to her credit. So I think

it's too soon to come to any fundamental judgments.

TABER: Joy?

MACPHAIL: Well let me just tell what you the people in the riding are saying.

And you know, Mr. Segal, we still have a system in this country where you

elect an MP locally. And these people are not talking about what the elites

want out of David Emerson, about saying oh he'll be great in foreign trade and

he'll resolve the softwood lumber dispute which, by the way, he hasn't

managed to do for the last two years. They're saying we voted on issues of

trust, we voted on issues of day care, we voted on issues of an ethics

package, and we voted for a Liberal. And in fact, many, many of them said it

was a choice between NDP and Liberal. Never did it occur to them that they

would end up 24 hours after the election, after they cast the vote for, with a

politician who was making a deal with what they see as the devil. So don't say

this is typical. This is not typical of a politician getting into bed with the very

people that his own constituents were trying to stop merely 24 hours after the

vote took place.

TOBIN: And let me just jump in if I can. I just want to jump in. I don't think

you can equate, and I know my friend Hugh doesn't really expect that one

would equate this circumstance with Belinda Stronach. This is two weeks after

the election. This is obviously within days of the election there is a dialogue,

a negotiation occurring. In the case of Belinda Stronach, very clear and public

split over the issue. Not just over weeks but over many, many months in

particular of same-sex marriage, and other social policy questions as well. This

is day and night. I mean in David's case, and by the way, you know, I know

David. I respect him. I think he was very good, made a very good contribution

to the private sector as he did as well to the public sector, and I feel actually

sorry for him. I don't know that he truly understands the mess he's now in. But

you can't equate Belinda Stronach with this move.

TABER: I was going to ask Senator Segal about that, because there is a

bunker mentality, and it does seem that Mr. Emerson was not given any

support on the communications level when he made this decision. Why have

the, why has the Harper government retreated and has not been

communicating with Canadians about this?

SEGAL: Well, let me go back to the Emerson thing first of all. One would have

to conclude to buy into Joy's argument, that David Emerson's motivations

were quite venal. I don't think they were. I think they were about public

service. There may be a measure of naivety in that, but I think they were there

for the right reason. I think to some extent you're seeing a contrast between

the Martin administration where Mr. Martin would make 40 to 50

announcements every week, he'd show up at every week, none of which

meant anything, and I think the present government…

TOBIN: Be careful, he did name you to the Senate.

SEGAL: Which is operating more modestly and suggesting that when the

Prime Minister has something to say that is worth saying he will say it. He said

some very important things in the last couple of weeks on the Middle East. He

said some very important things by the person he appointed as ambassador to

Washington. I think we're setting an infrastructure for substantive and

competent government. But the notion that he's not in the news every day and

doing media availability simply because the media are looking for ways to fill

their time, I think indicates some measure of good judgment. There's also the

starting pains of a new government which, by the way, is very view. They

weren't just in office four years ago or three years ago. They've been out of

office for at least 16, 13 years and they're doing their very very best to put it

together.

TABER: Brian Tobin wants to get in there.

TOBIN: Look, the new Prime Minister is not available to the media because the

new Prime Minister doesn't want to explain the kind of angst and anger and

frustration and emotion that Joy has been talking about. That's the only reason

he's not available. Where there good news and were this thing playing well,

he'd be out there talking to the media and being available. But I think he's

making a mistake. If you begin a new government basically thumbing your nose

at the media, after all whose job it is on good days and bad days to

communicate what's happening in Ottawa, you begin a very chilly relationship

with people with whom you have to have a relationship. So I think he's making

a mistake. I think he should go out there. He made the decision. It's his. It

wasn't David Emerson's decision to cross the floor. It was Stephen Harper's

decision to invite him two. Now they're both culpable together, but Stephen

Harper can't, by hiding from the media, hope that this issue passes away

quickly and escapes him. When he comes back to parliament April 3rd, I'm sure

it's going to be there on the floor of the House, and he's going to have to

respond. He may as well respond now.

MACPHAIL: I think there is another issue as well as what's going on here, and

it isn't about Stephen Harper taking the high road about not wanting to have

his face in the media every day. That's a consequence. But I think there's inner

turmoil in the Tory caucus. It's what Brian Tobin referred to at first. There must

be huge angst and concern, anger, confusion, by the Tory caucus. Cabinet

can't even get staff that they, that will work for them now. That's terrible

confusion. So cabinet ministers don't have any assistants out there, and that's

because they started off by shooting themselves in the foot amongst Tories.

They cannot agree on what their message is because they disagree with the

Prime Minister.

TABER: Let's let Senator Segal answer that.

SEGAL: Well, I think the message has been very clear. It's been very clear on

Canada-US relations, it's been very clear on reaching out to people in other

political parties, it's been very clear on trying to find a way to cooperate with

the other political parties in preparation for the House. It's been very clear with

respect to support for the traditional public service. A distinguished public

servant was appointed as our Ambassador to the United Nations. Sends a

message to the public service about their importance in the construct of what's

coming in the months and years ahead. So I think a lot of progress has been

made. Is it ragged? Is it not perfect yet? Are there some areas where there

could be more perfection? Absolutely. But it's also the first 14 days of a new

administration. I think the public, if I may say so, are prepared to cut the

government a bit more slack as they get organized than the media and others

are. And that's all right. It's the media's job to be tough. It's the opposition's

job to be tough.

TABER: Okay, Mr. Tobin, we're running out of time, but I've got to ask you

about Liberal leadership. Are you reconsidering the leadership and what's going

on in that area?

MACPHAIL: Go, Brian go.

TOBIN: And miss the opportunity to sit here with my good friend Hugh and

Joy there in Vancouver and talk to you on a regular basis? Never.

TABER: Your decision has been made. You're not going to reconsider the

leadership?

TOBIN: That's right.

TABER: Okay, and what's happening on the leadership? Who are you going

to support?

SEGAL: Great loss to the country.

TOBIN: I think we're going to see a great number of candidates coming

forward over the next period of time. I think the fact that the air is cleared

about Frank McKenna, myself and others who are not running, John Manley

not running, gives an opportunity for a lot of candidates who would otherwise,

perhaps, take a little more time to be known to be focused on, and I think we

are going to see a great many of those candidates coming forward over the

next period of time. But there's really no rush for any of them to declare right

away. I think they're out scoping the ground. They're talking to colleagues,

they're talking to riding associations. They've got to raise money. But I think

you'll see a very vigorous campaign with six or seven or eight candidates in the

race.

TABER: Okay, thank you very much. We're out of time. I want to thank Joy

MacPhail from the NDP. She's in Vancouver. And our two guests in Toronto,

Brian Tobin from the Liberals and Conservative Senator Hugh Segal. Thank you.

MACPHAIL: Thank you.

SEGAL: Thanks.

TOBIN: Thank you.
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OTTAWA (CP) \_ A new poll suggests Tory support is as strong as it was in the Jan. 23 election, despite the political furor over Stephen Harper's cabinet choices.

The Decima poll, conducted March 9-13, suggests the Conservatives had the support of 37 per cent of decided voters, up slightly from the 36 per cent of the vote they won on election day.

The Liberals had the support of 28 per cent, down from 30 per cent on election night.

The New Democrats were up to 19 per cent after taking 18 per cent of the January vote, and the Bloc Quebecois had 10 per cent, down from 11 per cent.

''In this week's poll, the Conservatives have more support than the Liberals in every part of the country except for Ontario, where they trail by only three percentage points,'' said Bruce Anderson, Decima's chief executive officer.

Harper has come under some sharp political criticism for a couple of controversial cabinet appointments.

David Emerson ***changed parties*** to join the Tory cabinet just two weeks after being elected as a Liberal. And Michael Fortier, who didn't run in the election, accepted a Senate appointment to take the public works portfolio.

But that does not seem to have shaken public support.

''While not enjoying an extraordinary honeymoon, the Conservatives are certainly not losing ground in their early weeks in office,'' Anderson said.

He also said the Tories seem to be gaining ground among younger people and women ''as anxiety about the social policy agenda may be dissipating.''

The poll was conducted as part of Decima's national omnibus telephone survey. It was based on a sample of 1,012 people and is considered accurate to within 3.1 percentage points 19 times in 20.
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HALIFAX - Federal Agriculture Minister Chuck Strahl says Canadians will judge the new Conservative government by what it gets done in its spring legislative package.

Strahl, long known for his direct style, says despite some criticism about the government's performance in its first few weeks in office, the Conservatives have adapted well to a steep learning curve.

He says Prime Minister Stephen Harper's commitment in five major areas, including tax relief, hospital waiting times and choice in child care, has helped to focus the cabinet on the "big issues."

Strahl says the prime minister has not been deterred by "partisan political flak" over issues like the defection of International Trade Minister David Emerson from the Liberals to the Conservatives.

Strahl spoke to reporters following a meeting with Nova Scotia Agriculture Minister Ron Chisholm in Halifax.

The minister also announced a $370,000 dollar federal contribution toward promoting food safety in Nova Scotia's agricultural sector.

Meanwhile, a new poll suggests Tory support is as strong as it was in the Jan. 23 election, despite the political furor over Harper's cabinet choices.

The Decima poll, conducted March 9-13, suggests the Conservatives had the support of 37 per cent of decided voters, up slightly from the 36 per cent of the vote they won on election day.

The Liberals had the support of 28 per cent, down from 30 per cent on election night.

The New Democrats were up to 19 per cent after taking 18 per cent of the January vote, and the Bloc Quebecois had 10 per cent, down from 11 per cent.

"In this week's poll, the Conservatives have more support than the Liberals in every part of the country except for Ontario, where they trail by only three percentage points," said Bruce Anderson, Decima's chief executive officer.

Harper has come under some sharp political criticism for a couple of controversial cabinet appointments.

Emerson ***changed parties*** to join the Tory cabinet just two weeks after being elected as a Liberal. And Michael Fortier, who didn't run in the election, accepted a Senate appointment to take the public works portfolio.

But that does not seem to have shaken public support.

"While not enjoying an extraordinary honeymoon, the Conservatives are certainly not losing ground in their early weeks in office," Anderson said.

He also said the Tories seem to be gaining ground among younger people and women "as anxiety about the social policy agenda may be dissipating."

The poll was conducted as part of Decima's national omnibus telephone survey. It was based on a sample of 1,012 people and is considered accurate to within 3.1 percentage points 19 times in 20.
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A new poll suggests Tory support is as strong as it was in the Jan. 23 election, despite the political furor over Stephen Harper's cabinet choices.

The Decima poll, conducted March 9-13, suggests the Conservatives had the support of 37 per cent of decided voters, up slightly from the 36 per cent of the vote they won on election day.

The Liberals had the support of 28 per cent, down from 30 per cent on election night.

The New Democrats were up to 19 per cent after taking 18 per cent of the January vote, and the Bloc Quebecois had 10 per cent, down from 11 per cent.

"In this week's poll, the Conservatives have more support than the Liberals in every part of the country except for Ontario, where they trail by only three percentage points," said Bruce Anderson, Decima's chief executive officer.

Harper has come under some sharp political criticism for a couple of controversial cabinet appointments.

David Emerson ***changed parties*** to join the Tory cabinet just two weeks after being elected as a Liberal. And Michael Fortier, who didn't run in the election, accepted a Senate appointment to take the public works portfolio.

But that does not seem to have shaken public support.

"While not enjoying an extraordinary honeymoon, the Conservatives are certainly not losing ground in their early weeks in office," Anderson said. He also said the Tories seem to be gaining ground among younger people and women "as anxiety about the social policy agenda may be dissipating."
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OTTAWA (CP) -- A new poll suggests Tory support is as strong as it was in the Jan. 23 election, despite the political furor over Stephen Harper's cabinet choices.

The Decima poll, conducted March 9-13, suggests the Conservatives had the support of 37 per cent of decided voters, up slightly from the 36 per cent of the vote they won on election day.

The Liberals had the support of 28 per cent, down from 30 per cent on election night.

The New Democrats were up to 19 per cent after taking 18 per cent of the January vote, and the Bloc Quebecois had 10 per cent, down from 11 per cent.

"In this week's poll, the Conservatives have more support than the Liberals in every part of the country except for Ontario, where they trail by only three percentage points," said Bruce Anderson, Decima's chief executive officer.

Harper has come under some sharp political criticism for a couple of controversial cabinet appointments.

David Emerson ***changed parties*** to join the Tory cabinet just two weeks after being elected as a Liberal. And Michael Fortier, who didn't run in the election, accepted a Senate appointment to take the public works portfolio.

But that does not seem to have shaken public support.

"While not enjoying an extraordinary honeymoon, the Conservatives are certainly not losing ground in their early weeks in office," Anderson said.

He also said the Tories seem to be gaining ground among younger people and women "as anxiety about the social policy agenda may be dissipating."

The poll was conducted as part of Decima's national omnibus telephone survey. It was based on a sample of 1,012 people and is considered accurate to within 3.1 percentage points 19 times in 20.
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I will never forget my first Sunday service in Cape Breton. It was a hot July morning and I was wearing my clerical gown and green stole, symbolizing ordinary time. An elderly woman was waiting in line to shake my hand and I could tell she was angry. Her face was stern and as I began to greet her she pointed to my stole and said "imagine, a Protestant minister, wearing green on Orangeman's Sunday!" I had no idea.

That was 15 years ago and the chances of that happening again are next to nil. Those were the days when my mother's parents were Protestant, voted Tory and cheered for the Maple Leafs. My Dad's mum was likewise. However, my Dad's dad was Roman Catholic, voted Liberal and cheered for the Habs. It was just that simple.

In those days you inherited your political and spiritual identity. It was a given. It would have been heresy to change your party of choice, and worse to change your denomination. If you did it was almost always for reasons of marriage, not ideology or theology.

When exactly this changed I can't be sure, but change it did. I went to the only seminary in North America where people of three denominations; Roman Catholic, Anglican and United, studied as one student body under an integrated faculty. When this experiment in ecumenism began in 1971 you didn't need a program to tell the players apart. United Church candidates for ministry hung out together, Anglicans and Roman Catholics likewise. The challenge for the administration and faculty was to find ways and means to bring this disparate group of Christians together.

Fast forward to my days at the school, 1988 to 1990, and it was a whole different scene. Once again students were to be found in three distinctive units, but instead of Roman Catholic, Anglican and United you found conservative, liberal and what many would call "liberation theology." This was so profound an issue that each denomination was forced to employ formation directors to remind their fellow Roman Catholic, Anglican or United believer that they did indeed have their own tradition.

As a result you had many lay Roman Catholic women studying theology becoming Anglican because they felt called to the priesthood. You had conservative United Church candidates switching to the Anglican church because they didn't ordain gays and lesbians. And you had some high-church Anglicans becoming Roman Catholic because they thought their own church was becoming too liberal. Talk about crossing the floor!

I remember well that the gay pride parade would attract liberation and liberal Christians from all three denominations. And likewise, I remember pro-life rallies that did the same. Look around Toronto and you will find the same thing. Denominational identity just doesn't have the same passion as a theological perspective. Hold a conference on "what is a Roman Catholic" or "Anglican liturgy" or "United Church polity" and you'll be lucky to fill a bus stop. But put up posters that call for Christians to unite around Third World debt, abortion, or same-sex marriage and you'll find a large body of believers, strangely familiar with each other despite their various denominational labels.

As a minister in the United Church I have seen hundreds of Roman Catholics who have started attending our services because of our stance on women's issues and gay issues. But I have also witnessed just as many of my own denomination leave for more conservative denominations on the same issues.

And politics is the same. I took a lot of ribbing for switching from long-time support for the NDP to the Liberals. But as I look back on my ideological beliefs I note that little has changed. I didn't change because I married into the Liberal party (that's for sure!), nor to get a better job, but because I realized that my strange hybrid of passions; social justice and debt reduction, just didn't fit into an NDP platform anywhere west of Saskatchewan or east of Manitoba. I have great respect for Scott Brison, and less so for Belinda Stronach, who left their party over matters of principle. In Brison's case he accurately surmised that attending weekly caucus meetings with Christians who thought he was destined for hell couldn't be stomached. Stronach did express similar concerns about Stephen Harper's commitment to gays and a woman's right to choose, but I am not clear that was her entire reason for shifting parties.

I think the reason David Emerson's defection is so repugnant to the public today is that the motivation had nothing to do with ideology. Emerson himself says he ***changed parties*** to be in cabinet, period. Back in the day that might have been acceptable. But today there would have to be some compelling matter of principle to convince the voter it was necessary. And there wasn't.

I think for Emerson's sins this Lent he should have to sit in the back pew, I mean backbench.

Kevin Little is a United Church minister in Toronto.
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David Emerson says he just wants to be treated like fellow turncoats Belinda Stronach and Scott Brison. Obviously, he still doesn't get it. Although all three crossed the floor of the House of Commons, both Stronach and Brison did so after very public differences with their party. Both did so at a time when they would face election almost immediately (when Stronach ***changed parties***, it was by no means certain that the Liberals would win an immediate non-confidence vote in Parliament). Emerson switched parties after having campaigned vigorously against the Conservatives, when an election was not imminent. He never indicated (before or since) that he had differences with the Liberal party, only that he felt that he could contribute more as a member of the Conservative cabinet.

It is not up to Emerson to decide this. It is up to the voters in his riding -- a riding that is decidedly not in favour of the Conservatives, as your excellent March 18 article "Emerson riding leans hard to port" so well demonstrated.

Cindy Swoveland

Vancouver
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On the April morning next Monday when Canada's 39th Parliament convenes for its first session, a criminal regime in Sudan will still be starving, raping and slaughtering people on a scale unmatched since a comparable catastrophe occurred in Rwanda 14 years ago. When Governor-General Michaëlle Jean reads the Speech from the Throne on Tuesday, is it possible that she will speak of daycare centres and not Darfur? Will she speak of softwood lumber and not Western tariffs on African imports? Will she speak of ethics in government and not subsidized Canadian goods dumped on farmers who work fields with shovels, hoes and bent backs?

In the end, some things are more important than others - and occasionally they are more important than all others. It can take a good mind and a keen conscience to tell the difference. The manifold calamities of contemporary Africa are authentically important. In Africa, the consequences determine life or death. In Canada, they determine less - but they are nevertheless important, equally for economic as for moral reasons.

Conservative Prime Minister Stephen Harper's new government has begun to define its external mission: a principled position in Afghanistan; the correct decision on foreign aid for Hamas. But it has not yet begun to articulate a broader moral dynamic. The latter task should not be left too late. In this context, it's necessary to ask the whereabouts of David Kilgour, the parliamentary renegade who left the Liberal caucus in last year's Commons showdown strictly for reasons of principle and conscience. How can it be that, alone among all the others, Mr. Kilgour is the one abandoned on all sides? Scott Brison, Belinda Stronach, David Emerson - each has been elevated, in one way or another, by his or her desertion. But David Kilgour? He broke ranks with the Liberals in a valiant attempt to get more help for the people of Africa. The government was preoccupied with its own survival. Mr. Kilgour hasn't stopped.

Now back from a five-week tour of four African countries, he spoke two weeks ago at an ethics symposium in Oklahoma City. Africa's 880 million people, he said, should be "the first priority" of any new foreign policy initiatives adopted by the Canadian government - or, for that matter, by any government of a mature democracy. The continent generates only 1.3 per cent of global gross domestic product. Its share of world trade is half what it was in the 1980s. In the past five decades, it has received more than $1-trillion (U.S.) in assistance, yet its people are now worse off than they were in the 1950s. Half of them live on less than $1 a day. As many as half are illiterate. Of the 25 countries ranked lowest by the UN's human development index, all are African.

These facts require a Canadian response. Why so? Because we are one of the wealthy countries that persist with economic policies that keep Africans down. As Mr. Kilgour says: "African imports are blocked by our quotas on African farm products and by our steep tariffs.

We wealthy countries then compound this injustice by giving our own farm producers huge subsidies, amounting over all to a billion dollars a day. These subsidies exceed the entire economic output of sub-Saharan Africa. The final insult arrives when Western food surpluses are dumped into Africa. What could be more unprincipled?" It's worse. All of these protectionist practices hurt Canadians, too.

In the final analysis, economics and moral conduct are equal strands in the same, interwoven fabric. A certain minimal amount of decent government is another. Ultimately, as Mr. Kilgour says, Canada must support military intervention in Darfur, where perhaps half a million people have already died, and in other criminal states.

At the very least, development aid given to rogue states must be terminated "immediately" in favour of moving funds to responsible non-governmental organizations.

All governments, he says, must know that strict moral rules are in place - "and donor countries must apply them without fear or favour."

In the morality tests that people can give themselves to assess retroactively the vigour of their consciences, they may ask hypothetically what position they would have taken in 1938 on the Munich Agreement, on peace in our time with Hitler. Or what position they would have taken on military intervention in Rwanda in 1994. (In taking this particular test, former U.S. president Bill Clinton has called his decision not to act "the worst mistake I ever made.") In the past 25 years, no Canadian could take this kind of moral time-test and pass with such flying colours as David Kilgour, the MP who ***changed parties*** twice but who walked away without changing principles once. Mr. Kilgour says things that make governments nervous. But he says things that need saying - not least, from the Throne.

*neilreynolds@rogers.com*
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On the April morning next Monday when Canada's 39th Parliament convenes for its first session, a criminal regime in Sudan will still be starving, raping and slaughtering people on a scale unmatched since a comparable catastrophe occurred in Rwanda 14 years ago. When Governor-General Michaëlle Jean reads the Speech from the Throne on Tuesday, is it possible that she will speak of daycare centres and not Darfur? Will she speak of softwood lumber and not Western tariffs on African imports? Will she speak of ethics in government and not subsidized Canadian goods dumped on farmers who work fields with shovels, hoes and bent backs?

In the end, some things are more important than others -- and occasionally they are more important than all others. It can take a good mind and a keen conscience to tell the difference. The manifold calamities of contemporary Africa are authentically important. In Africa, the consequences determine life or death. In Canada, they determine less -- but they are nevertheless important, equally for economic as for moral reasons.

Conservative Prime Minister Stephen Harper's new government has begun to define its external mission: a principled position in Afghanistan; the correct decision on foreign aid for Hamas. But it has not yet begun to articulate a broader moral dynamic. The latter task should not be left too late. In this context, it's necessary to ask the whereabouts of David Kilgour, the parliamentary renegade who left the Liberal caucus in last year's Commons showdown strictly for reasons of principle and conscience. How can it be that, alone among all the others, Mr. Kilgour is the one abandoned on all sides? Scott Brison, Belinda Stronach, David Emerson -- each has been elevated, in one way or another, by his or her desertion. But David Kilgour? He broke ranks with the Liberals in a valiant attempt to get more help for the people of Africa. The government was preoccupied with its own survival. Mr. Kilgour hasn't stopped.

Now back from a five-week tour of four African countries, he spoke two weeks ago at an ethics symposium in Oklahoma City. Africa's 880 million people, he said, should be "the first priority" of any new foreign policy initiatives adopted by the Canadian government -- or, for that matter, by any government of a mature democracy. The continent generates only 1.3 per cent of global gross domestic product. Its share of world trade is half what it was in the 1980s. In the past five decades, it has received more than $1-trillion (U.S.) in assistance, yet its people are now worse off than they were in the 1950s. Half of them live on less than $1 a day. As many as half are illiterate. Of the 25 countries ranked lowest by the UN's human development index, all are African.

These facts require a Canadian response. Why so? Because we are one of the wealthy countries that persist with economic policies that keep Africans down. As Mr. Kilgour says: "African imports are blocked by our quotas on African farm products and by our steep tariffs.

We wealthy countries then compound this injustice by giving our own farm producers huge subsidies, amounting over all to a billion dollars a day. These subsidies exceed the entire economic output of sub-Saharan Africa. The final insult arrives when Western food surpluses are dumped into Africa. What could be more unprincipled?" It's worse. All of these protectionist practices hurt Canadians, too.

In the final analysis, economics and moral conduct are equal strands in the same, interwoven fabric. A certain minimal amount of decent government is another. Ultimately, as Mr. Kilgour says, Canada must support military intervention in Darfur, where perhaps half a million people have already died, and in other criminal states.

At the very least, development aid given to rogue states must be terminated "immediately" in favour of moving funds to responsible non-governmental organizations.

All governments, he says, must know that strict moral rules are in place -- "and donor countries must apply them without fear or favour."

In the morality tests that people can give themselves to assess retroactively the vigour of their consciences, they may ask hypothetically what position they would have taken in 1938 on the Munich Agreement, on peace in our time with Hitler. Or what position they would have taken on military intervention in Rwanda in 1994. (In taking this particular test, former U.S. president Bill Clinton has called his decision not to act "the worst mistake I ever made.") In the past 25 years, no Canadian could take this kind of moral time-test and pass with such flying colours as David Kilgour, the MP who ***changed parties*** twice but who walked away without changing principles once. Mr. Kilgour says things that make governments nervous. But he says things that need saying -- not least, from the Throne.
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Rick Woodford was a dedicated constituency man whose commitment to his district was rewarded by record-breaking polls, even after a 1996 switch from the Conservatives to the Liberals and after playing a key role in the disastrous Sprung greenhouse affair.

Mr. Woodford served as the elected representative of Humber Valley and Corner Brook for 18 years. He won a seat first as a Tory in 1985, serving in the cabinet of then-premier Brian Peckford as minister of agriculture. After Mr. Peckford left, the Tories lost power in 1989 and Mr. Woodford suddenly found himself in opposition. In 1993, he again won his seat as a Conservative but, three years later, ***changed parties*** and joined the Liberals under Brian Tobin, who was newly returned from Ottawa.

At the time, Mr. Woodford said his constituents wanted a change and hankered to have their MHA in the governing party. Mr. Woodford added that he liked Mr. Tobin, and that was good enough for him.

Mr. Tobin had chanced on Mr. Woodford in St. John's airport soon after he took over the leadership of the Newfoundland Liberal Party. "I said it's too bad because it's the first time we're running directly against each other," Mr. Tobin recalled. "And he said, maybe it didn't have to be that way."

After thinking it over, Mr. Woodford decided to leave the Conservative Party. Typically, he did it in an aboveboard fashion. "He didn't cross the floor," said Mr. Tobin. "He ran for the Liberal nomination and won, and ran in the election as a Liberal, and won."

In any case, Rick Woodford was never beholden to a specific party line. "He was really only interested in working for his community," said Mr. Tobin. "Politics was a means to improving the quality of life."

The switch proved good enough for his constituents, too. In the 1996 provincial election, Mr. Woodford polled 75 per cent of the votes - the highest return in the province.

Mr. Woodford later said he felt some emotion seeing his former colleagues on the other side of the House but did not doubt he'd done the right thing for his district. As a Liberal, he won two more elections in 1996 and 1999.Mr. Woodford often cited three high points in his political career. The first was joining the Liberals. The second was a phone call on Jan. 9, 1989, from Brian Peckford. The premier was on the line because Charlie Power, the provincial minister of agriculture, had just resigned over the Sprung fiasco. Mr. Peckford offered the portfolio. Mr. Woodford knew what he was getting into. At the time, the Sprung greenhouse affair was at its height. The misguided, multimillion dollar project that promised to produce hydroponically grown cucumbers outside of St. John's had just imploded. He suspected, rightly as it turned out, that his low-key, frank approach would dilute the crisis and soothe the fevered political waters.

The third occurred after the 1989 election that saw Clyde Wells installed as Liberal premier. Mr. Woodford was made the Conservative justice critic, and he relished the role. Although he lacked a law degree, he enjoyed holding his own against three highly trained lawyers: Mr. Wells, justice minister Ed Roberts, and NDP leader Jack Harris.

Rick Woodford grew up in Buchans, Newfoundland. He graduated from Xavier High School in 1965, later earning a vocational degree. He credited his love of debate, and his straightforward style, to his high-school public speaking. He believed in a non-confrontational, simple, ordinary method. "Just tell it like it is," he would later advise novice MHAs. "Then you don't have to be going back and picking up the pieces."

Later, Mr. Woodford moved to Cormack, a town on Newfoundland's west coast, where he was mayor for 10 years. He also worked as a dairy farmer and owned a sawmill.

Mr. Woodford was a successful business entrepreneur and a remarkably adept and well-liked politician, but his personal life was not easy. In 1999, he lost his wife Irene Catherine (Crocker), a teacher, to cancer. She was 50. He was typically private about the ordeal but later confided, "you've got to experience something like this [to understand]. It's terrible. It awakens everything in you."

One of the few disclosures he made about his loss was a statement he made to thank the nurses at the hospital where his wife was being treated. The nurses had gone on strike during the last phase of her treatment, and he thanked them for courteously allowing him, a recognizable public figure, to cross the picket lines. He was back at work two weeks after she died.

His Liberal cabinet portfolios included the department of rural, agricultural and northern development and also the ministry of works, services and transportation. The responsibilities of the latter were vast. The department's 3,000 employees oversaw everything from roadwork to firefighting water bombers, and from ambulances to snow clearing. In one day, Mr. Woodford could do nine interviews on seven different issues. His secret to success? "I survived it by telling the truth."

"Rick was a genuine person," said Oliver Langdon, a Liberal MHA. "People think politicians are anything but. On a scale of one to 10, we're minus a million."

In particular, Mr. Woodford put the interests of his constituents before anything else. On most days, after taking a run, his first order of business was a visit to Tim Hortons in Churchill Square in Corner Brook where he picked up the tenor of public talk. There were many examples of Mr. Woodford's community-mindedness, Mr. Langdon said. "One night, Rick got into Deer Lake airport, and it was late and it was stormy. But he had a 50th wedding anniversary certificate in his briefcase, so he drove to Hampton, which was an hour or more away, to deliver it before going home."

Then, all at once, Rick Woodford's life was again turned upside down. Three years after his wife died, he was diagnosed with a brain tumour. At first, it was treated with radiation, which gave him awful headaches. "You take the bloody old painkillers and muck your way through it," he said.

"He came to meetings with excruciating headaches," said Mr. Langdon. "But he was still his jovial self. He still had time for you."

In 2003, Mr. Woodford decided he'd had enough of trying to both fight cancer and adequately fulfill his duties. He resigned his seat and determined to enjoy what remained of his life. Always a lover of the outdoors, he enjoyed snowshoeing and hunting rabbits, and kept a cabin at Birchy Lake, a long, narrow waterway located beside the Trans-Canada Highway about 100 kilometres east of Corner Brook.

At Easter, Mr. Woodford and his girlfriend, Ina Saunders, spent part of the weekend at the cabin. On Saturday, they had arrived at the cabin, which is on the north side of the lake, with a 45-kilogram propane tank. Mr. Woodford, who was always very careful, would have frequently checked the ice. Somehow, the pair went through the ice on the return trip the next day. Both Mr. Woodford and Ms. Saunders, 55, were wearing life jackets. Police later said that autopsies confirmed the couple had both drowned.

"He was an example of civility in politics - a rare, rare guy," said Mr. Tobin. "And all that time in public service, and those incredible battles with his wife's health, and then his own illness. To go through that and finally take a breath and say it's time to do what I want to do, and to find a new relationship, and then to have both of them lost in the spring of the year . . ."

**Rick Woodford was born in St. John's Oct. 7, 1947. He died in Birchy Lake, Newfoundland, on April 17, 2006. He was 58. He leaves his daughter, Tanya.**
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OTTAWA (CP) \_ The Liberals and NDP are banding together in a last-ditch effort to force the Conservative government to address political floor-crossing in the Federal Accountability Act.

An amendment proposed by the Liberals calls for a byelection if a simple majority of constituents in an MP's riding sign a petition. Organizers of such petitions would have 60 days from the time an MP switched parties to gather signatures.

The move is in response to the outcry over cabinet minister David Emerson crossing the floor to the Conservatives from the Liberals just weeks after the last election. But the proposed measure would not be retroactive, so Emerson wouldn't be affected.

''It also gives the MP the opportunity to go straight back to his constituents and explain why he felt it was the best thing to do to change parties,'' said Liberal MP Stephen Owen.

''It gives both the actual voters who felt betrayed and the member who ***changed parties*** to express themselves in an effective way.''

The Liberals and NDP need one more MP on the committee studying the Accountability Act to agree to the amendment. They are likely to exert pressure on Conservative MP Pierre Poilievre, who last year put forward a private member's bill introducing similar guidelines for recalling MPs.

The NDP also has a series of amendments to propose to the Accountability Act \_ which is aimed at making government more accountable and transparent in the wake of the sponsorship scandal \_ most notably one that would address the issue of minors donating to politicians.

The measure would stipulate that if a minor made a financial contribution, the amount would be subtracted from the proposed $1,000 a parent is eligible to make.

New Democrat MP Pat Martin pushed for the change after it was revealed Liberal Leadership candidate Joe Volpe received thousands of dollars worth of donations from teens and pre-teens related to pharmaceutical executives.

''It doesn't preclude some bright young youth from getting involved if they choose to, but it also means that parents can't exceed the donational limit by laundering money through their children's bank accounts,'' Martin said.

The Accountability Act has been moving through a legislative committee at a blistering pace, largely due to the help of the NDP, which is backing the government on the bill. It's expected to go to the House of Commons for a vote next week.

It's unclear whether the Senate committee pegged to examine the legislation will sit through the summer, but some Liberals Senators have said they fail to see the urgency in getting the mostly regulatory bill passed.

Treasury Board President John Baird announced Tuesday that in conjunction with the act, he's appointing a blue-ribbon panel to see how to streamline the grant-application process for charities and non-profit organizations.

''When you have an organization getting a $5,000 grant to do public good, and having to live up to a 75-page application, that's not doing taxypayers any favours, that's not doing the charity any favours, and certainly not doing the public service any favours,'' Baird said.

The charitable sector has complained that the Accountability Act might be creating more work for it's cash-strapped organizations.

One element of the act requires anybody who lobbies the federal government to file reports every time they meet with public office holders. The Canadian Society of Association Executives has called on the government to exempt charities and non-profits from the requirement.

''We are also concerned that increasing this compliance requirement will prove to be a more onerous, time-consuming burden that will result in a loss of productivity for many not-for-profit organizations currently facing resource constraints,'' the society said in its submission to the Commons committee.
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The Liberals and NDP are banding together in a last-ditch effort to force the Conservative government to address political floor-crossing in the Federal Accountability Act.

An amendment proposed by the Liberals calls for a byelection if a simple majority of constituents in an MP's riding sign a petition.

Organizers of such petitions would have 60 days from the time an MP switched parties to gather signatures.

The move is in response to the outcry over cabinet minister David Emerson crossing the floor to the Conservatives from the Liberals just weeks after the last election. But the proposed measure would not be retroactive, so Emerson wouldn't be affected.

'It also gives the MP the opportunity to go straight back to his constituents and explain why he felt it was the best thing to do to change parties,' Liberal MP Stephen Owen said.

'It gives both the actual voters who felt betrayed and the member who ***changed parties*** to express themselves in an effective way.'

The Liberals and NDP need one more MP on the committee studying the Accountability Act to agree to the amendment. They are likely to exert pressure on Conservative MP Pierre Poilievre, who last year put forward a private member's bill introducing similar guidelines for recalling MPs.

More proposals

The NDP also has a series of amendments to propose to the Accountability Act - which is aimed at making government more accountable and transparent in the wake of the sponsorship scandal - most notably one that would address the issue of minors donating to politicians.

The measure would stipulate that if a minor made a financial contribution, the amount would be subtracted from the proposed $1, 000 a parent is eligible to make.

New Democrat MP Pat Martin pushed for the change after it was revealed Liberal Leadership candidate Joe Volpe received thousands of dollars worth of donations from teens and pre-teens related to pharmaceutical executives.

'It doesn't preclude some bright young youth from getting involved if they choose to, but it also means that parents can't exceed the donational limit by laundering money through their children's bank accounts,' Martin said.

Blistering pace

The Accountability Act has been moving through a legislative committee at a blistering pace, largely due to the help of the NDP, which is backing the government on the bill. It's expected to go to the House of Commons for a vote next week.
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The Liberals and NDP are banding together in a last-ditch effort to force the Conservative government to address political floor-crossing in the Federal Accountability Act.

An amendment proposed by the Liberals calls for a byelection if a simple majority of constituents in an MP's riding sign a petition. Organizers of such petitions would have 60 days from the time an MP switched parties to gather signatures.

The move is in response to the outcry over cabinet minister David Emerson crossing the floor to the Conservatives from the Liberals just weeks after the last election. But the proposed measure would not be retroactive, so Emerson wouldn't be affected.

"It gives both the actual voters who felt betrayed and the member who ***changed parties*** (a chance) to express themselves in an effective way," Liberal MP Stephen Owen said.

The Liberals and NDP need one more MP on the committee studying the Accountability Act to agree to the amendment. They are likely to exert pressure on Conservative MP Pierre Poilievre, who last year put forward a private member's bill introducing similar guidelines for recalling MPs.

The Accountablitiy Act is expected to go to the House of Commons for a vote next week.

Treasury Board President John Baird announced yesterday that in conjunction with the act, he's appointing a blue-ribbon panel to see how to streamline the grant-application process for charities and non-profit organizations.

"When you have an organization getting a $5,000 grant to do public good, and having to live up to a 75-page application, that's not doing taxpayers any favours, that's not doing the charity any favours, and certainly not doing the public service any favours,'' Baird said.

The charitable sector has complained that the Accountability Act might be creating more work for its cash-strapped organizations.

One element of the act requires anybody who lobbies the federal government to file reports every time they meet with public office holders. The Canadian Society of Association Executives has called on the government to exempt charities and non-profits from the requirement.
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Do you suppose Prime Minister Stephen Harper will lean over and whisper into George W. Bush's ear on July 6 and ask coyly, "Did you like your birthday present?"

We are at a loss otherwise as to why federal Trade Minister David Emerson -- who supposedly ***changed parties*** in order to serve Canada better -- would be defending the proposed softwood-lumber settlement signed in Geneva on Canada's birthday.

Sure, we understand that Harper would dearly love to benefit from warmer relations with the Bush administration than the Liberals enjoyed. But the question remains: At what cost?

On Friday, B.C. forest industry representatives finally convinced the B.C. government to abandon its support of the U.S.-led settlement proposal. A joint letter was sent to Emerson communicating that fact, but Emerson ignored it and signed the deal anyway.

We can only assume he was ordered to since Emerson's defence of the agreement -- that it will bring long-term stability to the forest industry -- does not stand up to even casual scrutiny.

What is clear about the agreement, if Harper is foolish enough to sign it Thursday, is that Canada will never recover all of the illegal U.S. duties that it is owed because all outstanding litigation against the United States will be dropped, and that either side can walk away from the deal after only 23 months. We don't call 23 months a long-term agreement.

Fortunately a remedy is in the hands of the forest companies themselves: the major softwood suppliers must agree to the deal or it dies.

We are betting it will.
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High-profile Liberal Belinda Stronach should have been in a caucus session Wednesday but wasn't. Instead, she joined me for coffee, reflecting on her life in politics.

The 40-year-old divorced mother of two made a splashy dive into the Canadian political pool two years ago and has been making waves ever since.

In 2004, she ran, albeit unsuccessfully, to lead the Conservatives -- a new party she was instrumental in cobbling together from the Canadian Alliance and Progressive Conservative forces.

Elected as an Ontario MP, she ***changed parties*** a year later, after a falling-out with new leader Stephen Harper, controversially transforming herself into a Liberal and gleaning a cabinet post from then-PM Paul Martin.

This past spring, she seriously considered trying for the leadership of her new party, but in the end thought she'd rather play the role of free-wheeling party activist, touting an agenda of change.

"It was a tough decision," she recalls, adding she doesn't rule out the possibility of a leadership run at some future time. To date, she hasn't decided which of the 10 competitors will get her vote.

Possibly to her consternation, none of Stronach's political acrobatics to date has gotten more media play than her May 2005 post-fling breakup with Peter MacKay, then the Conservatives' foreign affairs critic.

MacKay took on the role of broken-hearted lover last summer, pathetically retreating to a potato patch in his home riding of Nova Scotia, comforted by the task of planting, family dog at his side.

Stronach laughs, "I don't eat potatoes," then turns serious, saying of the breakup, "It was very difficult. People have no appreciation for how difficult that breakup was."

Have she and Peter met for coffee since and patched up things? Apparently not.

"We are not drinking a lot of coffee together, no." Nor does she even have a working relationship with MacKay as foreign affairs minister, only a professional one whereby she might bring constituents' concerns to his attention, on an as-needed basis.

Wounds have been slow to heal as well following her dustup with Harper.

Their falling-out upon her departure from the Conservative caucus followed a difficult meeting in Harper's Opposition leader's office, attended by the leader along with MPs Jay Hill and Rob Nicholson. "We had a strong difference of opinion."

The discussion centred on Stronach's determination to split with the party position against a Liberal budget, for the sake of her Newmarket-Aurora constituents.

Since that time she and Harper "have not had a lengthy or any conversation."

Stronach reports she felt immediately welcome and ideologically comfortable in the Liberal party. She's totally relaxed about speaking freely on any issue.

She has several she is championing at the moment.

Aside from heading the party's women's caucus, she is pushing for the party to adopt a system of leadership selection based on one member, one vote.

Stronach, who is her party's critic for "competitiveness and the new economy," is also organizing a summit in Montreal next November to focus attention on a possible Canadian role in advancing a so-called green revolution in Africa. The project is aimed at improving farming methods to increase agricultural production. The issue of educating girls in poor countries is also at the top of her agenda.

She says she's in politics for the long haul, or at least as long as she can be productive.

As to the celebrity factor that dogs the autoparts heiress everywhere she goes in public life, she shrugs in exasperation: "I have no idea, I don't get it, I don't know, I don't think it affects me as a person."

On the glam front, during our chat, Stronach was attired in a tailored navy blue pantsuit and a pair of turquoise and navy blue open-toed stilettos to die for; a delicate chain with an oversized diamond adorned her neck.

She remains friends with former U.S. president Bill Clinton and the two speak by phone "from time to time."

While not "playing the field," Stronach says she's enjoying dating but isn't prepared to name any names.

"When the time is right, I'll be the first to call you."

[*byaffe@png.canwest.com*](mailto:byaffe@png.canwest.com)
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Recently, I was given a list of Liberal supporters to phone and remind them to come and elect our delegates for the Liberal party convention in Montreal beginning Dec. 3.

When asked how I'd be voting I replied, "Bob Rae." In some cases, people remarked that he had ***changed parties***. I replied that he believed in his former party when he was the premier of Ontario years ago, but since those days he has become a top Canadian mediator at all levels of government, has worked on post-secondary education, aboriginal issues, and constitutional changes in Iraq. His vision for Canada as a Liberal is great, as was evident at a breakfast get-together hosted by Shawky Fahel.

As a graduate of Harvard University, a Rhodes Scholar, and a chancellor of Wilfrid Laurier University, Rae has shown to Liberal party members that he is ready for the top leadership position, with no baggage!

Sue King

Kitchener Federal Liberal Association

Kitchener
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REGINA -- The Saskatchewan Party says the NDP must be pretty desperate if it's thinking about changing its name.

But the NDP says if anyone knows about that kind of desperation, it would be the Saskatchewan Party.

News that a constituency association has proposed a name change for the NDP from the New Democratic Party to the Social Democratic Party at the NDP's upcoming convention prompted some Opposition jibes in question period Thursday.

Saskatchewan Party Leader Brad Wall announced his party would hold a contest and invited provincial residents to make their own suggestions for a replacement name for the NDP.

"We already have some submissions for the name because everywhere we go . . . you'd be surprised how creative people are in terms of what they call that governing party opposite," Wall said to guffaws from his caucus.

"We've seen it already on Highway 368 on signs: No Darn Pavement, the New Destruction Party, New Democratic Potholes. There's any number of suggestions out there."

Wall also took aim at Industry and Resources Minister Eric Cline, who mused to reporters Wednesday that a ***changed party*** name should perhaps incorporate the word Saskatchewan, since he was bothered the Opposition had laid claim to the province's name.

"They want to steal our policies. They want to steal our name," said Wall.

Wall said the NDP is trying to run from its record by contemplating a name change.

But Premier Lorne Calvert said that was pretty rich coming from the Saskatchewan Party, which was formed by Progressive Conservative and some Liberal MLAs in 1997.

The Progressive Conservative party, tainted by the Tory fraud scandal and the fiscal record of the Conservative government in the 1980s, was put in hibernation.

Calvert wondered why there's no mention of Wall's work as a ministerial assistant in the Grant Devine government in his official bio.

"If there was ever a pot calling the kettle black, this is it. That's the group of Conservatives that had no alternative but to change their name to hide from their record," Calvert said to cheers from his own caucus.

The proposed constitutional amendment was put forward by the Batoche NDP constituency association, which said a name change would reflect the party's social democratic principles. The constituency association also said the party is no longer new.

Party officials have said the party name has never been a major topic of discussion on the provincial level. It appears the amendment is unlikely to pass at the Nov. 17 to 19 convention in Saskatoon, given that it would require a two-thirds majority.

Outside the legislative chamber, Calvert told reporters he loves the debate, but said he's proud of the name of the Saskatchewan New Democratic Party.

"It stands for the record that we stand with and the future we propose."

However, at least some other cabinet ministers were like Cline and said they might consider a party name change.

Finance Minister Andrew Thomson said he was proud to run under the NDP banner, but he also considers himself a social democrat.

"I believe in economic growth but I also believe in social progress, and if that better reflects the objective of the party, I would be prepared to run under that banner," he said.

Social Democratic Party is a common name for left-wing parties in other countries, with parties in Sweden and Germany being perhaps the most notable.

[*jwood@sp.canwest.com*](mailto:jwood@sp.canwest.com)
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The Saskatchewan Party says the NDP must be pretty desperate if it's thinking about changing its name.

The NDP says if anyone knows about that kind of desperation, it would be the Saskatchewan Party.

News that a constituency association has proposed a name change from the New Democratic Party to the Social Democratic Party at the upcoming NDP convention prompted some Opposition jibes in question period Thursday.

Saskatchewan Party leader Brad Wall announced his party would hold a contest and he invited provincial residents to make their own suggestions for a replacement name for the NDP.

"We already have some submissions for the name because everywhere we go ... you'd be surprised how creative people are in terms of what they call that governing party opposite," Wall said to guffaws from his caucus.

"We've seen it already on Highway 368 on signs 'No Darn Pavement, the New Destruction Party, New Democratic Potholes.' There's any number of suggestions out there."

Wall also took aim at Industry and Resources Minister Eric Cline, who mused to reporters Thursday that a ***changed party*** name should perhaps incorporate Saskatchewan, since he was bothered the Opposition had laid claim to the province's name.

"They want to steal our policies, they want to steal our name," said Wall.

Wall said the NDP was trying to run from its record by contemplating a name change. But Premier Lorne Calvert said that was pretty rich coming from the Saskatchewan Party, which was formed by Progressive Conservative and some Liberal MLAs in 1997.

The Progressive Conservative party, tainted by the Tory fraud scandal and the fiscal record of the Conservative government in the 1980s, was put in hibernation. Calvert wondered why there's no mention of Brad Wall's work as a ministerial assistant in the Grant Devine government in his official bio.

"If there was ever a pot calling the kettle black, this is it. That's the group of Conservatives that had no alternative but to change their name to hide from their record," said Calvert.

The proposed constitutional amendment was put forward by the Batoche NDP constituency association, which said a name change would reflect the party's social democratic principles and that the party is no longer new.

Party officials have said the party name has never been a major topic of discussion on the provincial level. It appears the amendment is unlikely to pass at the Nov. 17-19 convention in Saskatoon, given that it would require a two-thirds majority.

Outside the legislative chamber, Calvert told reporters he loves the debate but "I am proud of the name of the Saskatchewan New Democratic Party. It stands for the record that we stand with and the future we propose."

CanWest News Service

**Load-Date:** November 3, 2006

**End of Document**

[***With vars Liberal Leadership***](http://advance.lexis.com/api/document?collection=news&id=urn:contentItem:4MF9-TSW0-TX4V-K2FS-00000-00&context=)

The Canadian Press(CP)

November 26, 2006 Sunday

Copyright 2006 Press News Limited All Rights Reserved

**Section:** GENERAL AND NATIONAL NEWS

**Length:** 1125 words

**Byline:** THE CANADIAN PRESS, CP

**Body**

Here are brief sketches of the remaining eight candidate for the Liberal leadership:

Scott Brison

Age: 38.

Born: May 5, 1967, in Windsor, N.S.

Education: Bachelor of Commerce from Dalhousie University in Halifax.

Business career: Founded University Rentals Inc., 1987; Canadian sales manager for Aquarius Coatings Inc., 1989 to 1991, North American sales manager, New York, 1991 to 1997; investment banker with Yorkton Securities Inc., in Toronto, March 2000 to January 2003.

Political career: Elected MP for riding of Kings-Hants in 1997 as a Conservative; resigned seat in September 2000 so party leader Joe Clark could run in a by-election; re-elected in general election of 2000; defected to the Liberals on Dec. 10, 2003; elected a Liberal in Kings-Hants on June 28, 2004; named public works minister in July 2004.

Family: Unmarried.

Quote: ''I . . . stand here today as a child of the Charter. That Charter has helped make Canada one of the most socially progressive societies in the world. It means I can serve the country I love as a member of Parliament, a cabinet minister, and even a leader, while being open and honest about who I am as a person.''

Stephane Dion:

Age: 51.

Born: Sept. 28, 1955.

Education: Universite Laval, B.A. 1977, M.A. in 1979; doctorate in sociology from the Institut d'etudes politiques in Paris 1986.

Career: Taught public administration and political science at the Universite de Montreal,1984 to 1996; lectured at the Universite de Moncton in 1984; author of numerous books and scientific articles.

Political experience: Named to cabinet as minister of intergovernmental affairs by Prime Minister Jean Chretien, January 1996; elected to Parliament in a byelection March 1996; re-elected 1997, 2000, 2004 and 2006; environment minister 2004.

Family: Married to Janine Krieber; one daughter, Jeanne.

Quote: ''Underlying our Liberal philosophy is a conciliation of two great human ideals: individual freedom and equal opportunity. I propose that we add another: a healthy environment.''

Ken Dryden:

Age: 59.

Born: Aug. 8 1947, Toronto.

Education: BA Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.; Law McGill University.

Career: Professional hockey player; lawyer, hockey administrator, broadcaster author. Won six Stanley Cups with Montreal Canadiens 1970-79; played 1972 Canada-Russia series; TV commentator 1980, 1984, 1988; published best-seller The Game 1983; named president, Toronto Maple Leafs 1997.

Political experience: First elected to Parliament 2004; re-elected 2006; named minister of social development 2004.

Family: Married to Lynda Dryden; two children, Sarah, Michael.

Quote: ''I'm running because the day after the election day, I was mad. For 18 months we had worked on something that mattered, a national system of early learning and child care. Then it was gone.''

Martha Hall Findlay:

Age: 47.

Born: Aug. 17, 1959.

Education: University of Toronto BA, Osgoode Hall Law School.

Career: Practised corporate and commercial law at private firm; general counsel and corporate secretary Moblity Canada, Bell Mobility; vice-president for corporate development and general counsel The Rider Group; founded The General Counsel Group, a legal and management consulting firm.

Political experience: Ran and lost Newmarket-Aurora riding to Belinda Stronach in 2004 in Newmarket-Aurora; after Stronach ***changed parties***, Findlay did not run in 2006.

Family: Divorced; lives with partner Randy Reynolds; three children: Katie, Everett, Patrick.

Quote: ''As Liberals, we have a choice to make. We can stick with old-style politics that was sometimes successful in the past, or we can embrace the opportunity for the renewal that opposition brings. For me the choice is clear. It's time to renew our approach to politics and to policy.''

Michael Ignatieff:

Age: 59

Born: May 12, 1947, in Toronto.

Education: University of Toronto and at Oxford University; PhD Harvard.

Career: An academic, broadcaster, journalist and author. Worked with TVO, CBC, BBC. Author of 16 books. In 2000, became director of the Carr Center for Human Rights Policy at Harvard.

Political experience: Elected MP for Etobicoke-Lakeshore, January, 2006.

Family: Married to Zsuzsanna Zsohar; two children, Theo and Sophie.

Quote: ''I'm in politics to speak up for a Canada that takes risks, that stands up for what's right. A Canada that leads.''

Gerard Kennedy

Age: 46.

Born: July 26, 1960, The Pas, Man.

Education: Trent University in Peterborough and the University of Alberta in Edmonton.

Career: Founded Canada's first food bank in Edmonton in 1983; moved to Toronto in 1986 and founded its food bank, helped found similar organizations in several other cities.

Political experience: First elected to Ontario legislature in 1996 byelection, re-elected 1999, 2003; appointed minister of education 2003.

Family: Married to Jeanette Arsenault-Kennedy; two children, Theria and John-Julien.

Quote: ''I am able to come in from being most recently a provincial Liberal and look forward. I don't have to explain or justify and that may be part of the advantage we frankly need, because the Liberal party has a very big hill to climb in terms of getting the respect and the apprecation of the public back.''

Bob Rae:

Age: 57.

Born: Aug. 2, 1948, in Ottawa.

Education: Bachelor of Arts and law degree from the University of Toronto; Rhodes Scholar in 1969; philosophy degree from Oxford University in 1971.

Career: Lawyer at international law firm Goodmans LLP; author of two books, From Protest to Power and The Three Questions; officer of the Order of Canada in 2000.

Political experience: Elected to the House of Commons in 1978 representing the Toronto riding of what was then known as Broadview; became Ontario NDP leader in 1982; elected Ontario premier in 1990; defeated in 1995; retired from politics in 1996.

Family: Married to wife Arlene; three daughters.

Quote: ''Some will say that a person who led a government that ran deficits in the early 1990s should not aspire to lead. Let me say this: I made mistakes when I was premier of Ontario. I have learned from them and am the wiser for them.''

Joe Volpe:

Age: 59.

Born:Sept. 21, 1947, Monteleone di Puglia, Italy.

Education: University of Toronto, MA education.

Career: Teacher, vice-principal.

Political experience: First elected to Parliament 1988; re-elected 1993. 2997, 2000, 2004, 2006; parliamentary secretary to the minister of health 1996-98; appointed minister of human resources 2003.

Family: Married to Mirella Volpe; four children, Luciano, Flavio, Letitzia, Massimo.

Quote: ''For my dad, and for all of us, the Liberal party was, and is, the vehicle of hope. We don't need to re-invent the party. We just need to give it back to the people who are its rightful owners. We need to take it back from the back room players who hide behind new faces.''
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Scott Brison

Age: 38.

Born: May 5, 1967, in Windsor, N.S.

Education: Bachelor of Commerce from Dalhousie University in Halifax.

Career: Founded University Rentals Inc., 1987; Canadian sales manager for Aquarius Coatings Inc., 1989 to 1991, North American sales manager, New York, 1991 to 1997; investment banker with Yorkton Securities Inc., in Toronto, March 2000 to January 2003.

Political career: Elected MP for riding of Kings-Hants in 1997 as a Conservative; resigned seat in September 2000 so party leader Joe Clark could run in a byelection; re-elected in general election of 2000; defected to the Liberals on Dec. 10, 2003; elected a Liberal in Kings-Hants on June 28, 2004; named public works minister in July 2004.

Family: Single.

Stephane Dion

Age: 51.

Born: Sept. 28, 1955, in Quebec City.

Education: Universite Laval, BA 1977, MA in 1979; doctorate in sociology from the Institut d'etudes politiques in Paris 1986.

Career: Taught public administration and political science at the Universite de Montreal,1984 to 1996; lectured at the Universite de Moncton in 1984; author of numerous books and scientific articles.

Political experience: Named to cabinet as minister of intergovernmental affairs by Prime Minister Jean Chrétien, January 1996; elected to Parliament in a byelection March 1996; re-elected 1997, 2000, 2004 and 2006; environment minister 2004.

Family: Married to Janine Krieber; one daughter, Jeanne.

Ken Dryden

Age: 59.

Born: Aug. 8, 1947, in Toronto.

Education: BA Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.; Law McGill University.

Career: Professional hockey player; lawyer, hockey administrator, broadcaster author. Won six Stanley Cups with Montreal Canadiens 1970-79; played 1972 Canada-Russia series; TV commentator 1980, 1984, 1988; published best-seller The Game 1983; named president, Toronto Maple Leafs 1997.

Political experience: First elected to Parliament 2004; re-elected 2006; named minister of social development 2004.

Family: Married to Lynda Dryden; two children, Sarah and Michael.

Martha Hall Findlay

Age: 47.

Born: Aug. 17, 1959, in Toronto.

Education: University of Toronto BA, Osgoode Hall Law School.

Career: Practised corporate and commercial law at private firm; general counsel and corporate secretary Mobility Canada, Bell Mobility; vice-president for corporate development and general counsel The Rider Group; founded The General Counsel Group, a legal and management consulting firm.

Political experience: Ran and lost Newmarket-Aurora riding to Belinda Stronach in 2004 in Newmarket-Aurora; after Stronach ***changed parties***, Findlay did not run in 2006.

Family: Divorced; lives with partner Randy Reynolds; three children, Katie, Everett and Patrick.

Michael Ignatieff

Age: 59

Born: May 12, 1947, in Toronto.

Education: University of Toronto and at Oxford University; PhD Harvard.

Career: An academic, broadcaster, journalist and author. Worked with TVO, CBC, BBC. Author of 16 books. In 2000, became director of the Carr Center for Human Rights Policy at Harvard.

Political experience: Elected MP for Etobicoke-Lakeshore, January 2006.

Family: Married to Zsuzsanna Zsohar; two children, Theo and Sophie.

Gerard Kennedy

Age: 46.

Born: July 26, 1960, in The Pas, Man.

Education: Trent University in Peterborough and the University of Alberta in Edmonton.

Career: Founded Canada's first food bank in Edmonton in 1983; moved to Toronto in 1986 and founded its food bank, helped found similar organizations in several other cities.

Political experience: First elected to Ontario legislature in 1996 byelection, re-elected 1999, 2003; appointed minister of education 2003.

Family: Married to Jeanette Arsenault-Kennedy; two children, Theria and John-Julien.

Bob Rae

Age: 57.

Born: Aug. 2, 1948, in Ottawa.

Education: Bachelor of Arts and law degree from the University of Toronto; Rhodes Scholar in 1969; philosophy degree from Oxford University in 1971.

Career: Lawyer at international law firm Goodmans LLP; author of two books, From Protest to Power, and The Three Questions; officer of the Order of Canada in 2000.

Political experience: Elected to the House of Commons in 1978 representing the Toronto riding of what was then known as Broadview; became Ontario NDP leader in 1982; elected Ontario premier in 1990; defeated in 1995; retired from politics in 1996.

Family: Married to Arlene; three daughters, Judith, Lisa and Eleanor.

Joe Volpe

Age: 59.

Born: Sept. 21, 1947, Monteleone di Puglia, Italy.

Education: University of Toronto, MA education.

Career: Teacher, vice-principal.

Political experience: First elected to Parliament 1988; re-elected 1993. 1997, 2000, 2004, 2006; parliamentary secretary to the minister of health 1996-98; appointed minister of human resources 2003.

Family: Married to Mirella Volpe; four children, Luciano, Flavio, Letitzia and Massimo.
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MONTREAL (CP) \_ Belinda Stronach emerges from the chic Montreal hotel where she's just fine-tuned her final push to overhaul Liberal party democracy.

She's barely a block from the lobby and a morning of weighty discussions, including an ambitious plan to revolutionize agriculture in parts of Africa, when an admirer stops her on the street.

''I saw you on TV last night,'' says the middle-aged woman, a member of the Liberal women's commission. ''You looked great.''

A brief discussion follows about the havoc Montreal humidity plays on hair. The admirer comments on Stronach's brown eyes. ''That's one thing I can't change,'' the Liberal MP says with a wan smile.

Stronach, 40, has big plans and has adopted a policy oriented, low-key approach to her first Liberal convention. But on the street among her fans, it's still all about the new look.

The obvious superficial change is her shift from blond to brunette, but Stronach is tackling serious issues like women's rights and party structure, trying to put substance over style.

Stronach championed the push to put an end to the long tradition of federal leadership conventions. Her plan to adopt a one-member, one-vote failed Thursday, meaning the steamy backroom dealings of the political convention will survive another day.

One-member, one-vote became Stronach's crusade when she bowed out of the leadership race in the spring. She put on a brave face after her defeat.

''I'm not so disappointed, I think it's unfortunate, I think the party missed a moment to really modernize,'' she says in an interview. ''But the debate has begun.''

Political conventions are known for big bashes and nobody in politics throws them like Stronach. This time, however, she is behind the scenes helping the youth wing organize a tribute to former prime minister Paul Martin. She's left the post of party host to others.

''We'll throw a party on the hill in Ottawa for everybody,'' Stronach says. ''There's 24 hours in the day and you've got to decide where you want to focus your energy.''

Stronach is one prime target in the behind-the-scenes jockeying for position among candidates in the current leadership race.

Every day the four front-runners and their staffers are nudging elbows or on the phone gently trying to draw Stronach into their camps.

''They're moving around in various packs trying to show they have momentum, trying to convert to their side,'' she says.

''I'd be on that list of people they're trying to convert.''

Stronach says she plans to remain ''publicly neutral'' during the convention while coyly clinging to the possibility of changing her mind later.

Stronach does owe a favour to Martha Hall Findlay, the last-placed and lone female candidate who stepped aside so Stronach could run in her riding as a Liberal in the last election.

Stronach hints that political payback may not be her top priority.

''I'm very appreciative to Martha for what she did when I ***changed parties*** and when I came to the Liberal party,'' Stronach says.

''I don't take that for granted. But we're also picking the person who can best represent the party and be the next prime minister.''

All the secretive manoeuvring at the convention proves the need for reform, she argues.

''There are backroom deals being made, and to me that cuts out the membership base,'' Stronach says.

''I like to have a say over who the leader would be and be able to follow that through the successive ballots and choices. The members should have the same right.''

Stronach doesn't say it, but a new system would have the added benefit of giving party newcomers like her a better chance of taking a run at the leadership.

Mass appeal trumps massive organization in the party with one member, one vote. Her street appeal is a major asset in that kind of race.
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MONTREAL -- Belinda Stronach emerges from the chic Montreal hotel where she's just fine-tuned her final push to overhaul Liberal party democracy.

She's barely a block from the lobby and a morning of weighty discussions, including an ambitious plan to revolutionize agriculture in parts of Africa, when an admirer stops her on the street.

"I saw you on TV last night," says the middle-aged woman, a member of the Liberal women's commission. "You looked great."

A brief discussion follows about the havoc Montreal humidity plays on hair. The admirer comments on Stronach's brown eyes. "That's one thing I can't change," the Liberal MP says with a wan smile.

Stronach, 40, has big plans and has adopted a policy oriented, low-key approach to her first Liberal convention. But on the street among her fans, it's still all about the new look.

The obvious superficial change is her shift from blond to brunette, but Stronach is tackling serious issues like women's rights and party structure, trying to put substance over style.

Stronach championed the push to put an end to the long tradition of federal leadership conventions. Her plan to adopt a one-member, one-vote failed Thursday, meaning the steamy backroom dealings of the political convention will survive another day.

One-member, one-vote became Stronach's crusade when she bowed out of the leadership race in the spring. She put on a brave face after her defeat.

"I'm not so disappointed, I think it's unfortunate, I think the party missed a moment to really modernize," she says in an interview. "But the debate has begun."

Political conventions are known for big bashes and nobody in politics throws them like Stronach. This time, however, she is behind the scenes helping the youth wing organize a tribute to former prime minister Paul Martin. She's left the post of party host to others.

"We'll throw a party on the hill in Ottawa for everybody," Stronach says. "There's 24 hours in the day and you've got to decide where you want to focus your energy."

Stronach is one prime target in the behind-the-scenes jockeying for position among candidates in the current leadership race.

Every day the four front-runners and their staffers are nudging elbows or on the phone gently trying to draw Stronach into their camps.

"They're moving around in various packs trying to show they have momentum, trying to convert to their side," she says.

"I'd be on that list of people they're trying to convert."

Stronach says she plans to remain "publicly neutral" during the convention while coyly clinging to the possibility of changing her mind later.

Stronach does owe a favour to Martha Hall Findlay, the last-placed and lone female candidate who stepped aside so Stronach could run in her riding as a Liberal in the last election.

Stronach hints that political payback may not be her top priority.

"I'm very appreciative to Martha for what she did when I ***changed parties*** and when I came to the Liberal party," Stronach says.

"I don't take that for granted. But we're also picking the person who can best represent the party and be the next prime minister."
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Whoever wins today's Liberal leadership must confront an alarming political fact: The party has been in slow, long-term decline.

Three consecutive wins by Jean Chrétien masked that reality. Since the early 1980s, however, the country's so-called natural governing party has struggled. Liberals lost three times to the Conservatives, in 1984, 1988 and 2006. Even when winning, disturbing trends emerged.

Liberals ceased being the natural choice of Quebeckers, whose province had kept the party alive through good times and bad. They remained weak in most of Western Canada. Liberals dominated Ontario largely courtesy of the split on the political right.

Under Mr. Chrétien, the Liberals never captured more than 40 per cent of the national vote while winning their three majorities. They could not dislodge the Bloc Québécois from being Quebec's preferred federal party. Liberals were fortunate that the NDP remained weak under Audrey McLaughlin and Alexa McDonough.

Tomorrow morning, one of Michael Ignatieff, Bob Rae or Stéphane Dion will awake as leader to contemplate that decline. The Conservatives are in power. They are better financed and extremely motivated. The NDP is much better led under Jack Layton. The Bloc remains Quebec's preferred party. (In the Montreal-area by-election, the Liberal candidate finished fourth, even behind the NDP.) The arrival of the Greens on the national scene raises questions for every party.

When Paul Martin inherited the party from Mr. Chrétien, it appeared he spelled renewal and an easy electoral triumph. Within months, his apparently invincible steamroller had run into the sands. In Quebec, the party was devastated by the sponsorship scandal, and the reputation for corruption from that affair spread across the country.

Pushed back to minority government, the Liberals then quickly lost office in the 2006 election.

New Democrats dream about the disappearance of the Liberal Party. Canada's Liberals must decline to marginality, they reason, just as Britain's Liberals did after the First World War. Then Canada will have a true two-party, left-right, system.

The NDP is wrong. The Liberals, in an essentially middle-class country where most issues do not revolve around traditional left-right cleavages, will not disappear. They are too strong to vanish but too weak to recover past glories.

The Martin Liberals were transfixed by winning votes from the NDP. They never believed that Canadians would elect a party led by Stephen Harper, whom they considered dour and ideological. They figured to grab three or four points from the NDP by big spending programs and large dollops of anti-American posturing.

Where to go now? As a first step, the party wisely voted this week to reform its constitution, turning the party organization into a national outfit instead of a collection of regional baronies.

In one of those sweet political ironies, the Liberals under Mr. Chrétien ***changed party*** financing laws, eliminating union and corporate contributions and restricting the size of individual donations. The new system hurt the Liberals far more than the Conservatives, since the Liberals had been more dependent on corporate contributions, a legacy of having been the natural governing party.

Alas for the party, the candidates will emerge from the leadership campaign with debts - in some cases, running into the hundreds of thousands of dollars. These must be repaid within 18 months (there is some legal dispute about this), so that rather than raising money for the party, the new leader must spend precious time and energy raising money to pay off his debts and help defray those of the other candidates.

Beyond organization and money, however, lies the more consequential question: For what does the Liberal Party stand? It has been difficult to find out since the last election. Very quickly, the Liberals displayed the reflexes of the parliamentary opposition: Oppose everything. When asked for alternatives, the party harkened back to what it had done in government. Except that the people chucked them out of office and, with them, went many of their grand policies.

In fairness, the leadership campaign made coherence difficult. Bill Graham was only an interim leader. The party could not take a fixed position on various issues until it had a new leader. Starting tomorrow morning, that luxury ends. Liberals will be expected to speak with one voice.

The leadership campaign, for all its intensity, revealed a widespread consensus on important issues. The Liberals have definitely gone green. The environment, especially attacking greenhouse-gas emissions, preoccupied the leadership candidates. The party had a poor record on the file in government; all candidates pledged to do much, much better if given another chance.

Fiscal prudence is now a party hallmark, courtesy of the Chrétien-Martin success in turning around the country's finances. Investments in education, research, innovation, regional development, child care - all candidates accepted these objectives.

Divisions elsewhere emerged in the leadership campaign. The party is split on Canada's Afghan mission. The temptations of crude anti-Americanism are apparently irresistible with the Bush administration in office. The party quietly prays that the difficult existential debate about Quebec as a "nation" will go away. Otherwise, the issue will further reveal internal divisions, because differences between Trudeauites and those who wish accommodations with Quebec nationalism have not vanished.

There will be, if the past four decades of Canadian history offer any guide, another national-unity challenge, or crisis, in the next decade or so. Quebec is moving increasingly into a kind of associate status within Canada. Whoever the Liberals choose will eventually have to deal with the Quebec/unity issue, however it emerges.

Of course, as partisans, Liberals will ask themselves today the fundamental political question: Who can win an early election? The more fundamental questions should be: Who has the courage and wisdom to guide the party and perhaps the country through the next unity challenge, and who can rebuild the party in Quebec, without which the Liberals cannot conceivably form a majority government?

*jsimpson@globeandmail.com*

**Graphic**

Illustration

**Load-Date:** December 2, 2006

**End of Document**

[***Stronach aims for sustance despite talk of her new look***](http://advance.lexis.com/api/document?collection=news&id=urn:contentItem:4MGD-N880-TWD3-82YF-00000-00&context=)

The Guardian (Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island)

December 2, 2006 Saturday

Copyright 2006 The Guardian, a division of Transcontinental Media Group Inc. All Rights Reserved

**Section:** CANADA; Pg. A11

**Length:** 512 words

**Byline:** CP

**Body**

Belinda Stronach emerges from the chic Montreal hotel where she's just fine-tuned her final push to overhaul Liberal party democracy.

She's barely a block from the lobby and a morning of weighty discussions, including an ambitious plan to revolutionize agriculture in parts of Africa, when an admirer stops her on the street.

"I saw you on TV last night," says the middle-aged woman, a member of the Liberal women's commission. "You looked great."

A brief discussion follows about the havoc Montreal humidity plays on hair. The admirer comments on Stronach's brown eyes. "That's one thing I can't change," the Liberal MP says with a wan smile.

Stronach, 40, has big plans and has adopted a policy oriented, low- key approach to her first Liberal convention. But on the street among her fans, it's still all about the new look.

The obvious superficial change is her shift from blond to brunette, but Stronach is tackling serious issues like women's rights and party structure, trying to put substance over style.

Stronach championed the push to put an end to the long tradition of federal leadership conventions. Her plan to adopt a one-member, one-vote failed Thursday, meaning the steamy backroom dealings of the political convention will survive another day.

One-member, one-vote became Stronach's crusade when she bowed out of the leadership race in the spring. She put on a brave face after her defeat.

"I'm not so disappointed, I think it's unfortunate, I think the party missed a moment to really modernize," she says in an interview. "But the debate has begun."

Political conventions are known for big bashes and nobody in politics throws them like Stronach. This time, however, she is behind the scenes helping the youth wing organize a tribute to former prime minister Paul Martin. She's left the post of party host to others.

"We'll throw a party on the hill in Ottawa for everybody," Stronach says. "There's 24 hours in the day and you've got to decide where you want to focus your energy."

Stronach is one prime target in the behind-the-scenes jockeying for position among candidates in the current leadership race.

Every day the four front-runners and their staffers are nudging elbows or on the phone gently trying to draw Stronach into their camps.

"They're moving around in various packs trying to show they have momentum, trying to convert to their side," she says.

"I'd be on that list of people they're trying to convert."

Stronach says she plans to remain "publicly neutral" during the convention while coyly clinging to the possibility of changing her mind later.

Stronach does owe a favour to Martha Hall Findlay, the last-placed and lone female candidate who stepped aside so Stronach could run in her riding as a Liberal in the last election.

Stronach hints that political payback may not be her top priority.

"I'm very appreciative to Martha for what she did when I ***changed parties*** and when I came to the Liberal party," Stronach says.

"I don't take that for granted. But we're also picking the person who can best represent the party and be the next prime minister."
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Crossing the floor of the House of Commons is always a controversial move, but it is a move that should be accepted with the understanding that the voters always have the last word.

The latest member of Parliament to switch parties is Wajid Khan, who was elected as a Liberal in the Mississauga-Streetsville riding almost one year ago. As of last week, he is a Conservative.

Khan's departure from the Liberal party is not a complete surprise. As a Liberal MP, he had an association with Prime Minister Stephen Harper's Conservatives that some Liberals found troubling. Harper appointed Khan as a special adviser on the Middle East and Afghanistan.

Khan had offered to help the prime minister after police in Ontario charged 17 people in connection with an alleged plot to launch a terror attack. He brought a different perspective to his advisory role because he once lived in Pakistan.

Interestingly, Khan made his decision to become a Conservative partly because of comments made by Stephane Dion, the new Liberal leader. Dion was uncomfortable with what he considered to be Khan's divided loyalties and gave him an ultimatum: Give up the advisory job with the Conservatives or give up being a Liberal.

Khan's departure is easier to accept than the last defection from the Liberals. That occurred last year shortly after the Jan. 23 election when David Emerson left to join the Conservatives as minister of international trade. That move annoyed many Canadians because, given the timing, it was morally questionable. It certainly appeared to be cynical. Immediately after the Conservatives won the Jan. 23 election, Emerson said, "I'm going to be Stephen Harper's worst enemy." Weeks later, he was Harper's best friend.

Of course, politicians have moved to the Liberals from time to time. Belinda Stronach left the Conservatives in May 2005 to join the Liberals as the minister of human resources. Scott Brison also moved to the Liberals in December 2003, but his switch was more complicated. He had been a member of the Progressive Conservative party and he left when it merged with the Alliance to form the Conservative party. Brison's position was that he hadn't left his party but that his party had ceased to exist.

The New Democratic Party has taken a clear position on parliamentarians who switch. It has proposed legislation that would require MPs who change parties to face a byelection. This would let the voters decide if they still want someone who has ***changed parties*** to continue to represent them.

The NDP proposal reflects the annoyance many voters feel. But this legislation isn't really necessary. Sooner or later, the voters do exercise the power that the NDP thinks they should have as soon as someone wants to switch. All candidates who change parties undoubtedly have to justify their decision if they choose to run in the following general election. In the case of Stronach and Brison, the voters in their constituencies did re-elect them. Judging by their initial reaction to Emerson's departure from the Liberals, the voters in Vancouver Kingsway may not be so charitable. In all likelihood, it won't be too many months before those voters have a chance to comment on Emerson and the voters in Mississauga-Streetsville have a chance to comment on Khan.

The current system, in short, works very well.
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The friendlies had all the best standing spots in front of the stage, equipped with inflatable thundersticks in good old Canadian red, poised to clap them together at the slightest urging from the flawlessly prepared emcee, Renee Smith-Valade of the Vancouver Olympic Organizing Committee (Vanoc).

The unfriendlies were gathered mostly on the outskirts of the crowd, on the Howe Street side of the Vancouver Art Gallery, chanting "Homes Not Games!" or possible "Halt The Games!"-- someone really should have wished them better luck on their next project -- and waving their protest signs, trying to position themselves between the stage and the TV cameras. Because, let's face it, if your act doesn't make the evening news, you've failed.

"Housing Before Games," read a polite entry carried by a small, silent woman with grey hair tucked up under a bicycle helmet.

"Smash The Wrecking Balls of Gentrification!" read another.

There was the predictable "Bread Not Circuses" sign, but with an added line, apropos of nothing: "Butter Not Guns." We half-expected to see "Nutella Not Fireworks" complete the trilogy, but it must have got stuck in traffic.

But it was the holder of the boldly lettered "Stop The Clock!" sign who won the prize, because when the spiffy new Omega Countdown Clock -- a lovely piece of artwork incorporating wood, metal, glass and the very best of Swiss electronics -- was unveiled just after 12:30 p.m. Monday, it appeared to have . . . well, stopped.

Or rather, it was running, all right, but it already looked to be 28 days slow, exactly the sort of discrepancy that could be problematic in February of 2010 if, say, the gold and silver medallists in the bobsled come down 1/100th of a second apart, and the timing device says they finished in January.

Luckily, representatives of the Swiss Timing Enforcement Unit were in attendance, and pointed out that the inner side of the clock was counting down to the Paralympics, which begin a month after the Olympics, so it said 1,124 days until the opening ceremony, while the west side read 1,096.

But these little misunderstandings are to be expected, which is why Vanoc has occasions like Monday's unveiling.

And now that they can safely tick "timing" off their to-do list, the next item they need to look at is "security."

We surround the word with quote marks because another lesson the organizers will have learned Monday (although these things are always clear in hindsight) is that when you have a whole bunch of people who have advertised in advance an intention to protest an event, and a passel of politicians and other bigwigs on stage -- including a not-universally beloved premier and a federal cabinet minister who ***changed parties*** after the election -- the crack security force should probably keep an eye out for scruffy-looking people lurking near the stage, wearing bandanas and not clapping their thundersticks.

Not that there's any law against looking scruffy, or wearing a bandana, either. But when the bandana is covering the lower half of the face, most Crimebusters Manuals agree that the wearer is either about to cream-pie a politician or hold up a 7-Eleven.

In this case, poor Smith-Valade had barely warmed up her tonsils with "It's an exciting day for all of us" when one of two similarly-attired protesters leaped on stage, grabbed the microphone, and yelled something that sounded like "4Q-2010!"

Security officials believe it may be some sort of protester code.

They're looking into it.

Meanwhile, there were some nice moments, too, in the noon-hour celebration.

Monday's ceremony included a group of first nations performers dancing to Warrior Song. (Vanoc's own troupe was to have followed, but elected to save up for a tap-dance when the next set of budget numbers is released.)

Calgary's Jeff Pain, the 2006 Olympic silver medallist in skeleton, was in mid-speech on behalf of Canada's Olympians when the protesters' chanting hit its zenith, but he plowed on, and got a huge cheer when he concluded: "I'll see you on the podium in three years!"

As for the protest, he wasn't bothered by it.

"That's why this is the greatest country in the world," Pain said later. "Everyone gets to express his or her own opinion."

Of course, being an Olympian, he would argue that it's possible to have circuses and bread, too. But it's probably a good thing he didn't try that message on the hostile section of the crowd at the art gallery: that concept is 'way too difficult to grasp. Like Games and housing. Can't have both. It's one or the other.

Meanwhile, the clock ticked on: a reminder, said the Conservative government's Olympics minister David Emerson, "that it is crunch time."

Three years out. It seems like a lot of time, said Omega president Stephen Urquhart, "but check your watch: believe me, three years goes by very quickly."

"The eyes of the world will be on our city," said Mayor Sam Sullivan, "on our Olympics. . . ."

And on our Offended People.

If there were medals for umbrage, we truly would Own The Podium.

[*ccole@png.canwest.com*](mailto:ccole@png.canwest.com)
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So what are some of the latest trends on the party scene? White and square, for two.

Square tables - if you can afford to rent them - give a sleek look, and people are opting to replace the traditional round tables that might come free with the hall and springing for this new look that might cost extra. People are also setting up sitting areas in their party rooms filled with white, oversized square sofas and ottomans (sometimes with fun pillows in an accent colour), often even removing furniture that might be in the room to get this cool, modern look.

Event planner Suzanne Laplante, of Marriages et Receptions Suzanne Laplante, said weddings are less "fairy tale-ish" and more modern, with square tables, oversized martini glasses filled with candles and a cleaner look.

That "supper club feeling" is apparent at parties now, said Mike Goldfarb, manager of Global Entertainment, which also organizes events and provides lighting and music.

"The slick furniture and lighting, everything in white and plexiglass, very South Beach," he said. "People are definitely being more extravagant."

Themes are big.

Party designer Roger Chen, whose company is called Themeworks, specializes in decorating parties according to themes. His Pirates of the Caribbean theme, for example, includes nets and a big boat. A beach theme will include thatched-roof huts, palm trees and beach balls. He might also bring in a little bridge to help guests across the "sand." He has also done circus themes with trapezes and cut-out acrobats dangling from the ceiling.

And since people love seeing their name in lights, he has done lots of "Oscar" parties with marquee and red-carpet entrances, giant film strips adorning the room and the paparazzi snapping photos.

He, too, said that the chic look, with sheer fabrics, white lounge furniture and a "Delano hotel feeling," is all the rage.

Another thing that's ***changed? Party*** hosts: they're just more party savvy.

"Martha Stewart has really educated people," said florist Robert Pettigrew of Robert Designer Floral Inc. "Things have changed a lot because of that."

But he said he's just as happy working on low-budget centrepieces as the wedding he did recently that had $500 centrepieces of hydrangeas.

"I just like the challenge of doing something original."

And even for the rich and privileged, there is nothing like a Montreal party.

A former Montrealer, who did not want his name used in this story, threw an extravagant Bar Mitzvah for his son at Oheka Castle on Long Island, N.Y. He brought in Harry Kloda of Superior Sound to put it together and flew in a Montreal band, 1945, to perform. The theme? Grand Prix, natch.

He wanted the party to have that certain je ne sais quoi that can only be found ici.
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Ontario's energy minister says he hopes squabbling between Ottawa and the Newfoundland and Labrador government will not derail a hydroelectric megaproject in Labrador.

Dwight Duncan, who visited Newfoundland and Labrador government officials Monday, said the planned Lower Churchill project fits perfectly with Ontario's future energy demands.

"This is clean, green, renewable power that we'd like to get into the southern Ontario market," Duncan said.

"We have an air quality problem. We have a need for new power. We think the east-west energy grid is the railroad of the 21st century."

Newfoundland and Labrador is hoping to develop the Lower Churchill - a two-site megaproject that could potentially deliver enough electricity to power about 1.5 million homes - on its own.

However, the province is seeking a multibillion-dollar loan guarantee from the federal government.

Relations between Premier Danny Williams and the governing federal Conservatives have been strained because Williams says Prime Minister Stephen Harper ***changed party*** policy on including non-renewable resource revenues in the equalization formula.

Williams and his ministers have acknowledged they would like to see Harper unseated in the next federal election.

Natural Resources Minister Kathy Dunderdale said Monday that federal participation is not essential to a Lower Churchill deal.

"One thing you can take to the bank is that we are going to do this project, one way or the other," she said.

"We will do it with federal government help, hopefully, but in any case the project will proceed."

Duncan would like to see the federal government step up for a project that he says will help Canadians in several provinces.

"Ontario sees it as essential for the federal government to be at the table as well, regardless of who is in office," Duncan said.

"If any government has a national vision, if any government sees a future for this country, they have to look at this."

Meanwhile, Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro president Ed Martin said the next 12 to 15 months are critical for the success of the Lower Churchill proposal.

Martin said if the project hits all points on its timeline, Lower Churchill power could hit the market by 2014, which is the same year that Ontario is projecting its greatest energy need.
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Photo, Ontario Energy Minister Dwight Duncan (right) met Monday with N.L. counterpart Kathy Dunderdale. (CBC)
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Surrey trailer-park residents experienced double-wide relief yesterday as their mobile homes were saved from destruction.

Seacrest Motel and RV Park residents celebrated after council refused a developer's plan at 12:30 a.m.

"Barney opened his best bottle of cognac," said Bill Runka, 80. "Everybody's lights were on at 2 a.m. We won the battle."

Residents' spokeswoman Deanie Kolybabi said there is "a whole new confidence in council.

"It proved to me that Surrey is the kind of city I want to live in," she said.

The 6-2 vote denied a developer's application to turn the site in the 800-block 160 Street into 15 single-family residences. The Lark Group bought the property for $2.85 million in 2005 and residents were told they would have to move.

Council's decision indicated a change in its typical voting patterns.

Mayor Dianne Watts formed the Surrey First civic coalition two weeks ago. Three councillors from the Surrey Electors Team majority ***changed parties*** to side with her.

Surrey First joined two independents and a SET member, Tom Gill, to defeat the proposal. Two SET councillors, Marvin Hunt and Judy Higginbotham, were in favour of it.

Watts said the decision was "about doing the right thing."

"It's not always going to be popular," she said. "Elderly people and folks with mental challenges lived there. It's incumbent upon us to take all things into consideration."

Happy residents said they had a new lease on life. Their homes were saved. They can still stroll to White Rock's famous beach.

"It was a long time to be under that kind of stress," said resident Darlene Nekrep of the two-year battle. "At least one senior had a heart attack."

There are 14 manufactured homes, 12 rooms at a "nothing fancy" motel and parking for recreational vehicles.

Kolybabi said it was the best use of the land because it mixed tourism with low-cost housing.

Residents said they now need permanent zoning or long-term leases so there can be certainty. The developer has not decided what it will do.

[*kspencer@png.canwest.com*](mailto:kspencer@png.canwest.com)
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Tories - Re: "Liberals seize Calgary riding," June 13.

The simple math offered up by Tory spin doctors is quite farcical. The idea is that the Tory voters stayed home while every single Liberal voter from the previous election, save 100, made it to the polls.

Obviously, not a single Calgary-Elbow resident moved in or out of the constituency or ***changed party*** allegiance.

The Liberal campaign was, according to this logic, so well organized that it was able to identify every Liberal voter in the constituency and convince all but 100 of them to vote. That's one heck of a well-oiled machine!

I had the opportunity to knock on a good number of Calgary-Elbow doors during the campaign. My tally of Conservative to Liberal votes on my scorecard after talking directly to the constituents was represented within a few percentage points on election day. The same held true with all those who actually went face to face with Calgary voters.

There was a significant shift in the riding. People did change their minds. Many people, for the first time, voted Liberal.

Marc Doll, Calgary
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To those who don't follow politics -- or political history -- very closely, a flipflop is a simple rubber sandal that's well-suited to the beach.

But if you're a provincial Conservative in Ontario, it's what your party leader, John Tory, now stands accused of doing with his attempt to salvage the chance of winning next week's election.

Predictably, there's been eager finger-wagging by his opponents over the issue on which Mr. Tory appears to have stubbed his campaign: the controversial notion of public funding for faith-based schools.

At first he said there'd be no free vote on the subject if he became premier -- then he reversed that position.

To be fair, however, what Mr. Tory has done is change his mind in response to consistent pressure from within his party and from the voters to whom he's listened along the campaign trail.

He hasn't dropped the issue, ***changed parties*** or shifted philosophies. Technically, he hasn't even broken a promise -- just bent one.

Of course, as a former campaign manager for Kim Campbell, he should have remembered the alleged misquote which, nonetheless, remains part of the former prime minister's modest political legacy: "An election is no time to discuss serious issues."

Furthermore, for those who do it, reversing your engines is a well-established, ignoble tradition in Canadian politics.

A politician crossing the floor to another party is something Canadians are well-acquainted with. In the past year we've seen Garth Turner leave the Tories for the Liberals and Wajid Khan and Joe Comuzzi do the reverse. International Trade Minister David Emerson won his seat in 2006 as a Liberal, only to immediately re-surface as a Tory cabinet minister.

And then there are the flip-flops on policy issues. Prime Minister Stephen Harper began his political career as a Reform party member and policy strategist.

The party's slogan "The West Wants In" was a reference to the party's strong desire to see the region assume a more meaningful role in Confederation.

As prime minister, however, Mr. Harper has spent most of his political capital on the issue of Quebec, and he is also the one who gave Quebec national status in the Constitution.

Jean Chrétien was opposed to the Meech Lake Accord, but after the 1995 referendum, he tried to bring forward many of the same principles in a bid to cut a constitutional deal.

And just in case anyone in Canada has forgotten, former prime minister Brian Mulroney, currently on a book tour promoting his published memoirs, is happy to remind us that Chrétien was elected on a promise to abolish the Goods and Services Tax.

The Liberals also passionately campaigned against ratification of the Free Trade Agreement 20 years ago. And although Chrétien pledged to re-negotiate key parts of the pact in the 1993 campaign, only minor amendments were made before he signed the expanded North American Free Trade Agreement which came into effect a year later.

Furthermore, even though the Liberals first sent Canadian troops to Afghanistan, they are now calling for their unilateral withdrawal.

And then of course, there's Ontario's incumbent Liberal premier Dalton McGuinty who began his term by breaking a pledge not to raise taxes -- something he did within months of taking office.

That flipflop -- one of the principal points of the Tory campaign against him -- was a perfect fit. Until Oct. 1.

[*dmcmurdy@thecitizen.canwest.com*](mailto:dmcmurdy@thecitizen.canwest.com)
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Furious with MLAs who have crossed the floor to join the Liberal government, the New Brunswick opposition is demanding that any future defectors pay back money spent on their election.

The idea was raised on the weekend at the party's annual general meeting and was "overwhelmingly approved," Progressive Conservative Party executive director Kevin Price said yesterday.

The move comes six months after the defections of Wally Stiles and Joan MacAlpine-Stiles, who were each elected three times as Tories, married while in office and crossed the floor together on April 17.

"They don't seem to be able to get over the fact that I ***changed parties***," Mr. Stiles said yesterday. "They've got to get over it. These things happen."

Mr. Price acknowledged that crossing the floor is an old political practice, but argued that public cynicism is now so prevalent that a strong stand has to be taken. He said that, in a typical New Brunswick election, a riding association spends about $20,000 on its candidate and doesn't want to see that person go on to switch parties.

"It sends a clear message, a shot across the bow," Mr. Price said yesterday of the weekend move. "You leave our party after we've spent time and money to get you elected and you've got to pay."

The idea is not unprecedented - when Vancouver MP David Emerson crossed the floor to join Stephen Harper's cabinet, his riding association sought the return of nearly $100,000 - but the New Brunswick Tories have taken the additional step of entrenching it as an amendment to their constitution.

"It wasn't applicable at the time and I don't believe it should be retroactive," countered Mr. Stiles, MLA for Petitcodiac. "I'm not going to pay any expenses back. I was elected to represent the riding and I continue to do so."

It's not clear how the party could go after future defectors, with some speculating that candidates may have to sign affidavits pledging to repay election money. Even Mr. Price acknowledged the idea may in fact be unworkable.

"Whether it's enforceable, that's a question for another day," he said. "I'm not a legal expert; I'm not a constitutional scholar. It would be unfair for me to comment on how it might work." The party will be seeking expert opinion "over the coming days," he said.

The problem of how to deal with political defectors crops up regularly on the federal and provincial scene.

The appearance of Mr. Emerson at Rideau Hall when Mr. Harper's cabinet was being sworn in, following his harsh attacks on the Tories during the campaign, led even several Conservatives to say he should resign and run again in a by-election. He weathered the storm and refused to reimburse his former riding association, reportedly countering that his business connections had allowed him to raise large sums of money for his former party.

When Belinda Stronach left the Tories to join the then-governing Liberals, saving Paul Martin's government and receiving a cabinet position, the NDP called for an investigation. A probe of whether Ms. Stronach might have been unduly influenced by the possibility of a portfolio was rejected by the ethics commissioner.
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Hoping to concentrate support from separate sides of the political spectrum, Tory Leader Ed Stelmach and Liberal Leader Kevin Taft are urging Albertans not to cast a ballot for other opposition parties that can't form government.

In the face of a new poll that shows the Liberals face a steep climb to unseat the Tories, Taft called on undecided voters and NDP supporters to back the only party he says still stands a chance.

Campaigning in southern Alberta, Stelmach had a similar message, calling on small-c conservatives to rally behind his party instead of splitting the right wing by voting for the upstart Wildrose Alliance.

In Calgary, Taft told the Herald editorial board that the Liberals are aware of the odds before them, noting Alberta's government has ***changed parties*** only three times in its history.

"We are asking people to do something they do once in a lifetime, basically," Taft said Wednesday, as he encouraged Albertans of all political stripes to back the Liberals.

"You can vote NDP and make a point or you can vote Liberal and make a change. The New Democrats who rally against the government all the time and say, 'We need a change,' need to realize we'll all be pushing up daisies before there's a New Democrat government in Alberta."

A new Calgary Herald/Edmonton Journal poll indicated the Tories have the support of 40 per cent of respondents, while the Liberals trail at 18 per cent.

The poll by Leger Marketing of 900 Albertans found the Wildrose Alliance attracted six per cent of respondents, while the Greens and NDP had five per cent each.

However, 27 per cent of people polled remained undecided or wouldn't respond, and political analysts say the electoral map is volatile.

NDP Leader Brian Mason doesn't think the Liberals have a shot at forming the next government, contending Taft has talked about change, but hasn't back it up with fresh ideas.

He also doesn't think much of Taft's assessment of the NDP: "It sounds a bit arrogant to me."

While the Liberals and NDP are expected to slug it out in some Edmonton ridings, support for the Wildrose Alliance is strongest in southern Alberta, according to the poll.

The newly merged party is attempting to appeal to disenchanted Tory voters, while Stelmach is vying to lure those people back.

"A vote for the Alliance is a vote for the Liberals," Stelmach said while campaigning in Lethbridge.

"It's not any dissimilar to what happened in the '90s where (federal) Conservative party split, and allowed the Liberals to rule government in Ottawa for 13 years."

Wildrose Alliance Leader Paul Hinman, however, took offence to Stelmach's plea, insisting there would be no disillusioned right-wing voters if the governing Tories stuck to their fiscally conservative roots.

"A vote for anybody except for the Alliance is a vote for status quo," Hinman said.

"Yes, there might be a few Liberals and (New Democrats) that get in because of it, but it sends a message to Ed Stelmach . . . There would be no vote on the right if he came back to where he belongs."

The tactical strikes are the latest manoeuvres in a campaign that's seen all of Alberta's parties run on a platform of change, argued observers.

But their messages don't appear to be resonating with voters, said Peter McCormick, a political scientist with the University of Lethbridge.

"This election has not created excitement. If you go into the coffee shops, people aren't buzzing with talk about the election," McCormick said.

Taft, meanwhile, also took a swipe at another Stelmach campaign strategy.

The Grit leader dismissed comparisons to Pierre Trudeau as irrelevant and decades old, as the provincial Liberals have no formal ties to the federal party.

Taft panned the "victim role" that Stelmach and the Tories continue to turn to, insisting it eventually becomes self-fulfilling.

"That's the old Alberta. If we continue to approach our future as, 'Ah, we're victims, we're put upon, fend off the world, build a firewall.' That's the role we'll be stuck in forever," he said.

"I want to take a different role. I want to say we are going to become a centre -- we are going to build bridges to the world. We're going to set a bold course for the future."

[*rdaliesio@theherald.canwest.com*](mailto:rdaliesio@theherald.canwest.com)
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NEW YORK \_ Many Americans endured long lines to vote. Tim Robbins had to get a court order before he was allowed to cast his vote for president.

The 50-year-old actor's voting woes began Tuesday morning when he ran into trouble at his polling station: His name was missing from the registration rolls. He said his name was nowhere to be found on the books at a YMCA in downtown Manhattan, where he'd previously voted in presidential elections.

''I had been voting there for years,'' he said in a telephone interview. ''I have not moved, I have not ***changed party*** affiliations. There's no reason why it shouldn't be in the rolls. So I was given a paper ballot and filled it out, but I wanted my vote to be registered there \_ and I don't trust paper ballots.''

Robbins, who lives with partner Susan Sarandon and has been registered to vote in New York since 1988, said he doesn't trust paper or affidavit ballots because ''oftentimes those things get lost or thrown away.'' So he did not submit his and asked to speak to a supervisor.

''I stayed in the voting place and asked to see someone from the Board of Elections and told them I wasn't going to leave until someone from the Board of Elections came and explained to me why I wasn't being allowed to vote \_ why my name had been taken off the voter rolls.''

The supervisor said a police officer had been called over, he said, ''at which point, I said to him, 'Are you trying to intimidate me?' '' The police at the location said he had ''every right to be there,'' said Robbins, well-known as a liberal activist who even played a candidate running for the Senate in ''Bob Roberts,'' a 1992 film he also wrote and directed.

Police said there was no police involvement.

After hours of waiting, Robbins said he was told to visit the board's downtown office, which confirmed what he knew to be true: He's a registered voter. A judge then issued a court order allowing him to vote \_ and that he did, at the same location where his trouble began.

''If anything it seems like a random thing, but in randomness there are numbers. And there have been in the past,'' said Robbins, who said that other voters also were not listed.

''This is just one example of how difficult it is to vote in the United States,'' he said.
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Okay, so we started celebrating a bit early.

Yesterday's surge in global stock markets, as Americans took to the polls amid wide expectations that Barack Obama was about to make history, had a certain giddy, I'm-about-to-see-the-Beatles-on-Ed-Sullivan-like anticipation to it. Though at the time of this writing we don't know if Mr. Obama has, indeed, secured a four-year desk job in the Oval Office, there was a tingling in the air yesterday over the prospect that a new pop star in the White House would bring about a climate of change - and right about now, *any* change has to look good for the markets.

And why not? History shows that when a Democrat takes over in the White House, it has been good news for stocks.

In the past 80 years, the presidency has ***changed parties*** eight times - four for the Democrats, four for the Republicans. According to data compiled by the Stock Trader's Almanac, the average gains on the Dow Jones industrial average in the 12 months after the Democrats have seized power has been 20 per cent. When the Republicans took over? An average *loss* of 9 per cent.

When you're dealing with small numbers like eight years out of 80, it's easy to dismiss such phenomena as coincidence. And yes, the data are skewed by a whopping 67-per-cent jump in the Dow the year after Franklin Delano Roosevelt was elected, in the midst of the most depressed stock market in history. Yet there is logic behind the trend.

First, history shows that incumbent parties tend to get bounced from office in times of subpar economic and stock market performance. In a recent report, economist James Marple of Toronto-Dominion Bank noted that the average U.S. gross domestic product growth in years when incumbent parties were ousted from the White House was 3.2 per cent; when incumbent parties won, it was 5.1 per cent.

Similarly, in years when incumbent parties lost, the average gains on the Dow were a slim 6.4 per cent, compared with 10.8 per cent in years they won. Perhaps even more telling (as the chart accompanying this column shows), stock markets faded badly shortly before the election date in years the incumbent party lost. It would seem that weak markets and a weak economy were significant contributors in voters' desire for change.

When the stock market and the economy are already depressed, the odds of a recovery within the next year are generally pretty good. Regardless of what party he's from, the new guy has a pretty good chance of overseeing a stock market turnaround in his first year.

If that's the case, then, why have Democrats done so much better coming into power than Republicans?

"In the past, Democrats came to power over domestic issues, and Republicans won the White House on foreign issues," writes Jeff Hirsch, editor of the Stock Trader's Almanac.

While the war in Iraq and the threat of terrorism haven't been entirely forgotten, they have moved well down the list of priorities for the U.S. electorate, overtaken by the deepening economic and financial collapse that unfolded over the past several months. Exit polls yesterday showed that the U.S. economy has become *the* issue - named by 60 per cent of voters as their main concern, while no other issue garnered more than 10 per cent.

It's a perfect scenario for a Democrat to oust a Republican. And, again, since economies tend to move in cycle, it's a perfect scenario for conditions to improve, and the markets to reflect that, over the next year.

In short, conditions were not only set up for Mr. Obama to win this election, they were set up for him to do better than the last guy once he came into office - mainly because it would be hard to do worse.

But forget about one party ousting another. What about straight market performance under Democrats versus Republicans, not just in the post-election year but in their entire term? Again, investors fare better under a Democratic president - and even more so if the investors are Canadian.

CIBC economist Avery Shenfeld wrote in a report this summer that over the past 50 years, average annual returns on the S&P 500 have been 5 percentage points higher under Democratic presidents than Republicans. But for Canada's S&P/TSX composite index, the out-performance has been even more pronounced: a full 10 percentage points better with a Democrat in the White House.

So, if investors have woken up this morning to find Mr. Obama is president-elect, good for investors; history suggests it's a sign that things are looking up. Then again, they were probably bound to get better anyway.
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Celebs celebrate Obama's win

Many Americans endured long lines to vote. Tim Robbins had to get a court order before he was allowed to cast his vote for president.

The 50-year-old actor's voting woes began Tuesday morning when he ran into trouble at his polling station: His name was missing from the registration rolls. He said his name was nowhere to be found on the books at a YMCA in downtown Manhattan, where he'd previously voted in presidential elections.

"I had been voting there for years," he said in a telephone interview. "I have not moved, I have not ***changed party*** affiliations. There's no reason why it shouldn't be in the rolls. So I was given a paper ballot and filled it out, but I wanted my vote to be registered there - and I don't trust paper ballots."

Robbins, who lives with partner Susan Sarandon, asked to speak to a supervisor. "I stayed in the voting place and asked to see someone from the Board of Elections and told them I wasn't going to leave until someone from the Board of Elections came and explained to me why I wasn't being allowed to vote - why my name had been taken off the voter rolls."

The supervisor said a police officer had been called over, he said, "at which point, I said to him, 'Are you trying to intimidate me?' " The police at the location said he had "every right to be there," said Robbins. Police said there was no police involvement.

After hours of waiting, Robbins said he was told to visit the board's downtown office, which confirmed what he knew to be true: He's a registered voter. A judge then issued a court order allowing him to vote - and that he did, at the same location where his trouble began.

"This is just one example of how difficult it is to vote in the United States," he said.

\*\*\*\*\*

Madonna doesn't do anything small.

The Material Girl celebrated Barack Obama's victory Tuesday night with a glittering rally of her own, leading thousands of fans at her concert in San Diego with a rousing introduction to her song Express Yourself.

In a video posted on YouTube, Madonna claps her hands and declares, "This is a historical evening! . . . We are lucky to be sharing it with each other!"

Other celebrity supporters of Obama echoed Madonna's good cheer.

Oprah Winfrey, who cried during the celebration in Chicago's Grant Park, told the TV show The Insider: "I was so, so, so excited and then just sort of a calm came over me. It feels like it actually is kind of real, so it feels great. "

Asked what this means for the country, she said, "It means democracy at its finest. It's just the best. We did this. America did this."

George Clooney said in a statement: "I congratulate president-elect Obama on his historic victory, and now it's time to begin unifying the country so we can take on the extraordinary challenges that this generation faces."

Actress Scarlett Johansson, who stumped for Obama throughout his campaign, said the "overwhelming hope that Obama inspires is infectious."

"I've always maintained a strong faith in the power of Obama's positive campaign and am so proud of every citizen who took a stand, participated in the political process and insisted their voices be heard," Johansson said in a statement.

Singer Colbie Caillat, who cried when Obama won, said she thinks "our country is in safe hands."

\*\*\*\*\*

Merle Haggard is recovering after having a malignant tumour removed from his lung.

Friends said Monday's surgery at Bakersfield Memorial Hospital in California was a success and that the 71-year-old country crooner is in stable condition.

Doctors informed Haggard, who's from a Bakersfield suburb, about a spot on his lung in May. He told The Bakersfield Californian in August that he wasn't going to seek treatment, but friends and family members convinced him otherwise.

Haggard became a household name after the anthem Okie From Muskogee hit No. 1 in 1969.

He has had 38 No. 1 hits stretching back to 1966.
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CANBERRA -- Canadians should know the fate of the Harper government is attracting international attention. Many people in Australia are watching with interest, because the Rudd government, elected a year ago, also faces parliamentary obstruction from non-government parties. But the current Australian situation is manageable because Kevin Rudd's government, unlike Stephen Harper's government, has a majority of seats in the lower house of Parliament. The Rudd government does share something with the Harper government: a hostile upper house where the governing party lacks a majority.

So both prime ministers are way out of the traditional Westminster comfort zone: their power to govern is limited by the constraints on their power to make law.

What might be new for Canadians is not so new for Australians, where the elected Senate is rarely in the hands of any governing party. Voters seem to like it that way: the same voters who a year ago gave the Rudd government its comfortable lower house majority also took out electoral insurance by splitting their vote to ensure that neither of the two main parties competing for government won a Senate majority. In the Australian Senate, the balance of power is held by a colourful but unpredictable collection of Greens and socially conservative independents.

The Australian Parliament has just risen for the Christmas break, and the Rudd government is reconciled to the fact that a fair slab of its legislative program remains unresolved in the Senate: on ice until the new year.

The Australian Senate has greater public legitimacy than the Canadian Senate because it is popularly elected, using a system of proportional representation that Prime Minister Harper is on record as admiring. Not that Mr. Harper's preference for Canadian Senate elections would make life easier for him or any other head of government.

I note the many references in Ottawa over the past two weeks to the 1975 dismissal of the Whitlam government by the Australian governor general. By all means, take seriously these warnings about the powers of the Crown's representative to hire and fire prime ministers. But remember that these warnings also relate to powerful upper houses.

Like Canada, Australia is a constitutional monarchy. Unlike Canada, Australia is openly considering becoming a constitutional republic. The events of 1975 help explain why the republic option is alive in Australia.

On Nov. 11, 1975, the Australian governor general John Kerr dismissed the Whitlam government which had been first elected in 1972, then re-elected in 1974. During 1975, the Whitlam government faced steadily increasing obstruction by the Senate where the government did not have a majority. By November 1975, the opposition-dominated Senate made clear its determination not to pass, or indeed, not even to consider the Whitlam government's most recent budget.

This was partisan brinkmanship on the gravest scale. The two houses of parliament were deadlocked. The opposition parties claimed that the government had in effect lost confidence through its inability to obtain the passage of its budget. The Whitlam government claimed that it had a mandate to govern and that the Senate was required to exercise its legal powers subject to established conventions of responsible government which acknowledge the rights of lower houses over supply. The deadlock dragged on, with both sides digging in for a long struggle.

Many feared that the national government would soon run out of money. The Whitlam government began to fear that the governor general might use the unregulated reserve powers of the Crown to change the government before rather than after an election.

The only other time that an Australian government ***changed party*** hands without an election was in wartime in 1941 when defectors from the governing conservative party in the lower house switched their support to the Labour opposition which was then commissioned in office by the governor general following due parliamentary processes, and went on to win the next two general elections.

Nineteen-seventy-five was different. Governor general John Kerr made it his official responsibility to fix the situation. He dismissed the Whitlam government and commissioned the opposition under Malcolm Fraser as a caretaker government, pending fresh elections. A month later, the Fraser government won office in a landside electoral victory.

But the office of governor general suffered very considerably. Even the winner of the 1975 contest, former prime minister Malcolm Fraser, believes that politics is best left to elected politicians and those they represent.

John Uhr is a professor in the Policy and Governance Program at the Crawford School of Economics and Government, Australian National University, Canberra.
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Canadians should know that the fate of the Harper government is attracting international attention.

Many people in Australia are watching with interest, because the Rudd government, elected a year ago, also faces parliamentary obstruction from non-government parties.

But the current Australian situation is manageable because Kevin Rudd's government unlike Stephen Harper's, has a majority of seats in the lower house of Parliament.

The Rudd government, however, does share something with the Harper government: a hostile upper house where the governing party lacks a majority.

So both prime ministers are way out of the traditional Westminster comfort zone: their power to govern is limited by the constraints on their power to make law.

What might be new for Canadians is not so new for Australians, where the elected Senate is rarely in the hands of any governing party. Voters seem to like it that way: the same voters who a year ago gave the Rudd government its comfortable lower house majority also took out electoral insurance by splitting their vote to ensure that neither of the two main parties competing for government won a Senate majority.

In the Australian Senate, the balance of power is held by a colourful but unpredictable collection of Greens and socially conservative independents.

The Australian parliament has just risen for the Christmas break, and the Rudd government is reconciled to the fact that a fair slab of its legislative program remains unresolved in the Senate: on ice until the new year.

Australian Senate elected

The Australian Senate has greater public legitimacy than the Canadian Senate because it is popularly elected, using a system of proportional representation that Prime Minister Harper is on record as admiring. Not that Harper's preference for Canadian Senate elections would make life easier for him or any other head of government.

I note the many references in Ottawa over the past two weeks to the 1975 dismissal of the Whitlam government by the Australian governor general. By all means, take seriously these warnings about the powers of the Crown's representative to hire and fire prime ministers. But remember that these warnings also relate to powerful upper houses.

Like Canada, Australia is a constitutional monarchy. Unlike Canada, Australia is openly considering becoming a constitutional republic. The events of 1975 help explain why the republic option is alive in Australia.

On Nov. 11, 1975, the Australian governor general John Kerr dismissed the Whitlam government which had been first elected in 1972, then re-elected in 1974. During 1975, the Whitlam government faced steadily increasing obstruction by the Senate, where the government did not have a majority.

By November 1975, the opposition-dominated Senate made clear its determination not to pass, or indeed, not even to consider the Whitlam government's most recent budget.

This was partisan brinkmanship on the gravest scale. The two houses of parliament were deadlocked. The opposition parties claimed that the government had in effect lost confidence through its inability to obtain the passage of its budget.

The Whitlam government claimed that it had a mandate to govern and that the Senate was required to exercise its legal powers subject to established conventions of responsible government which acknowledge the rights of lower houses over budgetary supply.

The deadlock dragged on, with both sides digging in for a long struggle.

Then things got dicey

Many feared that the national government would soon run out of money. The Whitlam government began to fear that the governor general might use the unregulated reserve powers of the Crown to change the government before rather than after an election.

The only other time that an Australian government ***changed party*** hands without an election was in wartime in 1941, when defectors from the governing conservative party in the lower house switched their support to the labour opposition, which was then commissioned in office by the governor general following due parliamentary processes, and went on to win the next two general elections.

Nineteen-seventy-five was different. Governor general John Kerr made it his official responsibility to fix the situation. He dismissed the Whitlam government and commissioned the opposition under Malcolm Fraser as a caretaker government, pending fresh elections.

A month later, the Fraser government won office in a landside electoral victory. But the office of governor general suffered considerably.

Even the winner of the 1975 contest, former prime minister Malcolm Fraser, believes that politics is best left to elected politicians and those they represent.

John Uhr is a professor in the Policy and Governance Program at the Crawford School of Economics and Government, Australian National University, Canberrar
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